

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801
Fax (909) 599-3825

January 20, 2021

A meeting of the **ad hoc Compliance Committee** took place on the above date, **at 12:31 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Wayne Brown	Southern California Edison
Mr. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Camile Bowie	Southern California Edison
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Lupe Hernandez	Teleport Communications America, LLC
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L.P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Ms. Tara Andrews	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Claudia Arellano	City of Vernon
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Mr. Carrion called the meeting to order at 12:31 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes – Mr. Carrion inquired if the members had any comments or concerns regarding the prior meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Item 1630: CPUC Data Requests Updates (2/14/17)
– Mr. Carrion opened the discussion to CPUC activity and updates. There were no comments or concerns from any members at this time.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1658: Environmental Issues (1/16/2019, moved from Admin Board on 1/15/2020) – Mr. Carrion opened the discussion to Environmental Issues. He stated that up in the North they have been having some high winds for the past couple of days. He was unsure how impacted the South was. He asked if there were any immediate known impacts from the record high winds experienced this week or any other environmental issues. Mr. Brown stated that SCE's PSPS program is in effect as a result of the high winds. He stated service may be shut off for a period of time as a result of the high winds. Ms. Prescott stated that she believes they usually give this a new number at the beginning of each year since it is kind of a standing agenda item. Ms. Pranata stated that yes it was, but Mr. Williams changed that to just keep the same item number. She further stated that they can change the item number if they want to. Ms. Prescott stated that it does not matter. Mr. Bacon asked if they had to state the storm and area if that was agreed upon as well. Mr. Carrion stated he believed that was resolved. Ms. Black was the one that was mentioning if there was any impact, any JPAs that resulted for the specific environmental event, that the name of that even would be mentioned on the JPA. Mr. Carrion stated that the wind was a recent event and if it goes beyond that, they will hear more about it next month.

There were no other comments or concerns from any members at this time.

Agenda Item 4 – Item 1770: 3rd Party Inspection Notification (From Administrative Board meeting – 10/21/2020) – Mr. Carrion opened up to Third Party Inspection Notification which was from October 2020 and originally stemmed from member notifications for infractions and varying interpretations of Rule 18 and Rule 80. He stated that there was an action item for members submitting their third-party contact information. He was not sure who they were supposed to be submitting that to because there was a *JPA Alert* to have been issued with that information. He was not sure if that is something that they need to add to the Excel spreadsheet, Member Contact Information, and make sure that there is an entry for each member. He asked the members how they felt about this. Ms. Pranata stated that according to the minutes it looks like someone was supposed to bring up the third-party notification at the Administrative Board Meeting, but it was not brought up. She stated she could go ahead and publish the *JPA Alert* if Mr. Carrion wanted. Mr. Carrion asked Ms. Pranata if this would be a *JPA Alert* with contact information or one requesting contact information. He stated that he did not receive anything and does not know if Mr. Serrato received anything. Ms. Pranata stated that the minutes stated Mr. Serrato was to bring it up at the Administrative Board meeting so there was not an email or *JPA Alert*. Mr. Carrion stated that it seems that members need to have some sort of a contact for third party inspection notifications. Mr. Carrion added he does not have a list. Mr. Brown stated that there is a contact list but that he believes it needs to be updated. He has seen people sending theirs in because he had seen some emails months ago that was a request that people send in their contact information. Ms. Black stated that

she liked Mr. Carrion's comment about seeing it on the member sheet because currently it is a separate list. She believes it would be better published if the third-party notification process got added to the member contact list so there is just one place for people to get their information. Mr. Carrion agreed. Ms. Black further stated that because it is a separate document and it is not named third party, that it gets overlooked. Mr. Carrion stated that this is probably why he could not find it. He stated that he went to go look for it in the member contact list. The list has information for who to contact for graffiti, so he does not know why it would not have third party inspection notification contacts as well. Ms. Black stated that she could be wrong and asked Ms. Pranata to open the website. Ms. Black stated that it is not under the member contact list but a separate sheet under Pole Inspection Resources webpage. Ms. Black stated that it is confusing, and she has had to tell a couple of people where to find it. She likes the idea of adding it to the member contact list. She asked the members what they thought about this. Mr. Bacon stated that customer service wise it would obviously work better. Ms. Pranata asked for clarification if the members wanted to change the title from *pole inspection contacts* to *third-party notification contacts*. Ms. Black stated that Mr. Carrion's comment was he was expecting to see it under the member contact information list, and have it be a line item on that. Ms. Pranata stated that she could add it to the main member contact list on a different row. She wanted to know if the members wanted her to change the title. Mr. Brown stated that that they have a couple of different things on the Pole Inspection Resources webpage. There is already a third-party notification there. He asked if they are talking about as a result of an inspection. He asked what the third-party notification that was blank on the webpage was. Ms. Pranata stated that it is a form from LADWP. Ms. Black stated that third party contacts are under the Pole Inspection Contact list excel file. She stated on that sheet for AT&T California it has go95@att.com. But this is under a place that Mr. Carrion did not know it was there and that it is just confusing. Ms. Prescott stated that she likes the name of the spreadsheet and she does not think they need to say third party inspection. She thinks pole inspection contacts is good. Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Bacon stated that third party does not have the same meaning across the spectrum for everybody. Ms. Prescott agreed. Mr. Carrion stated that he thinks there is a line in the member contact information, line 22, for poles inspections contact, but under all of that is just a link to the committee website. He does not know if they would just like to fill that in with an actual contact. Mr. Bacon asked what would help the members to have with one of the biggest things right now are the buddy poles, the complaints, government involvement, and city council complaints. He is sure all the members have dealt with inquiries into that and they do not have is who exactly to contact with the buddy pole problems. He stated that he knows that they are regional, but it would really help was if they had one point of contact to let them know that there is a buddy pole for them to take and distribute to the area that it would belong. The buddy pole situation is becoming quite a problem at LADWP, and he is unsure if any of the other members are sharing in this as well. A lot of times his phone number or somebody else's will be given when that is not necessarily the department that

should be getting it first. He wanted to know if they could get a directory on that. Mr. Brown stated that he thinks they have one called dual poles and asked Ms. Pranata if this was correct. Ms. Pranata presented the Dual Poles in Field contact webpage on WebEx. Mr. Bacon asked if that was up to date. Mr. Brown stated that was a different question. Ms. Pranata stated that it is up to the members to send her the information for her to update it. If it is not sent to her then she does not know if that person is still working with the company. Ms. Prescott stated that she thinks they should have all the contacts on one contact spreadsheet, that it makes better sense. Mr. Bacon stated that when it comes to an errant or an errored JPA, would Ms. Prescott want those calls from one of those companies or it is a buddy pole if that should go to the construction side of the house for removal when its due. Ms. Prescott agrees that they have contacts, but that have to go in the website and find this contact list. What Mr. Carrion is saying is to put it on one list. When you go to the member contact list you get everything. You get the single point of contact for the buddy poles, the single point of contact for the pole inspections. She stated it makes a lot more sense to incorporate all of these onto the one contact list. When it is updated then people can look at the one list and update whatever needs updating instead going to of all the various lists. Ms. Pranata explained that the Dual Poles in Field list is for the public and they do not need to be a member to access the contact information. If she moves them to the main excel spreadsheet, that is only for the members. She asked if the members did not want the two contact lists, – SPOC Dual Poles in Field and SPOC Graffiti Removal, to be published for the public. Ms. Prescott stated that she did not know they were for the public. Ms. Pranata stated that anything under *contact* is for the public, but anything under *members* is for members only. Mr. Bacon stated that they need to keep it updated for the right person that needs to be notified for the buddy pole thing. He stated customers get such a runaround, and they have nowhere to go. So LADWP is always looking up who it is, and then that person shows retired two years ago which then they have no one to talk to about a buddy pole and they then want to sue them. That is how severe they get. Mr. Carrion wanted to confirm that depending on the nature of the list, some of those they do wish to remain publicly. Mr. Bacon stated this was correct. Mr. Carrion stated that it is just a matter of setting out exactly what kind of list they want to exist, and which ones are to remain publicly accessible and which ones are going to be internal because the member contact list, as far as he is concerned, should then now evolve to be just a JPA contact list. Then have a separate list for pole inspections contacts and it should not even be a line on the member contact list. As opposed to having them all in one, no list would be publicly available, they would have separated by category and if they want to go that route it would work as well. Mr. Carrion stated he can take the action item upon compliance to look at the different contact lists that they have, categorize them for the next meeting to see how many lists they do need to update them, if that is the way they want to go. Mr. Brown stated on the dual pole, if Ms. Pranata could change that to dual/buddy pole because buddy pole is now the new term. He stated that on those it would be good if they have that because this may be part of Track two in regards to the commission. They will be ahead

of the game by having the contact information. Ms. Pranata stated that she will change it. She then stated she believes there is another contact information list. She then inquired since members are not using NJUNS if she can delete that list. She did not want to delete anything without confirming. There were no objections. Ms. Pranata will delete the NJUNS lists. She stated she that was all she had. Mr. Carrion stated he believes they are ready to move forward with that.

Agenda Item 5 – Item 1773: Concerns with fire mesh wrap (From Administrative Board meeting – 11/18/2020)

– Mr. Carrion opened to Concerns with fire mesh wrap. He stated this was discussed at the Administrative Board meeting, but it seems like the members are pending a response from the product experts, which he asked Mr. Brown if this was correct. Mr. Brown stated that he called them during the first break and was waiting to hear back from them. Mr. Carrion stated this sounded good and they would move on to the next agenda item.

Agenda Item 6 – Wildfire Mitigation Efforts (11/15/2019, moved from Pole Loading Agenda on 11/18/2020). – Mr. Carrion opened to Wildfire Mitigation Efforts and asked if there are any updates concerning this that require discussion at this time. Mr. Brown stated there were not any from SCE. Mr. Carrion stated that there is no item for this and asked if this should be kept on the agenda. Ms. Pranata stated it can be removed if they are not going to discuss it anymore. Mr. Carrion stated that he does not think there will be more discussion since there is no item number. Mr. Brown agreed because when he brings it up it will be in the Pole Loading. He stated Pole Loading is no longer an every month meeting ad hoc, only when needed. If SCE has any Wildfire Mitigation updates, he will ask for a Pole Loading meeting. Mr. Carrion agreed that it does seem to be an as needed discussion. Mr. Brown stated this was correct.

Agenda Item 7 – Miscellaneous –

- Mr. Carrion opened to the proposed draft letters that can be found in the Compliance packet (see attached). From Mr. Carrion's notes, no meeting ever materialized toward the end of the year. The last he heard from Mr. Serrato is that he will make another attempt to organize an offline meeting for any parties interested to discuss the letter. He stated that this letter was to present to non-committee associated parties, such as jurisdictions making inquiries about the JPA process. The compliance packet contains the various revisions of that letter. Mr. Carrion asked Ms. Pranata to present the letter. He stated there are three notable versions. The first was an AT&T California version, which focused primarily on existing joint ownership and the nature of that. An SCE version, and a subsequent revised version from Crown Castle. Mr. Carrion asked the members if this was something, they would want to have any further discussion on this at this time. He asked the members

if they had any thoughts or strong feelings towards this. Mr. Carrion stated that the main issues that they were facing and the reason this letter came about was because some of the jurisdictions were asking for copies of JPAs. They were starting to dig deeper into their process asking for approvals, asking about the process itself, how approvals come about, and so forth without them really gaining any substantial understanding or their process. They needed a sort of unified explanation about what is done on a high level. Crown Castle drafted a letter that they wanted to provide to the jurisdiction, but they wanted it to be sort of a unified agreeance into it so that it had a little more backbone and that it would be consistent across the board if such a request were made of the other members. Mr. Van Stryk asked if it was Cal Trans was the issue. Mr. Carrion stated that Cal Trans was just one of the issues. He stated it was one of the issues that AT&T California was experiencing. Ms. Black stated yes and that there were others. Mr. Carrion stated that it did go all the way down to just cities asking about the JPA process and asking for JPA forms as proof that they had permission from other members to do work on joint poles. He stated that this was a way to explain to them on a really high level without divulging too much information that would lead to further questioning about what they do and the sort of rights that members have on jointly own poles. Ms. Black stated she thinks she is good with the letter to Mr. Carrion. Mr. Carrion stated that it is just a matter of which version the members would agree upon or if any of the versions are acceptable. He stated there was a concern on SCE's end about the letter being used as sort of a golden ticket. Mr. Carrion created another version to include an agreement that if all the members agreed to what was outlined, the letter would not be used to circumvent any process that is established within the handbook. Mr. Carrion was hoping that would put SCE's concerns at ease. It primarily focused around the work that JPAs need to be approved, which all the members know they do. He does not know if parties outside of the committee necessarily need to know that. He reviewed SCE's version and stated the problem he has with this was that wherever approved was seen would subsequently lead to the party asking about this to then assume that approval is needed regardless of the situation. He stated that he understands on Mr. Brown's account, the fear that the letter would be used as a golden ticket. Mr. Bacon stated that on all of the letters they are in a horrible predicament. They have to have a signed piece of paper to ask permission to work on their own facilities, and they should not have to. They are a card-carrying member like the rest of them. Mr. Bacon then asked if all the applications that Crown Castle is submitting if they have a riser. If all the applications have a riser going on to the pole. Mr. Carrion agreed it was for Crown Castle. Ms. Black stated it was not for AT&T California. Mr. Bacon stated what he has been doing and has worked is the agreement he has a Form 9, which most of the time, whether they are an owner or whatever, he has them submit a Form 9.

He then puts an electronic signature on it, and they are good to go. It seems to work, and it is still legal because that is the pole that they are going to be putting a riser on. They need excavation and it is a right of excavation. They did not want to do all the legal wording; they are not responsible or anything. There is the quadrant or their Form 9 for the pole and they just sign off on that. They are a member, and it is a Form 9 signed by the utility. He further stated that they will have to work it out between them and SCE, but that they definitely have a right to work on their own facilities. That is all though. Mr. Carrion stated that there is someone in the jurisdictions has gotten privy to the JPA process to a certain level, and they know what a Form 2 looks like, and that is what they are specifically asking for. The assumption goes that SCE owns all the poles and they are looking for Crown Castle having permission, particularly from SCE. The letter was to hopefully create a solution that explains that SCE might be the base owner of the majority of the poles but does not necessarily give them any less rights of ownership than them. Crown Castle has found ways to keep it at bay and move forward with getting the encroachment permits that they need from the jurisdictions. They are continuing to do so. They were hoping to create a letter that was unified amongst all the members because Crown Castle is not the only member that is being asked for jurisdictions for JPAs. Mr. Bacon agreed. Mr. Carrion stated that they necessarily did not want to give something up that other members were not. Inversely they did not want other members giving more information that they were not and also getting questions to provide additional documentation. Mr. Bacon stated that it is obviously SCE's discretion whether or not they want to sign it or how the wording of it. From a legal point of view, that is like signing off. He stated it is like saying "We like NextG is financially responsible for all the stuff that's on the pole." On the legal side that is what SCE is worried about. That is why they are stepping very carefully on their end and rightly so. There is a lot of money if something does go wrong. Mr. Brown stated this was correct and that SCE does not share the documents first of all. They do not share a JPA or anything like that. They do explain the JPA process and they do say that upon approval anybody is allowed to get on that pole at their space or whatnot. They do not tell the city that it is ok for them to get on the pole. Or in Mr. Carrion's case they are going to the city or Cal Trans, whoever it may be they are saying that they need to get permission from SCE. SCE is telling the city that once the JPA is approved, yes, they have permission to be on that pole because they do not want the city coming back after them saying, "Okay, Edison, you told us they can get on the pole." regarding getting permits from Caltrans, SCE will then respond they did not tell them they can get on the pole but that they said if approved they can get on the pole, because if something goes wrong and if that pole falls over, then SCE is held liable because they informed the city they are ok to get on the pole. He further stated that SCE is telling the City or Cal Trans if they are approved then yes,

they can get on the pole. SCE is not just arbitrarily just saying they can get on the pole and they are not telling the city it is their pole. They explained the whole joint pole process that as long as there is sufficient space anybody can get on the pole as long as they are member of the committee or they are intact to a member, such as a renter from one of the members that occupy space. SCE tells them that they are the base owner, but they are not the owner of the pole. That the pole is jointly owned between whoever has the legal rights to be on that pole. But just to say that you can get the pole because you are a member, that is not true. They cannot just get on the pole because they are a member. They have to be approved to get on the pole and that is SCE's argument. Mr. Bacon stated that they need to move on. Mr. Carrion stated they will put a pin on this. He would like to break it down and then maybe they can agree on a few things along the way. He will take it back to Mr. Serrato and they will work from there. He stated Mr. Serrato did want to organize a new meeting outside with other interested parties, and they will see if that materializes. He asked if any members had other miscellaneous items.

- Mr. Brown stated he had a couple. The first one is Do Not Bills. SCE is receiving numerous Do Not Bills. They are requesting the Do Not Bill be lifted from the members, and they are not getting any response. In some of the cases on the Do Not Bills, they are not even receiving the initial Do Not Bill. They are getting it from the committee. Once they try to final it, the committee is saying there is a Do Not Bill on there. That is not the right process to send it to the committee and not send it to the member. In the other cases, it has been months and months since they have sent letters, even years on a couple of them and they have not been lifted from the committee. He stated there has to be some type of time limit or something to that. They send it back to the member and correct the issue or deny it. If they deny it, that leads to further communication, but if they correct it then they should be lifting the Do Not Bill, but, yet they are still on hold. They need to come up with some type of time limit on the Do Not Bills. When SCE returns it to the member, maybe they should be returning it to the committee also and at that time it just starts the clock on some type of a timeframe to lift that Do Not Bill. In one case for one of the members, the employee had not even worked there in over six-seven months and for 90% of the Do Not Bills were coming from that one employee. SCE needs to be able to get passed the Do Not Bills at some point. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he is looking into this and he would like to call Mr. Brown later in the week and discuss offline those if it was okay with him. Mr. Brown stated okay and that he appreciated it. He stated there is a few others but that a majority of them he would have to discuss with Mr. Treepaisan. Mr. Treepaisan stated he got the list that Mr. Brown sent over and they are starting to investigate them, and he would like to speak to him about a couple of them. Mr. Brown stated this would be great and that he appreciated it.

- Mr. Brown stated he had another item to bring up. He stated SCE denies the JPA and the member went ahead and got on the pole. They are on that pole illegally and not as a result of denying it, but SCE's communication is going underground. Now they are trying to get that member to go underground and they are pushing back. That member was denied access on that pole and they went ahead and go on the pole anyway. He had a couple of things to say in regards to that, 1. They got on the pole after being denied and then, 2. That same member created a second JPA and sent it off to another member who was not on the original JPA. He stated that they should have revised the JPA, but they did not send any revisions out or anything like that. He asked how does SCE handle those. If 1. They are being denied and then, 2. They sent out a revision, but did not change the JPA number or added a revision, all they did was just add the member to the JPA and sent it four months later. He stated that is not the process. Mr. Bacon agreed that it was not. Mr. Brown asked how does SCE handle those. Mr. Bacon stated they are limited to what it says in the JPA Handbook. That and that he thinks the very least the contact or the group to notify you on getting their facilities put underground. They strangled them once and now they are strangling them again because they are insisting that they stay overhead and that is unacceptable, especially when it has to go underground. He stated that getting the timing right of getting everybody underground at the same time is an act of god if it happens. It adds to the difficulty. Whatever member it is, both need to open up their communication and try to get that resolved, but that it should not be happening on the JPA side and just changing it. He stated to look at each other and get that resolved.
- Mr. Brown stated he had one more item. He stated SCE's claims department reached out to the committee a couple of months ago and they were asking for a certificate of insurance on one of the members. He stated that the committee does not keep a certificate of insurance. Mr. Brown asked Ms. Pranata if she remembered this and he believed her response was that they do not house those at the committee and that the members are responsible to have one every year or something along those lines. Ms. Pranata stated her first email reply was she can look at what they have and then send them what they have to them. It took her a couple of weeks, but she did find the COI and sent them to the person who requested it and they should have the information requested. Mr. Brown stated this was good and he did not see the email trail. Mr. Brown asked if they do keep the certificate of insurance housed at the committee. Ms. Pranata stated that it is only when they send it to her. There is a file for it, but they do not request it every year. She does not recall the year, but there was one time where everyone was asked to submit their COI. But she only believes it was one time. It was not every year that the members were asked to submit a COI. Mr. Brown asked if they do have one for every member. Ms. Pranata stated they have one from that year. She asked Ms. Prescott to assist her because she was the

one helping her with the letter. She believes it was more than three years ago possibly. Ms. Prescott stated that she thought they got one from just about everybody at that time. She does not remember what generated it, but they did get one. She does not remember if they decided they were going to do it every year or just that one time. She stated it probably should be something that is ongoing every time that it renews. Ms. Pranata stated that it was just one time because they reviewed the SCJPC agreement, and it is stated in the agreement. If the committee asks for it then, yes, they will provide. Mr. Brown stated that means the committee should be housing that. Ms. Prescott agreed and that they should probably be asking for them every year. She stated that every company that they work for and work with even requests COIs as just routine business. Mr. Brown asked if they expire at any point or if they are just ongoing. Ms. Prescott stated that they renew every year. They have to renew their insurance and they are usually automatically sent out each year by the insurance company when they renew. So, it should not be a big deal to request it every year. Mr. Brown stated that if they do renew, they probably should be turning them in every year. Mr. Bacon stated also if the status has not changed year to year. Ms. Prescott stated that they may change insurance companies. Mr. Brown agreed and if that information changes, yes, but that most of them keep it the same company year after year. Ms. Prescott stated that the COI in the file is expired because it will have an expiration date. Ms. Pranata found it in the agreement. She stated it says, "Each member shall furnish a copy when requested by the Operating Committee." At that time, they were only asking for that one time only. Mr. Brown stated that maybe it should be requested every year by the Operating Committee. Mr. Carrion asked if this is something that they would want to have happen, maybe January of every year, just kind of an announcement. Ask if there have been any changes to anyone's COIs that need to be updated and just kind of let it be at that because if it does not change for most of them, which he does not think happens to often, then they can easily move forward after that. To make the commitment of every January meeting to make that announcement during the Administrative Board, then that should deal with it. Ms. Prescott stated that the insurance companies generate them automatically and all they need to do is add them to the list. They add the Joint Pole Committee. Then they do not really have to worry about it because they go out automatically. That is one way to do it, is that each year when they renew their insurance it goes out automatically to all of their clients and everybody who is on that particular list. She stated that is the way hers worked. She assumes it works like that for everyone. It is how they do it and it would be easy. They do not even have to request it because it is just automatic. Mr. Carrion stated that worked. Ms. Prescott stated that they either keep them current or they do not bother doing it because there is no point in having a bunch of expired COIs in a file. Mr. Carrion agreed. Mr. Brown

also agreed that they should keep them current. Ms. Prescott stated all their vendors send the COIs to them and they take a look at them. If they are expired, they send a note and they get it to them right away. She stated that most of them auto renew though. Mr. Bacon stated or one flash email to please submit and they just send them off every year to Ms. Pranata either way. Ms. Prescott stated that worked as well. Mr. Brown then stated that was all he had. Ms. Pranata asked if moving forward she is to ask all the members in January, if that was what was decided. Mr. Bacon stated it was. Ms. Pranata stated she will send the email out soon. She also stated that the requested COI has been sent to SCE to Ms. Diaz, Ms. Mitwasi, and Richard on December 1st of last year. Mr. Brown stated that was fine and thanked Ms. Pranata. Mr. Carrion asked if everyone was good or if there were any more miscellaneous items.

- Ms. Black stated she had an item. She stated she was going to bring this up under Routine Revision but thinks it may fall under Compliance. She stated she would like to see about some sort of service level agreement commitment from the members on their response for some specific item. AT&T California is having a difficult time getting the JPA paperwork for a pole that was replaced. It is a Section 7.13 basically, where they never got the paperwork. They then have a service order on hold, which has escalated to a customer complaint. They then cannot get the paperwork and they are on well over a month. She would like to hear from the members on how quick they think the paperwork should get turned around. She stated she would like to submit next month into the Routine Handbook something that would then capture that timeframe that the members think would be reasonable for the kind of a service level agreement for turnaround time. She then asked the members what they thought about this. Mr. Bacon asked Ms. Black to break this down and write a question out so that the members can all take a look at it as far as non-response, what action she would like to see taken, and how she would write it up in the JPA manual. Then they can take a look at it. This way the members can take a look at it, read it, and prepare for this one. Ms. Black stated she will do that but asked if she can get the first question answered today which was, what is a reasonable amount of time to expect JPA paperwork to be filled in and sent for a pole that was replaced without the paperwork initiated. She would like to get that reasonable timeframe, that way then she could draft something for the Routine Handbook. She asked if 72 hours or a week were reasonable because she did not believe a month was reasonable. She would like something that is less than a month. Mr. Van Stryk asked if this was a time to start the process. Ms. Black stated that right now what AT&T California has going on is they have a pole that was replaced out in the field without the Form 2 initiated. They have a service order where they need to go onto that pole. Their process is if there is a pole replacement they need to transfer to the new pole. They will not issue a job if they do

not have a JPA and the Form 48. They do not have any of the paperwork and the question is how long should it take and be reasonable for that based on who replaced the pole without initiating the paperwork to create paperwork for them. Mr. Bacon stated that sounds like one of their poles. Mr. Van Stryk suggested they send a Form 7 asking about it and then that could be the timeframe. Ms. Black stated they do not have a JPA to initiate a Form 7. Mr. Carrion stated there is no JPA to account for it and asked what the section for replacing a joint pole without having given notification was. Ms. Black stated it was a Section 7.13. Mr. Carrion stated that AT&T California should include Section 7.13 on their JPA that they need to issue and asked Ms. Black what would be the issue with that. Ms. Black stated that is the section code that should be on there when they do get the paperwork. The problem is they do not have the paperwork. Therefore, they cannot get that pole replacement done and they cannot complete their service order because they do not have any of the paperwork. Mr. Van Stryk asked if the pole was still out in the field or if it was just the new pole. Ms. Black stated it was there and they are unable to climb the old pole because of the placement of the new pole. They have to do the replacement in order to access the pole. Mr. Bacon asked if there has been no response. Ms. Black stated they have requested three times with no response and asked if it would be fair for them to ask for five business days. Ms. Prescott stated that she could start there as something to just throw out there. Ms. Black then stated she will write something up for the Routine Handbook for next month. Mr. Carrion stated he was starting to see where Ms. Black was getting at and that if she started with five days then they can discuss if that is too short or if it is not long enough. Ms. Prescott agreed. Ms. Black stated she will do that. Mr. Carrion then asked if there were any more miscellaneous items.

- Mr. Bacon asked Ms. Pranata to bring up the email that he sent (see attached). He then stated he was not sure if any of the other members had received this yet. He stated that LADWP just hit the fan. He believes it was Cal Trans sending out where they cannot place a pole within 52 feet of the freeway without a whole lot of paperwork that has got to go behind it. He asked the members if they experienced this yet. Mr. Brown asked for the question again. Mr. Bacon stated that he believes they got this from Cal Trans. It writes out what they will be up against. This is coming down from the state, which they will have to fill out a whole permit any time they want to go anywhere near any of the freeways or expressways, all those areas, and state highways. Mr. Bacon asked Mr. Brown if SCE is dealing with this yet. Mr. Brown stated that they have been dealing with this for about a year now. It is handled through SCE's permitting group and they are on top of this. He stated it has been brought up at the state level, the PUC level. SCE has been having some conversations about this with some of the members there. Mr. Bacon stated that this not good for utilities. Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Bacon

stated that they do not have the resources to be filling a book out on what they want. He stated they feed those places as well as their streetlights and their traffic signals and everything else. He stated they do not want to be held to, as well as the other members, want to be held to doing those. LADWP is fighting tooth and nail and he wanted this to be an FYI for all the members. If they did not know about this yet that it will be coming to their companies soon. Mr. Carrion asked if this would need a standing agenda item. Mr. Bacon stated that it will not but because they were talking about Cal Trans earlier, he wanted to add this to ask if everyone knows about this. Mr. Carrion asked if there are any developments on this that they would be sure to hear about them. Mr. Bacon agreed.

Mr. Carrion asked if there were any other miscellaneous topics. There were none at this time.

Agenda Item 5 – Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts -

- Compliance committee will review the various contact lists that they have to create a more streamlined set of categories and files to make that better for all.
- Ms. Pranata to change the title dual poles contact list to include the buddy poles, but that will be included in the review. The NJUNS contact list will be deleted.
- A COI update request will be sent out to all the members soon. Moving forward, that will happen every January of the year.

The meeting adjourned at 1:27 p.m. until February 17, 2021.

Anali Spencer - Committee Staff

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC), _____ maintains attachment rights, if approved, ~~and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction~~, on distribution/communication poles ~~to with an~~ established joint-ownership record, between _____ and other members of the SCJPC.

For distribution/communication poles in which ~~a~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s), which must be approved by the pole owner(s).

The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates. As per SCJPA guidelines, a JPA becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed (unless there is a denial or hold), from the date in which the JPA was submitted.

Please note that tThe SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of **Crown Castle NG West** with the SCJPC.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The pole(s) listed on the attached permit have the following Companies listed as established Joint-Owners of record at the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC).

Joint Owners include:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed Owners grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) listed on the permit. This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a ~~standing M~~member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee ("SCJPC"), _____ maintains attachment rights, ~~if approved, to and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction, attach equipment, and engage in construction,~~ on distribution/communication poles ("poles") ~~with an to with an~~ established ~~ed~~ joint-ownership record, between _____ and other ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC.

For ~~distribution/communication~~ poles in which ~~a-~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization ("JPA Form 2"), to the appropriate pole owners(s). ~~which must be approved by the pole owner(s).~~

~~The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates.~~ As per SCJPC ~~CA~~ guidelines, a JPA ~~Form 2~~ becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed ~~(unless there is a denial or hold)~~, from the date in which the JPA ~~Form 2~~ was submitted.

~~Please note that t~~The SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of ~~Crown Castle NG West~~ with the SCJPC.

Commented [CE1]: Open to misinterpretation from non-SCJPC parties that an approval request is repeatedly required, and that *explicit* approval is mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [EC2]: "to" implies that the action of attachment establishes joint-ownership, rather than the issuance of a JPA.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE3]: Open to misinterpretation that *explicit* approval is always mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE4]: Understood amongst Members, not pertinent to non-SCJPC parties.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Authorization Letter Terms of Use

THIS AUTHORIZATION LETTER TERMS OF USE (the “Terms”) is made on this ____ day of ____, 2020, by and between the **Members (“Members”) of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (“SCJPC”)**.

1. **Terms of Access.** Access to the Authorization Letter (hereinafter the “Letter”), and any iterations thereof, is granted exclusively to the Members of the SCJPC, their representatives and known associates.
2. **Description of Use.** The Letter is to be used for the purpose of demonstrating a Member’s basic attachment rights, as secured through membership with the SCJPC, to parties unassociated with the SCJPC.
3. **Limitations.** The Letter does not in any way supersede established processes, nor grant additional rights to any Member, beyond what is outlined within the SCJPC Routine Handbook (the “Routine”). The Letter may not be cited in a manner as to provide an alternate interpretation of the procedures of the Routine and does not imply that all necessary actions to obtain attachment rights have been met.
4. **Confidentiality.** Members acknowledge that the Terms herein are confidential to Members of the SCJPC and its operating staff.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) is made up of a group of Utility Companies, Communications Companies, and Municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed SCJPC Members grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) they own. The SCJPC Membership includes the following Companies:

ATC Outdoor Das, LLC	Frontier Communications
AT&T California	Golden State Water Company
AT&T Mobility	Mobilitie, LLC
CA-CLEC LLC	MCI Metro/ATS
City of Anaheim	MCI Telecommunications
City of Azusa	M-Power Communications
City of Banning	NewPath Networks
City of Burbank	Southern California Edison Company
City of Colton	Sprint Communications
City of Glendale	Sprint Nextel
City of Lompoc	T Mobile USA
City of Los Angeles	Teleport Communications America, LLC
City of Pasadena	Time Warner Cable (Spectrum)
City of Riverside	Verizon California
City of Vernon	Verizon Wireless
Crown Castle NG West., INC	XO Communications
ExTeNet Systems	

This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 1:32 PM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: Email from John Bacon for Compliance meeting attachment Fw:

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Bacon, John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 20, 2021 12:56 PM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Subject:

Please Post

(b) Discretionary Fixed Objects.

Discretionary fixed objects are features or facilities that are not necessary for the safety, maintenance or operation of the highway, but may enhance livability and sustainability. These may include, but are not limited to, transportation art, gateway monuments, solar panels, and memorial/historical plaques or markers. See Subsection (4) for high speed rail clearance guidance. When discretionary fixed objects are constructed on freeways, expressways or conventional highways, they should be located beyond the clear recovery zone at a minimum of 52 feet horizontally or 8 feet vertically up-slope from the planned ultimate edge of traveled way. However, if discretionary fixed objects are to be placed less than the 52 feet horizontally or less than the 8 feet vertically up-slope, they should be made breakaway or shielded behind existing guardrail, barrier or other safety device.

Shielding and breakaway features must be in conformance with the guidance found in Traffic Safety Systems Guidance. For input on the need for shielding at a specific location, consult District Traffic Operations.

Where compliance with the guidelines stated in Subsections (2)(a) and (b) are impractical, the minimum horizontal clearance cited in Subsection (3) Minimum Clearances shall apply to the unshielded fixed object. These minimum horizontal clearances apply to yielding objects as well.

John R. Bacon, Superintendent
Overhead Distribution Design
Office: 213.367.2745



-----Confidentiality Notice-----

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, which may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the content of this information is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mail and delete the original message and any attachment without reading or saving in any manner.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

Fax (909) 599-3825

February 17, 2021

A meeting of the **ad hoc Compliance Committee** took place on the above date, **at 1:32 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Mr. Joe Serrato	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Wayne Brown	Southern California Edison
Ms. Camile Bowie	Southern California Edison
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Lynn Prescott	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L.P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Ms. Cory Crawford	AT&T California
Ms. Tara Andrews	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Jim Todaro	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. Pedro Garganera	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Claudia Arellano	City of Vernon
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Mr. Serrato called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes – Mr. Serrato inquired if the members had any comments or concerns regarding the prior meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Item 1630: CPUC Data Requests Updates (2/14/17)

– Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to CPUC activity and updates. He stated that this topic was brought up at the Administrative Board Meeting today regarding Rule 20 and the consideration for revisions to the allocation of rate payer funds for utilities near roadways. He stated there was not much to be said for now, but that he thinks they will have an update on this next time. He asked the members if anyone had anything else to share for this topic. There were no comments or concerns from any members at this time.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1658: Environmental Issues (1/16/2019, moved from Admin Board on 1/15/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to Environmental Issues.

There were no other comments or concerns from any members at this time.

Agenda Item 4 – Item 1770: 3rd Party Inspection Notification (From Administrative Board meeting – 10/21/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened to Third Party Inspection Notification. He stated that the action items from the last meeting was for the compliance committee to review the various contact lists that they had to create a more streamlined set of categories and files to be better for all. Mr. Serrato stated that Mr. Carrion had sent over something to Ms. Pranata. While Ms. Pranata was pulling up the information sent, Mr. Carrion stated he compiled a list in the hopes that it would give the members a visual to see what can be consolidated, separated, reorganized, what would be for public reference and what would be for private, internal reference only. He stated there were a few repeats and a lot of links. Ms. Pranata then displayed Mr. Carrion's list (see attached). Mr. Carrion stated from the Members Menu on the SCJPC website there was the standard Member Contact Information excel spreadsheet that the members are familiar with, then listed are all the different categories of context within. He stated that there are JPA related ones in which he did not list all, 24-Hour Emergency Contact, Roster to Expedite (which he was unclear what that was supposed to expedite), and contacts for claims. He further stated that there are spaces for Dual Poles in the Field, Graffiti Removal, and Pole Inspections, but that those are just all links to other contact pages, and the last was the contact for Obtrusive Inspection Results request. He stated that from there is the Pole Inspections Resource which goes into the Pole Inspection Contacts, which is where they get sent from the excel spreadsheet. Furthermore, there is a separate contacts menu on the website for emergency, which is the same as the 24-hour Emergency, which he does not believe has been updated, and then a whole other copy for dual poles and graffiti removal. He stated he was unsure if all those need to live separately as is or if it all just needs to be combined in the excel spreadsheet as was discussed in the last meeting, and/or if possible, all be open for public reference or if they want to keep some of it for internal use only. He stated he is unclear of what the separation needs to be. Mr. Bacon stated that internally this is a great source for all the members because it is a hostile world out there right now with buddy poles. He stated that anybody in city council, mayors, cell cites going on and who is responsible, but to have

an internal one, he stated he would love to have something with all the contacts listed on there internally. For external customers he would not want one as detailed as this one is. He stated that he thinks they should just do the name and contact number for whatever company represented be listed. He stated that whether or not each member wants to have their number posted, or just a general, for example Verizon or AT&T number. For JPAs he stated they may want to list an essential JPA contact number, but not anything as detailed for the outside public. Mr. Carrion asked what the members thought about this. They have all these contacts, and they are separate, with some being duplicate. He stated he likes the idea of having it on one excel spreadsheet and maybe separated into tabs. He stated from that point the members can see which tab they would want to have available to the public. Because things like 24-hour Emergency Contact and for Graffiti Removal, those are that need to be available to the public. He stated that if they are on separate tabs, then they can dictate which ones are going to be for internal use only. Mr. Bacon stated they could protect the document and only the people they want seeing it will see it and this was a great idea. Mr. Carrion stated that he made this list so that all the members can get a visual of what is already out there. He stated he can take this back as an action item, reformat it as an excel spreadsheet, and bring it back next month. Mr. Bacon agreed. He stated the list is only as good as it gets updated since everyone is coming and going. He stated he loves the idea because when he gets a customer calling about something on another member, he is always scrambling to find the right person or a get a number that actually answers. Mr. Carrion stated he did have a question since the conversation arose from third party notifications being sent and not knowing who to send them to and being sent to random contacts. He asked if the members want to rename Pole Inspection Contacts to have the third-party notification term as part of that title of that contact list. Mr. Bacon questioned naming Pole Inspection Contacts to the third-party term. Mr. Carrion stated naming it Pole Inspection Contacts/Third-party notification or something along those lines. He was unsure if those were considered to be the same thing. Mr. Bacon stated that pole inspections yes, but that anybody interested in them was not going to be external. They will be more internal, unless it is a tenant, which would be Time Warner Cable, a few here and there but not too often. Mr. Carrion stated that he will take this back and reformat the excel spreadsheet. Ms. Crawford stated she had a request. She stated she receives a ton of calls from SCE's City of Riverside and City of Anaheim technicians thinking that they are to call her when they are out in the field and they decide that they are going to have a joint meet or somebody out there to answer questions. She stated she believes that when it is JPA Contacts that is confusing people. Mr. Bacon agreed and stated that this is why Mr. Carrion is asking for the 24-Hour Emergency Contact and all the other numbers so that people do have somewhere to go instead of Ms. Crawford getting the phone call. Ms. Crawford stated that is why they have to have a line item for assistance in the field or something that clearly notates what they are looking for. Mr. Bacon agreed. Ms. Crawford stated that when there is a guy out on a job and AT&T California has not been out there yet and he has a question they

should not be calling her. Mr. Serrato stated that they could have a standard set of contact numbers for the members internally and asked if externally they should leave it up to the members to decide what they want to put. He stated that they have all different companies each with different objectives. Mr. Bacon agreed and stated that he needs all the members to engage into this and actually do it and fill it out. He stated in the long run this is going to help every member not spend 25 minutes trying to get a valid contact for someone and send them away with the correct number. Mr. Serrato stated that sounded good and the action item was for Mr. Carrion to convert this to the excel format. He asked Mr. Carrion if he can send this out maybe a week before the next meeting so that all the members can fill it out and bring it to the next compliance meeting. Mr. Carrion stated he could and asked if it will just be a reorganization of the existing excel information and whatever is missing or needs to be updated should be updated. Mr. Serrato stated that this will be a two-step action item before the next meeting. There will be the excel conversion for the format and for all the members to fill it out. Ms. Pranata stated that she usually sends it to all members for them to update their contacts. She asked if Mr. Serrato wanted Mr. Carrion to send it to all members. Mr. Serrato stated that he will first send it to her and then she can email it to all members. She asked if the Compliance Committee needed to look at it first before sending it out to all members. Mr. Serrato stated that they are going to send it out and the members will fill it in and then it will be brought to the next compliance meeting. He stated it will not be officially released until they talk about it next time, unless the members thought there was a better order for that. Ms. Crawford asked Mr. Carrion if he was going to add a section that was called field needs because she cannot add a row and throw everyone else's off. Mr. Carrion stated that he had a note to add a tab for that because it seems it should be a separate tab away from the JPA contact. To keep it as a separate category. Ms. Crawford stated okay. Mr. Brown stated he would be curious to see what it is going to be like because he has been giving out information to the cities on where they go for contacts. He will be cautious because he wants to see what it looks like. Ms. Prescott stated that the members could look at it prior to filling it out and then send it to all the members so they can look at it and get a consensus on if that is what they want, then they can ask Ms. Pranata to send it out after the next meeting. Mr. Bacon stated that sounded like a great plan. Mr. Serrato stated that this sounded good and it would remain a one-step action item where Mr. Carrion was going to figure out the excel format, send it out to everyone, and the members were to bring their thoughts for the next compliance meeting. He asked if the members had any other concerns about this. There were no more comments or concerns at this time.

Mr. Serrato opened to the bullet about Ms. Pranata to change the title of the Dual Poles Contact List to include the Buddy Poles and deleting the NJUNS contact list. He asked if this was completed. Mr. Brown confirmed Ms. Pranata did update this. Mr. Serrato asked if there were any comments and if all the members were good with this. Mr. Brown stated he was. Mr. Serrato thanked Ms. Pranata.

Agenda Item 5 – Item 1773: Concerns with fire mesh wrap (From Administrative Board meeting – 11/18/2020)

– Mr. Serrato opened to Concerns with fire mesh wrap. He stated this was discussed at the Administrative Board meeting last November and was waiting for SCE to send fire mesh materials and answers to AT&T California's questions. He asked if there was any development on this. Mr. Brown stated as he was saying earlier that he ended up reaching out to the guy and because of the previous employees the two people involved went separate ways and he is trying to follow up to see what is going on. Mr. Brown stated that he is trying to follow up with his boss because he wants to escalate it just so to make sure that they get an answer and do not get put on hold. He stated he will have something on this very soon. Mr. Serrato asked if he could add this to Mr. Brown's list of action items. Mr. Brown stated he could.

Agenda Item 6 – Miscellaneous –

- Mr. Serrato opened to the Certificate of Insurance Request sent to all the members. He stated that most of the members have submitted it and Ms. Pranata requested that it be submitted to that particular email address, coi@scjpc.net, he stated that it was mentioned earlier by Ms. Pranata at the Administrative Board but for the minutes he wanted to see who was still left. He stated he could see a handful. Ms. Pranata asked if the members wanted her to send a reminder when they are expired. In the last meeting it was decided she only send it once, which was every January. That she sends it to all members and that is it or if the members wanted her to go through the list and tell them when they are expired. Mr. Brown stated the list presented was not the list shown earlier in the morning (see attached). Ms. Pranata stated that the list included in the packet was the list as of last Wednesday and stated she would pull up the latest list (see attached). Mr. Serrato asked the members how they felt if Ms. Pranata did not track when individual companies have their certificates provided expired and once a year, she sends everyone a list of the dates that they do expire so that everyone can take their own notes on if they have a year left, two, etc. Ms. Ortiz stated she thinks once a year was fine and Mr. Bacon agreed. Mr. Brown stated that with SCE they have no expiration on it, but they will provide it annually if that is what they wanted them to do. They can provide it January or whenever they want SCE to provide it. Mr. Serrato stated maybe something to check SCE off again, like stating it is still valid. Mr. Brown stated that it was the same with the City of Pasadena not having an expiration date. Mr. Van Stryk stated that most cities are self-insured. Mr. Serrato asked Ms. Pranata if she was good with once a year to send all the members their expiration date. Ms. Pranata agreed. Ms. Pranata asked if the members would like to see the table again at the next meeting. Mr. Serrato stated he would, and they will leave the bullet point.

Ms. Pranata stated that she will come back with an updated list. Mr. Serrato thanked Ms. Pranata. Ms. Pranata stated she understood.

- Mr. Serrato opened to the draft letter regarding getting permit from Cal Trans. He stated he was not at the last meeting and asked if they had made any progress with this. He asked what was discussed last time on the letter. Ms. Black stated she did not think they covered it. Ms. Crawford stated that she has not received any additional escalations from Cal Trans in Southern California and asked if Ms. Black had gotten any in Northern California. Ms. Black stated they were not and thought it was working with them using the pole card. She knows that AT&T California's issue was different from Crown Castle's, but for them because they are on the pole card it is enough proof to Cal Trans and seems to be pacifying them for now. Ms. Black informed Ms. Crawford that there was no current escalation. Mr. Bacon stated that he will find the JPA and he will send it to Cal Trans, or they will make a pole card and send that which seems to be satisfying them as well. Mr. Serrato stated that currently there is no burning force to push this. Mr. Serrato stated that they will bring it up again in the future if they have an issue, but that he thinks this can be shelved for now, so they do not have to put it on next month. Ms. Pranata stated she did receive an inquiry from City of Commerce which she forwarded to Mr. Serrato and Mr. Carrion the previous day (see attached). Mr. Serrato stated they should read through it. He read that City of Commerce wants an LOA. Mr. Van Stryk asked what LOA was for. Mr. Serrato stated that he believes it stands for Letter of Authorization. Mr. Serrato stated that a signed Form 2 is what they have been providing internally to each other as their letter of authorization. He stated it seems that the City of Commerce is asking for a specific letter. He stated the information they need/want answers for is if companies such as AT&T California, Charter Communications, or members of the JPA required to submit a JPA Form 2 or a LOA from JPA for attachments to JPA poles before the city issues a permit, or if being a member of the JPA was sufficient. Mr. Serrato stated that he interprets this as the City of Commerce is asking the members as a committee if they should be asking for a letter of authorization before they issue their permit or if being a member of the JPA committee is sufficient. Just the status of being a member before they can issue a permit. Ms. Black stated that it should be sufficient that they are a member in good standing because they are held to following the rules. In short of explaining to the City of Commerce the rules, which would not do anyone any good to have them explain the handbook to them because it is then opening up a can of worms like with Cal Trans. Mr. Serrato stated that it is up to the cities that they should decide they are going to give them a permit or not based off of whatever they need to check. They do not need to check between Crown Castle and the members if they are purchasing a space from each other or not. It is something they have to deal with each other. He asked the members if anyone had any other thoughts. Mr.

Bacon asked Mr. Serrato if they have reached out to Cal Trans or the other companies or the cities that are inquiring some kind of sign off. He asked if they have approached their corporate side or their executive side to explain that they are members and show them a JPA or a joint pole card. To tell them that they should not have a blanket policy backed up with a letter from the SCJPC. He asked if Crown Castle has thought of going that route so that they can get that blanket that if they show a pole card, which would be the simplest and easiest, to say that Next G does have ownership on the pole, if that has been an avenue that they have looked at. Mr. Serrato stated that they deal with the cities, city by city. That some ask for different things and they are able at the project team level satisfy what they need or explain enough to be able to get on the pole. He stated some are harder than others, which is why he thinks the discussion for a standardized letter came up. He has not heard anything from the field, he believes they have moved passed the one particular city. He asked Mr. Carrion if they have any projects with the City of Commerce and maybe that was why this inquiry came as a result of Crown Castle applying in their territory. Mr. Carrion stated that he does not know if they have any projects in Commerce but that the only issue for them is if they are existing joint owners and there is a pole card in existence, that is not a problem because handing over a pole card does satisfy their request. It is for pole where they are making a new attachment. They want to purchase space, and as Ms. Black had stated that they concur with the idea that being a member is sufficient as far as the other party needs to know. Mr. Bacon stated that there is no difference between SCE, LADWP, a power company or communications company that has to go out and either advance their facilities or build their facilities. Since Crown Castle is the current applicants digging up the street, they are going after them to prove that they are a member, and they should not have to prove that. He stated it should be a blanket policy across the board. Mr. Carrion stated that at the same time the members are not interpreting that as the only requirement needed because being on the other side of the fence, they know that there are a bunch of rules and processes that they need to abide by in order to make that happen, and that it is not just a matter of being a member that allows them attachment rights and so forth. Mr. Brown asked if they could come up with some type of a verbiage that they put on the front page that is visible to any member that wants to go in and check a contact on a letter stating if they are a member, they have the right to apply to attach to a pole. He stated whatever verbiage the members can agree on and then put it on the front page of the website, which they can direct the city to it not needing to supply a letter. Mr. Bacon stated it would be the current good standing members. Mr. Serrato stated that was a good idea, to have it on the landing page as well as a list of all the members in good standing. Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Bacon stated that he had another avenue, if Crown Castle has a contact list for whether it is

their version of BOE, each city has their own civil engineering department, and if they could get a list representing the SCJPC and informing all those people that Next G, Crown Castle, AT&T California, City of Azusa are in good standing members of the SCJPC, granting them the right to access the facilities. Maybe not putting right to any pole, but that it would be pretty much that. Mr. Harmon stated he had a contribution. Mr. Harmon stated that he is new and there to support Verizon Wireless's interests, but with all the experience they have had that there are a lot of times when the cities ask them things. He does not want to humor the misunderstanding, because as a city, they dictate the time, place, and manner. He stated that it is understandable that they are the local authority, but they also need to respect that this is a state issue. If a utility has a certificate of public convenience and necessity, it is heavy. They have the right to install in the right of way a pole by themselves. Mr. Bacon stated he agrees, but that the city will not let them on the street until they get the certificate, which then they will not get anything signed off. Mr. Harmon agreed and stated that would be the access of an encroachment permit. If the city wants to govern the time, place, and manner they go through an encroachment permit. If the city wants a business license, they will go that far. He stated their standing, in regards to joint pole assets, is completely irrelevant in regards to their right to build and construct within that city. He does not want to humor that misconception. He explained that they will do whatever permit needed. They will get the insurances, but their standing, or joint asset with the joint pole administration is irrelevant. That the right of rules, state, and federal law, allow them every right to build in the right of way for public benefit. Mr. Bacon stated that has never been a doubt and that is what they have said since this was brought up. He stated that they are outstanding members just like LADWP is, and the solution is to educate. To educate any city or government entity that they are members. The way to educate them is by sending out emails stating the members in good standing which have the right to access the poles. He stated the members pay their money and dues buying into the system, and they abide by the rules. They have the right to access. Which was never in question. It is how do they get this out, so they do not have the burden on themselves. He stated that the way they are talking about right now would help get them through to local city agencies. Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Harmon if he would like to assist in writing a draft statement for the landing on the SCJPC website, everything that he explained. Mr. Brown stated, to clarify for Mr. Harmon, that what is happening is the cities and counties are misunderstanding and believe the poles are SCE's poles. SCE then tells them they are jointly owned poles, and that every member has the right to purchase, as long as there is space available on the pole, pass pole loading, etc. He stated what is happening, for example the city is telling Crown Castle that SCE needs their proof for them to be on the pole. He stated that is not the case. What SCE is saying is that anybody

has the right to be on a pole upon approval. As long as they are approved to be on the pole, then there is no problem there. Crown Castle goes through the right steps by going out there, doing the pole loading, and making sure they are able to get on the pole. What the city then wants to know is if SCE says it is okay, then it is ok. All SCE says that it is ok upon approval. That not just anyone can jump onto the pole. Mr. Harmon stated that to say it is none of the city's business is factual, but that there is an actual precedent though. Many times, when they deal with those cities, there is a new person who does not know what they are doing. For the last 20 to 30 years, they have been doing this work. There is precedence that says they have been attaching to a pole for 30 years showed them their right to attach. He stated that they want to get away from humoring this and go more towards an educational standpoint as opposed to consistently going back to the same thing. Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Brown stated that Crown Castle is doing all the right things and the cities are still saying the same thing and then SCE is explaining that yes, it is ok for them to get on the pole as long as they are approved. SCE is not saying they can just go out and attach unauthorized. Mr. Carrion stated that Crown Castle is not saying that as well. The problem is that they want to give the cities just the right amount of information. They do not want to give the cities the impression when they say as long as they have approval because, though Crown Castle knows this is true, once that is said, the cities are going to start saying they need to see the approval. Then they may enter the scenario where they did not get approval after 45 days, needing to explain the time limit, following that route. He believes injecting that piece of information could make them go down a rabbit hole with the cities asking further questions upon further questions. Mr. Brown stated that truth was, just because they are a member of the committee, it does not allow them to get on the pole. Mr. Carrion stated that they know that. Mr. Brown stated that SCE is going to cover their back by saying that they are not just allowing Crown Castle to get on the pole because they do not want the city to come back and say, "Edison, you said it was okay." SCE in turn will say they did not, that they say it is ok if they are approved to be on the pole. He stated like Mr. Carrion explained, internally SCE knows that and asked if the city needs to know that. Mr. Carrion stated that SCE is making them know. Mr. Serrato asked how does Crown Castle tell them they are approved to be on the pole. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Serrato to repeat. Mr. Serrato stated if the city is asking SCE and SCE is saying, "Yeah, no, it's okay, as long as they're approved." He asked now how does Crown Castle say they are approved, or do they not have to tell them they are approved. Mr. Brown stated he did not know and that it is based on what they are asking Crown Castle for. He stated that from SCE's point they cannot just say anybody can jump on the pole even though they are a member of the committee. If something happened, for example if Malibu happened all over again and said SCE said it was ok, no that is not what they are

saying. Mr. Serrato agreed. Mr. Bacon stated that as a member Crown Castle has the right to go on the pole, regardless of its base owner. A member has the right to access the facilities. He stated that like he mentioned before, the avenues are to educate them. The SCJPC will support Crown Castles as far as letting the cities know that they are an active member and they do have facilities on the poles. He stated he noticed that there are ones where Crown Castle is not on the pole yet and they are applying, but there has to be an application and a JPA number to be able to educate. If there is a valid JPA number, that should satisfy it. He stated in all cases it is not a JPA number but a makeready number. Mr. Serrato stated he does not think so. Ms. Crawford stated pole applications. Mr. Bacon stated not for the members but for the tenants. That Time Warner Cable will run for other members a lot, for example Verizon or other companies and sometimes it is not always on a JPA. It is on a makeready as well. They run into cross-jurisdictions on those. Mr. Bacon asked if they were still going to move on with formatting a letter. Mr. Serrato stated that he does not believe they want to move on with a letter anymore because the cities will always be asking for a letter. He liked what Mr. Brown suggested of having a statement on the website so that SCE does not take full liability or anything, but that it does state that as members they have access to the pole if approved. He stated that if anyone wants to help volunteer and draft up a statement, they could talk about it next time. That he wants to make sure that the conversation gets parlayed off of this one, so they do not start over again. Mr. Bacon agreed. Ms. Prescott asked if they were going to send an answer to Karen at the City of Commerce. Mr. Van Stryk stated he could try calling since they are in the City of Vernon which is right next to Commerce. He could try talking to them on the phone and see if he can clear up some of their questions. Mr. Serrato stated that would be appreciated. Mr. Bacon stated that they should rally up some support and contact all the cities and agencies that are requiring it and educate them. Explain that when they have this, then it will apply to that and they should not have to ask for permission. Mr. Serrato asked if they should come up with a standardized talking point to draft and agree on at the next meeting. Mr. Bacon stated they should and if Crown Castle works on an agenda and where they want to go with it. Mr. Serrato stated that they will try to draft up a statement. He stated if the members have any ideas, they can reach out to them so they can incorporate or discuss it. He hopes to have something by the next meeting. They are just coming up with a paragraph or something that is not a full-blown letter to be passed out to everyone. Mr. Serrato asked the members if they had any more to say about this discussion. There were no more comments or concerns at this time.

- Ms. Black stated she had an item to discuss. She wanted to go back and revisit the issue with non-wood poles, because AT&T California is still going around and around with this. She wanted to summarize what she

got out of the last meeting when this was discussed. She stated it was regarding steps and what she thinks the members had explained, that as base owners, when they place a non-wood pole, that 100% of the poles have holes for steps and if this was correct. Mr. Bacon asked her if she stated 100%. She stated yes because how is AT&T California going to climb a pole without a step, and if there is not a hole there how will they get a step in there. Mr. Bacon stated that he can guarantee that all of LADWP's poles have a hole pattern, they designed a hole pattern which he was involved in doing that, so he knows the spacing of the holes. He stated that with all their alternative poles they have step capabilities, and he would be able to say yes, they do. Ms. Black asked about SCE. Mr. Brown stated that he does not think so because, he remembers doing a training in their Chino yard, and he remembers them putting straps and there was something to the straps on those composite fiber poles, he then said sectional poles. He does not think they have holes on the sectionals. That he would have to follow up because he does not think so. Ms. Black questioned on fiber poles. Mr. Brown stated on the sectional poles that SCE installs. Ms. Black asked what the difference between a sectional fiberglass pole and a fiberglass pole was. Mr. Bacon stated one piece or two pieces. Mr. Brown agreed. Ms. Black stated she now understood. Mr. Brown stated that he will follow up and unfortunately it was the same person that is handling the mesh. Ms. Black asked for the poles that do have holes in them predrilled, that the particular question that AT&T California has right now is that they do know it has holes in it, but they still need to know about the rest of them. The last discussion she stated it was recommended that their techs get some kind of steps that they put in their truck because it was mentioned they can buy them, and they are all going to be universal and all go into the holes. She asked if this was correct. Mr. Bacon stated it was not. That there are many different vendors and not all of them do it the same. A lot of them are custom to whatever the specifications are for that utility. He stated LADWP's specification may be different than what SCE's specifications will be on the engineering side. Sometimes they have self-tapping steps, which means they are pre-threaded, so they thread into the poles. Others can be a whole step or a bolt that will go right through the whole center of the pole and they put two curb washers on each end and those are curb steps going up the pole. He stated that there are different variations that he has come across throughout the years for steps. He understands that Ms. Black is trying to corner what the universal step that they will need in order for their people at AT&T California to ascend the poles without having to get 20 to 30 different sets thread in. He stated it depends on the area they are in and the age of the pole. That there are other alternatives out there for pole steps, but that he thinks they will need to have an assortment of steps on their trucks because it is not all universal all the time. He stated that this was hopefully the answer to her questions. Ms. Black stated it did, but that

she does not think these are the same answers that were given the last time she brought it up. She stated that she appreciated the dialogue, but as a member she does not know how or why they would agree that a base owner could place a pole that those who are also owners cannot climb. She stated that she does not know how to purchase steps so that they can access the pole safely. Mr. Bacon stated that he cannot speak for the other utilities, but if they are going up a pole, somebody has to be on the pole. That is one of their safety rules. There will be one guy up in a bucket, and the other guy is up on the pole. They have to have two people up in the area so all LADWP's poles were made with some type of pole step. All their poles are made with some type of pole step. He stated it has changed because the specifications of steps, vendors come and go, and they switched to other steps as they went along. He stated it is kind of universal, but that it is going to vary. He stated for AT&T California purchasing into a pole they cannot climb; he does not think that would be the case in L.A. Ms. Black stated that the particular pole they have an issue with is an SCE pole. She stated that could be a different statement. Mr. Brown stated Mr. Stonerock was in a meeting a few months prior where he talked about how it is no longer a requirement to have steps. Mr. Brown stated Mr. Harmon may know more about it, but that it is no longer a requirement for step poles. Mr. Stonerock had attended the meeting to explain. Ms. Black stated she remembered this and that it was due to a recent GO 95 change. Mr. Bacon stated that was correct. That due to the ground belt necessity, they have to use a cinch lock type of belt. It makes it too difficult to ascend and descend the pole with the steps there. They changed the rule because they would have to basically un-belt and belt over each step because the cinch lock belt would not make it over the steps. The GO 95 rule changed because of that. Mr. Bacon asked Mr. Harmon if he was right. Mr. Harmon stated that Mr. Bacon was right, and it was made optional. Steps are not required to be installed when they put risers or equipment on there anymore. He stated that it did go through the full proceedings and was accepted in the last rulemaking with some of the changes. He stated that when it was being discussed at the last rules committee meeting, they came to a general agreement that if they take a wood pole that is climbable by definition and replace it with a lightweight steel, that they do add climb ability to it. He stated that he believes this is mostly getting done, but that he has found some locations where he has seen lightweight steel poles that do not have steps installed, and the only way to install the steps is to use a bucket. He stated that if his understanding is correct, a company may come out there and use a bucket to install the steps and use them, then another company might come and remove the steps because it is optional. He stated he was unsure if this would be congruent or work for everyone and they would need to take a look at how they were going transition into this. Mr. Bacon stated this was true. He stated LADWP usually puts a latter up there for the first two steps and proceed from

there. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he remembered that in the rules committee they had all agreed to the poles not having the steps because of the fall protection, but that there was a caveat that they still had to be the holes so they could make it step able. Mr. Harmon agreed. Mr. Treepaisan stated it was optional, but the pole still had to be step able. Mr. Harmon stated that if he came to a pole that was lightweight steel that had the holes but no steps in it at all, they would not be able to climb the pole. They would need to use the bucket to install the steps to thereby climb the pole. He stated that they have to make sure if that is going to happen that there are steps there. It is no longer becomes optional because the pole replaced a climbable pole because it was climbable by definition, and they want to make that pole climbable even though it is steel, and in order to make it climbable they need to leave the steps in. He stated he understands there are different steps but that he feels the steps should remain there as opposed to be installed as necessary, which seems cumbersome. Ms. Black stated that the problem is that is not happening. In particular she stated they have a location with an SCE pole right now that has holes, but they do not have the steps and they cannot climb it. Ms. Crawford added there was a climbable pole there before. Mr. Bacon asked if there were step holes in the pole. Ms. Black stated there is holes, but no steps and it is now a fiberglass pole. It was a wood pole that was replaced with fiberglass. Mr. Brown stated that AT&T California asked for all of SCE's vendor information and they provided it for them. Ms. Black stated what she is hearing is that there was a decision that the steps should have been left and asked if that was not what was just discussed. Mr. Brown stated it is not required. Mr. Bacon stated that it was not required and that is what they were saying. There is no requirement to put steps up anymore because of the difficulty of the people that have to climb the pole with their belts. Ms. Crawford stated that she heard what Ms. Black heard which was the ruling was if there was a climbable pole replaced with a composite or fiberglass that steps had to be retained. She stated she heard it incorrectly as well. Mr. Harmon stated to maintain the functionality of that and the only way to climb a special type of pole is to have the climbable feet go there. To the extent that a member would say they want to go to a different material, they would have to respect the ability to immediately climb the pole, which is what a wood pole is, immediately climbable. To the extent that they do not have a means to ascend or descend, his understanding was, if they are going to replace it, that it would have to be able to be climbed when they approached the pole. Ms. Crawford stated that means that steps have to be placed and asked if this was correct. Mr. Harmon stated for special material poles, because if they are saying they are going to replace a climbable wood pole with a climbable steel pole, because when they walk up to it, they want it to be climbable. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Harmon if this was his interpretation or if it was a rule. Mr. Harmon stated that was their

discussions among the rules committee, as why they would agree to replacing wood poles with other material poles that did not have readily accessible climbing means. He stated certain cost functions, like carriers that do not have facilities that could easily provide the buckets and would like to send other types of services out there that climbing it would not make it necessary to have the bucket truck to reach certain facilities. Mr. Bacon stated that he was trying to look up the GO 95 rule that changed. He asked Mr. Harmon to post the rule change that was last addressed for the next meeting. Mr. Harmon asked if Mr. Bacon wanted him to look up the last time they address this at the rules committee. Mr. Bacon stated no, that he would like the GO 95 rule that addressed pole steps on the poles. Mr. Harmon stated the one that was removed, that he could get that. Mr. Bacon stated they will bring that forward at the next meeting. Mr. Serrato asked what the action item was. If Mr. Harmon was going to pull up the verbiage that was changed. Mr. Harmon agreed.

Mr. Serrato asked if there were any other miscellaneous topics. There were none at this time.

Agenda Item 7 – Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts -

- Mr. Carrion is to convert the contact list format into an excel spreadsheet with two different tabs. One for public and one for internal use for the members.
- SCE is going to provide a status update on providing the material for the fire-resistant mesh pole wrap.
- Mr. Van Stryk volunteered to call the City of Commerce and explain some of the JPA operations to help them better understand who can attach to JPA poles.
- Mr. Carrion and Mr. Serrato are going to bring a draft statement that they can place on the landing page of the SCJPC website, to explain their JPA status and being able to attach.
- Mr. Harmon will bring the GO 95 text that was recently changed in regards to pole steps.

The meeting adjourned at 2:26 p.m. until March 17, 2021.

Anali Spencer - Committee Staff

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC), _____ maintains attachment rights, if approved, ~~and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction~~, on distribution/communication poles ~~to with an established~~ joint-ownership record, between _____ and other members of the SCJPC.

For distribution/communication poles in which ~~a~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s), which must be approved by the pole owner(s).

The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates. As per SCJPA guidelines, a JPA becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed (unless there is a denial or hold), from the date in which the JPA was submitted.

Please note that tThe SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of **Crown Castle NG West** with the SCJPC.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The pole(s) listed on the attached permit have the following Companies listed as established Joint-Owners of record at the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC).

Joint Owners include:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed Owners grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) listed on the permit. This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a ~~standing M~~member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee ("SCJPC"), _____ maintains attachment rights, ~~if approved, to and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction, attach equipment, and engage in construction,~~ on distribution/communication poles ("poles") ~~with an to with an~~ established ~~ed~~ joint-ownership record, between _____ and other ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC.

For ~~distribution/communication~~ poles in which ~~a-~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization ("JPA Form 2"), to the appropriate pole owners(s). ~~which must be approved by the pole owner(s).~~

~~The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates.~~ As per SCJPC ~~CA~~ guidelines, a JPA ~~Form 2~~ becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed ~~(unless there is a denial or hold)~~, from the date in which the JPA ~~Form 2~~ was submitted.

~~Please note that t~~The SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of ~~Crown Castle NG West~~ with the SCJPC.

Commented [CE1]: Open to misinterpretation from non-SCJPC parties that an approval request is repeatedly required, and that *explicit* approval is mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [EC2]: "to" implies that the action of attachment establishes joint-ownership, rather than the issuance of a JPA.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE3]: Open to misinterpretation that *explicit* approval is always mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE4]: Understood amongst Members, not pertinent to non-SCJPC parties.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Authorization Letter Terms of Use

THIS AUTHORIZATION LETTER TERMS OF USE (the “Terms”) is made on this ____ day of ____, 2020, by and between the **Members (“Members”) of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (“SCJPC”)**.

1. **Terms of Access.** Access to the Authorization Letter (hereinafter the “Letter”), and any iterations thereof, is granted exclusively to the Members of the SCJPC, their representatives and known associates.
2. **Description of Use.** The Letter is to be used for the purpose of demonstrating a Member’s basic attachment rights, as secured through membership with the SCJPC, to parties unassociated with the SCJPC.
3. **Limitations.** The Letter does not in any way supersede established processes, nor grant additional rights to any Member, beyond what is outlined within the SCJPC Routine Handbook (the “Routine”). The Letter may not be cited in a manner as to provide an alternate interpretation of the procedures of the Routine and does not imply that all necessary actions to obtain attachment rights have been met.
4. **Confidentiality.** Members acknowledge that the Terms herein are confidential to Members of the SCJPC and its operating staff.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) is made up of a group of Utility Companies, Communications Companies, and Municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed SCJPC Members grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) they own. The SCJPC Membership includes the following Companies:

ATC Outdoor Das, LLC	Frontier Communications
AT&T California	Golden State Water Company
AT&T Mobility	Mobilitie, LLC
CA-CLEC LLC	MCI Metro/ATS
City of Anaheim	MCI Telecommunications
City of Azusa	M-Power Communications
City of Banning	NewPath Networks
City of Burbank	Southern California Edison Company
City of Colton	Sprint Communications
City of Glendale	Sprint Nextel
City of Lompoc	T Mobile USA
City of Los Angeles	Teleport Communications America, LLC
City of Pasadena	Time Warner Cable (Spectrum)
City of Riverside	Verizon California
City of Vernon	Verizon Wireless
Crown Castle NG West., INC	XO Communications
ExTeNet Systems	

This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 4:48 PM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: City of Commerce JPA Poles

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: PW Permit Counter <PWPermitCounter@ci.commerce.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:30 PM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Cc: Mohammad Mostahkami <mohammad.mostahkami@transtech.org>
Subject: City of Commerce JPA Poles

Good Afternoon Angela,

I am the permit technician at the City of Commerce for the department of Public Works. The City of Commerce has been requesting that our permit applicants submit a letter of authorization and/or form showing that they have received JPA authorization when proposing work on JPA owned poles. We have received several permits where the applicant is proposing the installation of fiber optic cable to the poles but before we issue the permits we would like to see a letter of authorization.

We are hoping you will be able to address a few questions for us since we have been having some difficulties receiving the requested JPA authorization.

- Are companies such as ATT, Charter Communication who are a members of JPA required to submit JPA Form 2 or a LOA from JPA for attachments to JPA poles before the City issues a Permit or is being a member of JPA sufficient?
- How about overlashing to the poles?

We just want to ensure we are following the correct protocol when issuing permits for work on JPA poles.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Karen Vigil | Associate Engineer | **City of Commerce**
2535 Commerce Way | Commerce, CA 90040

COI SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS

JANUARY 2021 REQUEST

Member Code	Company Name	ON FILE?	Expiration Date	NOTES
A	City of Glendale	Y	2/1/2022	
AMT	ATC-Outdoor DAS, LLC	Y	12/1/2021	AMERICAN TOWER
ATC	Verizon Wireless			
ATS	MCI Metro/ATS	Y	6/30/2021	
B	City of Burbank			
BVE	Bear Valley Electric, Inc	Y	2/1/2022	
COB	City of Banning	Y	7/1/2021	
D	City of Anaheim			
E	So. Calif. Edison Co.	Y	No expiration date	SELF INSURED
EXT	ExteNet Systems, Inc.			
F	City of Colton			
FON	Sprint Comm, L.P.			
FTR	Frontier Communications			
H / T	AT&T California	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
ICG	Mpower Communications	Y	7/1/2021	US TELEPACIFIC HOLDINGS CORP DBA MPOWER
J	City of Riverside	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
LAC	AT&T Mobility	Y	6/1/2021	NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS LLC
LLW	City of Lompoc	Y	7/1/2021	SELF INSURED
M	City of Los Angeles			
MA	City of Azusa			
MCI	MCI Telecommunications	Y	6/30/2021	
MOB	Mobilitie, LLC			
MP	City of Pasadena	Y	NONE	SELF INSURED
NG	Crown Castle NG West Inc.	Y	4/1/2021	
NXT	XO Communications			
PBM	T-Mobile USA, Inc.			
SPR	Sprint Nextel Corporation			
TCA	Teleport Communications America, LLC	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
TWC	Time Warner Cable	Y	1/1/2022	CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS INC
V	City of Vernon	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
		17		

EMAIL YOUR COI to this inbox: coi@scjpc.net

Members (menu)

Member Contact Information (Excel)

- JPA Contacts
 - Representatives
 - Billing
 - Forms
- 24-hr Emergency Contact
- Roster to Expedite
- Claims
- Contact: Dual poles in field (Link to *Dual Poles* page)
- Contact: Graffiti removal (Link to *Graffiti Removal* page)
- Contact: Pole inspections (Link to *Pole Inspection Resource* page)
- Contact: Intrusive inspection results request

Pole Inspection Resource (page)

- Pole Inspection Contacts

Contacts (menu)

- Emergency (same as 24-hr Emergency? Not updated?)
- Dual Poles
- Graffiti Removal

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801
Fax (909) 599-3825

March 17, 2021

A meeting of the **ad hoc Compliance Committee** took place on the above date,
at 12:36 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Joe Serrato	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Alida Montiel	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Wesley Jones	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Wayne Brown	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Camile Bowie	Southern California Edison
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L.P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Ms. Cory Crawford	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Ms. Jim Todaro	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Claudia Arellano	City of Vernon
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Mr. Serrato called the meeting to order at 12:36 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes – Mr. Serrato inquired if the members had any comments or concerns regarding the prior meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Item 1630: CPUC Data Requests Updates (2/14/17) – Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to CPUC activity and updates. He stated that last time they talked about Rule 20 and the consideration for revisions to the allocations of rate payer funds for utilities near roadways. He stated that Mr. Bacon was going to provide an update for this month. Mr. Bacon asked if this was regarding the Rule 20b for the sharing of costs. Mr. Serrato stated that it was on whatever one pertained to the allocation of repair funds for the utilities near roadways. Research was going to be done on this topic and the findings presented. Mr. Bacon stated that this was something he was not familiar with and would have to look into it. He asked if this was not regarding Cal Trans. Mr. Brown agreed it sounded like Cal Trans. Mr. Bacon stated that he believes that Cal Trans was following the CPUC lead as to the beautification and undergrounding. He stated that is what LADWP is on about. Currently they are requesting contact information with SCE and they forwarded to their legislative affairs and government affairs people to take a look at this. He stated he has not heard anything back from them yet and it is just brand new. At the moment LADWP is in the investigative state and has nothing new to add. Mr. Serrato thanked Mr. Bacon.

Mr. Serrato stated that before he moved on to Agenda Item 3, he would like to announce that two additional people from Crown Castle would be joining the call today. He introduced, Mr. Wesley Jones, Regional Manager, and Ms. Alida Montiel, Utility Relations Manager. Mr. Serrato thanked the members for having them on today.

Mr. Bacon inquired about the people invited from Crown Castle, if they were there to hear the conversation on the CPUC updates. Mr. Serrato stated they joined in general, and that Crown Castle also has some miscellaneous topics that they would probably participate in. Mr. Bacon stated ok. Mr. Serrato stated that they were not there specifically for those updates. Mr. Bacon thanked Mr. Serrato.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1658: Environmental Issues (1/16/2019, moved from Admin Board on 1/15/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to Environmental Issues. He stated that this is a standing agenda item, and it is for any members to bring up anything regarding Environmental Issues to talk about. There were no comments or concerns from any members at this time.

Agenda Item 4 – Item 1770: 3rd Party Inspection Notification (From Administrative Board meeting – 10/21/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened to Third Party Inspection Notification. Mr. Serrato stated that Crown Castle had an action item for this where Mr. Carrion was to propose a new format for the contact list that is available on the SCJPC website. He was going to convert it to an Excel format and there was going to be a distinction between what is available

internally for the committee members and what is available externally. He stated that Crown Castle is still working on this and is going to hold off for any updates until the next Compliance Meeting unless any members had anything to say at this time. Mr. Carrion stated that he would like to ask the members a question in regards to one of the contact categories on there. He asked if anyone knew what Roster to Expedite was. He wanted to know what those contacts were for and which subcategory they would be put in. Ms. Crawford stated that it was the conversation that people were giving out member's name and contact information instead of the pole desk. Mr. Bacon stated that he has gotten a few of those phone calls as well. Mr. Carrion stated that it is Roster to Expedite but would like to know exactly what it is to expedite. Ms. Pranata presented the SCJPC Member Information sheet that she sends to the members to fill out (see attached). She stated it is in Microsoft Word and it was clearer what was being requested. She stated that for expedite it is the contact information that is JPA related. Mr. Carrion confirmed that it was JPA related. Mr. Bacon and Ms. Pranata stated it was. Mr. Carrion stated that he was just not sure where to put that and did not know if it was to expedite field work or something else because it only said Roster to Expedite. Mr. Carrion noted this and stated that there were some changes and that he would add those updates that happened this week to what he already has in order to hopefully look at this next month. Mr. Brown stated that the Roster to Expedite would be good because in the past SCE has asked for a JP2 to Crown Castle so they would know that they are EOI or Tier 3 related and that they would like to expedite those JPAs. Mr. Brown stated having a contact like that would be very beneficial. Mr. Carrion stated that he was definitely keeping that in there and that he just was not sure where to put it because he is separating things into categories so that all the JPA related contacts were in one and now he knows to keep Roster to Expedite within the JPA related contact list. He stated it will remain there. Mr. Serrato stated that there will be more to come on this item for the next Compliance meeting. That they will have something more solid to propose.

Agenda Item 5 – Item 1773: Concerns with fire mesh wrap (From Administrative Board meeting – 11/18/2020)– Mr. Serrato opened to Concerns with fire mesh wrap. Mr. Serrato stated that SCE provided some information regarding their new mesh wrap that they are deploying on their poles. He stated he believed that Ms. Pranata forwarded the documents to the committee members and they were to take it back to their companies for feedback. Ms. Crawford from AT&T California had some interest and Mr. Serrato asked if they had anything further to say on this item. Ms. Crawford stated she had one thing. She asked Mr. Brown that if she recalled correctly, SCE was only going to deploy this on the solely owned poles, but that AT&T California had started to see them on jointly owned poles and would like to clarify from SCE.

Mr. Brown stated that was not the original intent to set them on solely owned poles. It was to set them on poles in high fire areas, which was SCE's main intent. Ms. Crawford stated that maybe the conversation had been that SCE had only put them on solely owned poles so far when they first demonstrated it for the members. She thanked Mr. Brown for the clarification. Mr. Serrato asked if any of the members had any other questions about the fire mesh wrap. Mr. Bacon stated that he did. He informed Mr. Brown that people were questioning some of the material that is going around the poles, as they use and climb the poles with their gaffs, it is going to leave thornlike wires sticking out where the wire mesh breaks. Mr. Bacon asked if it would even be acceptable to SCE, for example if AT&T California or any other communication company is uncomfortable climbing over that with their cinch lock belts and their jewelry belts and everything that they have to do. If they are uncomfortable with having that on there, would there be some way, because Mr. Bacon that they are going to end up cutting it off. If someone out in the field needs to climb the pole and it is full of burs and they are cutting them up and their pants, he asked if it would be permissible to have some notification with SCE that they need to remove this to safely ascend the pole. Mr. Bacon stated he believes that is where they are going to end up having a problem with some of the other utilities, the public access to these poles, even if it is in a high wind and fire area. He stated he is on SCE's side with this because LADWP has to deal with it as well. With having to deal with it, Mr. Bacon stated that there would have to be some way to remove it with a notification process or to be able to reinstall it after they remove it for the sake of climbing. Mr. Brown stated he thought he had asked this question but was unsure if it was in the response or not. One thing he would say is if any member has a concern about climbing a pole that is unsafe, then yes, SCE would have to address that. If it is in regards to the wire mesh, then SCE would have to address that. He stated he will bring it up again asking about that particular concern. Mr. Brown had expressed that same concern after the example that Mr. Armstrong gave about a pole being in a school area. If that were the case, what would happen if someone were to touch it. He stated he knows his team is aware of it and if it was not addressed in the response, then he will follow up and get a response. Mr. Bacon thanked Mr. Brown. Ms. Crawford asked Mr. Brown that when SCE states their program is not to wrap in service poles, she stated she was not sure what is meant by that. Mr. Brown stated that he was not sure either and would have to follow up. Ms. Crawford thanked Mr. Brown and stated that she was referring to question number three in what he had responded. Mr. Serrato asked if there were any other questions in regards to this. Ms. Crawford stated that AT&T California's EHNS department is reviewing it. She stated they got it either yesterday or the day before and had not had the time to go through it and make sure it answers their questions. She requested this be kept open for next month. Mr. Serrato stated that this will be brought up again at the next

month's Compliance Meeting after all the members had a chance to provide feedback or collect feedback.

Agenda Item 6 – Miscellaneous –

- Mr. Serrato opened to the Certificate of Insurance Request sent to all the members. He stated that Ms. Pranata was going to update on who she was missing. Ms. Pranata stated as it was mentioned in the Administrative Board, Verizon Wireless, City of Colton, City of Los Angeles, Mobilitie, XO Communications, T-Mobile USA, and Sprint Nextel Corporation. She asked the members if they would like her to leave in Compliance, or remove the bullet, or to keep it in both the Administrative Board and Compliance meetings. Mr. Bacon stated to leave it because next time they meet everyone will have theirs in and they can erase it across the board. Mr. Brown stated that they should leave it in Compliance and did not believe it was required in both. Mr. Bacon agreed. Mr. Serrato stated that this will stay in Compliance and reminded the members to send it to the correct email address coi@scjpc.net as Ms. Pranata had requested.
- Mr. Serrato opened to the draft letter regarding getting permits from Cal Trans. He stated that this topic evolved into that is should not be an agreed upon letter but maybe just a statement on the SCJPC landing page where they can direct outside parties to go. He stated that Crown Castle had a generic statement that they proposed (see attached). Mr. Serrato stated he will give members a change to read though and come back next month with comments or any additional feedback. Mr. Serrato added it does not need to be implemented right now. Mr. Bacon stated that they need to stay on this one, especially for the other members that are getting grief to work on a pole that they are a member on. He stated they need to work on getting this through so that members do not have this hurdle every time they go to get up on a pole out in the street. Mr. Serrato asked the members after reading through it if anyone had any immediate comments they would like to provide. He stated that these are just facts about their process, and they are to the minimum. They think they could provide this information on the landing page and that it does not reveal too much information and that everyone could provide comments about it now. Mr. Brown stated that as always anything that SCE agrees to needs to go through their legal. He stated that he will have to send this to SCE's legal. Mr. Serrato stated okay and asked if any other members had any further comments in regards to this. He stated what is being proposed is not changes to the Routine and has nothing to the bylaws. It is just text to put on the landing page of the SCJPC website. He does not believe it would require a motion and vote process but wanted to get a general consensus

among the attendees. Mr. Bacon stated that he agreed. He stated that SCE has to take it to their legal if it is a statement that would concern them, but that this is a broad, general statement that is just stating that they are a representative of the SCJPC and have the right to that pole. He stated that Mr. Serrato was right and that it does not affect any of the members as far as having them listed as a member. He further stated that where SCE is concerned is Crown Castle having the right to go out and work on a pole without having to go through SCE and the legalities of having them work on the pole underneath them. The way that Crown Castle is going through it as something that is on the website to declare that they are a member, Mr. Bacon stated he does not see where they would have to go back any lawyer or approval from the committee. He stated it is just stating what it is, which they are a member of the SCJPC. Mr. Serrato thanked Mr. Bacon for his input and stated they will bring this back at the next Compliance meeting giving the members a chance to review it and provide more in-depth feedback.

- Ms. Serrato opened the discussion to Non-Wood poles and steps: GO 95 Rule change brought up by Ms. Black. Ms. Black stated this could be closed and they were all able to figure it out. The bottom line was that power needs to provide the holes and communication need to provide the steps. That was AT&T California's understanding. Ms. Black asked if anyone else had anything different. Mr. Brown stated he did not know if he agreed with this and he would take it up their experts. Ms. Black stated that if they want to give them steps, that would be good as well. Mr. Bacon stated that most poles that are ordered through the utilities, Edison and LADWP, most steel poles are engineered with pre-drilled hole patterns. These would include steps 36 inches apart and 18 inches from the center. All the holes for the steps and everything else should be predrilled. He stated fiberglass poles may be a little different. He stated LADWP still has a drill hole pattern for fiberglass poles and that he cannot speak as to SCE and what they have on their fiberglass only that he knows that SCE and LADWP does pre-drilled holes on steel poles. The hole patterns for the steps are pre-drilled and they are under contract with most of the utilities to be manufactured that way. Ms. Black stated that because SCE questioned it, this would need to remain open, and they would need to have this confirmed. She stated it is AT&T California's understanding, based upon the ruling, that there is some wording which she did not know on hand, that the poles must be provisioned for which she could look up. She stated she had filed all of these things thinking that it was a done deal. She asked Mr. Brown if he could go back and find out how it would possibly work for the other owners if there were no holes for them to put their steps into. Mr. Bacon stated there could be several reasons. The steel

poles have been around for a while, that at the time he believes AT&T California refused to attach to fiberglass poles but did not know necessarily about steel poles. Back when steel poles started coming out LADWP did not incorporate the steps right away and he was unsure about SCE since he could only speak for LADWP. He stated for the last ten years, on any of LADWPs steel poles, they have provided a pre-drilled hole setup for their steel poles. He stated that there will be extenuating circumstances where some poles were grandfathered in before the whole step fiasco was created. He stated that LADWP has a set standard, but there are going to be some where the holes were not provided. Ms. Black stated okay. Mr. Treepaisan stated he recalled the rule change made it to where it had to be provisioned able for steps, but Mr. Harmon had pointed out there was some stipulation or exemption for something deemed as a non-climbable pole. Mr. Bacon stated this was correct, but because the new ruling on the wood pole is they have to put, because of the belt situation, the ground-to-ground belt with the sinch lock on the wood poles, he stated they have stopped installing the pole steps. Mr. Treepaisan stated that a lot was predicated when Sam Stonerock from SCE provided some empirical data that linemen were basically stabbing themselves with the secondary restraint and the pole steps. Mr. Bacon agreed. Mr. Serrato stated this topic will remain open for the next Compliance meeting.

- Mr. Serrato inquired about the second sub-bullet point in regards to Mr. Harmon bringing the GO95 text that was recently changed in regards to the pole steps. He asked if someone else was going to provide that as part of the discussion next time. Mr. Bacon stated he could bring it. Mr. Serrato thanked Mr. Bacon and asked the members if they had any more to say about this bullet point. There were no more comments or concerns at this time.
- Mr. Serrato opened to Pre-existing, non-compliant conditions on joint poles provided by Crown Castle. He passed the discussion over to Mr. Carrion. Mr. Carrion stated that Crown Castle wanted to bring forth a discussion surrounding a topic they are all familiar with, have reviewed before, but have never quite settled. He stated that it is pole replacements. At this time, certain limitations and restrictions exist on how a replacement is proposed in conjunction with how the work is conducted. He stated that in other words, the party who requires a pole to be replaced relative to the party who ultimately performs the replacement. He stated that Crown Castle feels there is an opportunity to cut through some of the ambiguity and shed light on some of those utility specific processes. To work out a more unified operation and establish guidelines that can truly be beneficial to all of the members. He then stated he wanted to pass it off to Mr. Jones to give everyone a bit of additional insight on what Crown

Castle hoped to accomplish and then go into some questions and concerns the other members may have. Mr. Jones stated what they are seeing at Crown Castle is that they are trying to understand in clarity from SCE over the timelines in which some of the poles are getting replaced in an attempt to establish a reasonable timeline in which their projects, schedules, and budgets can be managed. He stated as it currently stands, they see that it can take years to get a mutual benefit pole replaced. That timeline is beyond what they can do in terms of managing their schedule and budget. Crown Castle wanted to put forth a discussion to figure out what are some levers that they can establish through the committee that would enable them to look at a different way to manage the pole replacements. Then establishing a process and timeline which they can all agree would be more reasonable to conduct the pole replacements. That is what they wanted to discuss today and hopefully in future meetings as well, to look forward at establishing a more concrete way of doing those. Mr. Brown stated that he believes this is already outlined in the Routine. He stated it was either Section 15 or 16, where it talks about the time limit to perform work. He stated that at that point if it is not performed within that time limit, the member has the right to ask that the JPA be cancelled or revised, something to that magnitude. Mr. Serrato asked Ms. Pranata to pull up Section 16. Mr. Brown stated that it is something to do with time limits and was not sure what section it was. Mr. Jones asked Mr. Brown what SCE was seeing in terms of their pole replacements that are maybe not a priority for SCE from a perspective of wildfire safety or wildfire mitigation plans. He then asked if they are prioritizing JPC pole replacements in any particular manner. Mr. Brown stated that they are doing high fire first. Any high fire compliance work SCE is addressing first. He stated they also have their routine maintenance work. That is the work that may not take place within a certain period of time. He stated SCE schedules it but that they may schedule it out for 18 months, but they get the ball rolling. He stated then there is Rule 20 work which can take quite some time. On regular pole replacements, SCE is driven by compliance and whatever is compliant driven, whether it be High Fire Tier 3 work or if it is emergent work. He stated the emergent work takes priority. High fire work depends on the priority type, one through five, that drives the dates when SCE replace the poles. He stated any work that is in the scope can be set aside although it was put in scope to be replaced. Also, things come and change the actual plans or push them back. Mr. Jones stated that where Crown Castle's concern is, the idea that setting aside pole replacements that need to get done for businesses of the committee needs and their company's needs. Because of wildfire work, which they understand is very important. He stated if SCE is just stuck that it cannot handle the volume of pole

replacement that are needed through the committee. He gave the example, if the pole was in Tier 1, so it is not in the high fire red zone and SCE sees that as a low priority, that the committee should have a process in which a member can go forth and replace that pole to relieve SCE's burden of doing so. Mr. Jones stated that right now Crown Castle is beholden to SCE's priority and it is not working necessarily from a business perspective. He stated that he believes that is what they are trying to address, which is how do they gain the ability to do that. Or if SCE is able to work with a timeline that enables them to pull a lever after six months of SCE not being able to do the work. He asked if there is another way to do it. This is their goal of what they are trying to address. Mr. Van Stryk stated it would be hard to change out SCE's poles if there is voltage on it without an outage. They would also have to consider customer outages and permitting, which all extend timelines for pole replacements. It is also depending on which county they are in or city. Mr. Jones stated of course and stated that would happen if it is two years from now or six months from now. All the outages and all of those communications would still need to happen. He stated Crown Castle's issue is that it is taking two years. If there is a way to do it sooner, they should look for a way of doing that as a committee. All the work still needs to happen, and they understand that. Mr. Bacon asked Mr. Brown if SCE allows outside electrically qualified people to set or replace their poles. Mr. Brown stated no. Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP does not hold that right and if someone has qualified electrical workers, they can replace the pole, but that it is case by case when it comes to anchors and guy wires and things like that as to whether or not they will allow an outside utility to replace it. Mr. Brown stated that he had to disagree with Mr. Bacon on that because SCE did want to replace an LADWP pole, but they would not allow it because of outage issues. Mr. Bacon stated that was correct and that is why stated it was on a case-by-case basis. It was case by case as to whether or not they would allow simple pole set to help the communication companies proceed with their jobs. If it is a simple set, they would allow them to set. Communication companies that are behind on having pole change ups. He stated it is hard for them to find electrical contractors that can replace the poles. He stated he knows some companies have some of their own, but SCE will not allow them to. He stated that right now, they need to understand, utilities are under an immense amount of pressure and nothing is going to stop them from focusing on the different tiers and the priority that is going to go behind it. Mr. Bacon stated this is not going to end until they have upgraded the system from a utility point of view. Because there is the threat of being sued to the point of bankruptcy, as they see PG&E going through. Nothing will stop that, and he stated he understands it is unfortunate from a

business sense for Crown Castle and XP. From that point of view of having to wait two years, how are they able to conduct business. It is very difficult. LADWP gets a host of complaints from communication companies, 5G is here. He stated they know that they are under an immense amount of pressure to get their systems in. Two years behind is hard. He asked what can be done since SCE will not allow them to change out their poles. They are at SCE's mercy and as to whether or not Mr. Brown can or cannot possibly give them a priority list of what is important and maybe see what can be done from there. But Mr. Bacon stated he was unsure if this should be an issue that should be brought up in front of the committee. He stated he thinks this is more of an SCE and Crown Castle issue on productivity. and Mr. Bacon is unsure if SCE is the only one, they are having the problem with, but that he was unsure this was the forum to bring it up in. Ms. Crawford stated that AT&T California has the same concern. Mr. Van Stryk was wondering if there is a way for Crown Castle to pay for the entire replacement of an SCE pole and that way SCE can move up the timeline if it is already paid for if that would help to put it on overtime. Mr. Carrion stated that is where they are in disagreement because the Routine is pretty black and white as to what constitutes shared and non-shared costs. Mr. Van Stryk stated that money talks if Crown Castle is trying to move the timeline up. Mr. Carrion stated that money may talk but it does not necessarily change the fact that a pole may need to be replaced today and is out of compliance with today's standards without Crown Castle being on that pole or any other party being on the pole. Mr. Bacon stated that he had to clarify when it is said money talks in the sense of utilities and replacing poles, money talks as far as paying for overtime does not work because the contract crews and the crews that they have, have more overtime than they even know what to do with. Adding overtime does not change anything. The priorities of whether it is customer complaints or high wind, and fire areas is going to trump any overtime that would be offered as far as money or throwing money at it. The money really does not matter if they are overfilled with overtime, so they probably would not be interested. Ms. Crawford asked Mr. Bacon to see if she was correct in that LADWP lets AT&T California replace their poles today. Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP does, but that it is on a case-by-case basis. If it is holding back a considerable amount of strain or an important circuit, LADWP will refuse AT&T California and let them know. But if it is a simple set next to where they can make a hole and spread out the primary, LADWP will allow it. He stated that SCE has every right to not allow them to replace their poles as far as that goes. Mr. Carrion stated that it makes complete sense to Crown Castle. That some of the things they are hoping to get clarification on from SCE or perhaps other parties in a similar manner is that they need

certain understandings for certain statements that are made. Mr. Carrion stated that Mr. Brown states SCE does not allow other parties to replace SCE poles. He needs a little bit of a clearer definition as to what constitutes as an SCE pole. He wanted to know if it means an SCE base owned poles with an E number on it. If it includes AT&T California owned poles with SCE facilities on them. He asked what about SCE poles that only have overhead guys and down guys or have a P-Comm attachment on it, in which a communication company is fully licensed to conduct work on. It is those types of things Crown Castle is inquiring about. Mr. Carrion stated they would like to get to the bottom of what are the concerns. Crown Castle would like to know the legitimate concerns for an outside party doing the replacement if it is a liability thing or a cost thing. He stated that way it would give Crown Castle the opportunity to address it in a manner that can somewhat help work through this together. Mr. Carrion stated he understands what Mr. Bacon was mentioning that they are bogged down by the high priority pole replacements, the Tier 3 fire pole replacements. He stated that does not change the fact that there are poles out there that may not be in these high fire threat zones that still need to be replaced. If that is a burden that Crown Castle can take off of SCE's hands to be able to do that, maybe on SCE's terms by choosing from a list of qualified contractors that they work with. Crown Castle would be happy to do so and work through an avenue in that way. He stated that some of the key points that they are hoping to maybe work through establishing a reasonable timeline, not just for JPAs, but for replacements to occur and also provide an avenue for joint members to conduct that replacement, even if it is done so under SCE's guidelines. Mr. Carrion stated that they want to make sure that they do not change or alter the established guidelines that dictate shared and non-shared cost because they do not think that is fair or in the spirit of this joint committee. Mr. Brown stated that this is understood and that maybe on their communication poles it is a different story. Anything that SCE has power and if they are on an AT&T California pole or a pole setting pole or pole number pole and SCE is on there with electrical voltages, then they consider themselves the owner of that pole and have the right to say, yay or nay. He further stated that even though SCE was not the pole setting member they are not going to let anyone touch their power and that is the bottom line. He stated he cannot give all the particulars, but that he will get in contact with the group who has that. Mr. Brown stated that they could set up a meeting where they can talk about the particulars with Crown Castle and AT&T California since Ms. Crawford stated they have the same concerns. They can all get together on the call and work on settling these particulars and as to why SCE goes down the road that they take. Ms. Crawford stated that they

have something similar in San Diego with solely owned poles down there. She stated that there is a certain timeframe when it is AT&T California pole and power is on it and vice versa. That they have to respond within ten days. AT&T California will do the work and their expected due date is 18 months, with what she believes the max of two years allowed. She stated that maybe they can look at putting some timeline around it and that would be beneficial to Crown Castle and definitely AT&T California. Mr. Brown agreed and stated that as Mr. Van Stryk was stating, when a company wants SCE to expedite a pole replacement, they do work out an agreement and it can be cost driven. He stated that is when a company has not been a member of the SCJPC for 20 consecutive years. SCE will go down that route and they go with a Section 7.3, but other than that if a member has been here 20 consecutive years and SCE does not go down the route of saying okay to expediting at a cost. He stated SCE will try to work something out with the other members to get a pole moved withing a reasonable time if they are able to. If unable to, then maybe they can work something out, but he is unable to speak for the district at this time. Mr. Carrion stated what he would like to be clear is that what Crown Castle is trying to do is be as fair as possible to all the members because at the end of the day, they are asking SCE to replace a pole because it is failing today, and they would like to attach to it. If Mr. Carrion is being faced with being informed that Crown Castle needs to pay the full cost of the replacement, he does not necessarily think that is fair if the pole needs to be replaced today anyways. He could say they no longer want to attach to the pole anymore, but that will not change the fact that it still needs to be replaced according to the CPUC rules. Mr. Brown stated this was right. Mr. Carrion asked who is going to pay for that and that there should be a way for Crown Castle and SCE to work together on this. Mr. Brown stated that he agrees with Mr. Carrion, but that is also two sided because at the same time, SCE is telling people poles are failing and they are getting on them anyways. This is not in the spirit of fair dealing. He stated that is something they can continue to go on and on about, but that SCE would definitely like to make sure that all parties are being addressed equally. He stated that SCE does not want it to seem like they are trying to “shot call” because it is not that and they do want to work in the spirit of fair treatment. He stated that they can take it up and work something out with Crown Castle and AT&T California that they can in turn bring back to the committee and present. He stated the three of them could work offline on this and bring back a solution that all three of them are satisfied with. Ms. Crawford agreed and asked Mr. Brown if there was anything she could do research on in advance to educate herself on like if a pole number is an AT&T California number, but if power is on it, it is considered an SCE pole.

Mr. Brown stated that was brought up and it is under pole inspection on the website in technical resources section. It talks about the guidelines of pole replacement and such. Mr. Van Stryk stated that it talks about inspection responsibility as well. Mr. Brown stated that was it. Ms. Pranata displayed the *Pole Inspection and Replacement Guidelines* PDF document on the SCJPC website found under *Members* drop down menu -*Pole Inspection Resources* page. Mr. Jones stated that earlier he thought Mr. Brown stated that SCE does not use outside vendors to conduct pole replacements. Mr. Brown stated that was incorrect and they do use outside vendors. Mr. Brown proceeded to discuss how the guidelines are something that was created some years ago with Mr. Larry Chow and the other members. Ms. Crawford stated she will read it and thanked Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown stated that if Ms. Crawford had any questions they could talk about it. Mr. Todaro with AT&T Mobility asked if he could be part of the call. Mr. Brown stated he could. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Carrion what he thought about the four of them getting together and to talk it through, maybe he can get the right SCE people on the call to answer their questions and Mr. Jones' concerns. Through that maybe they can come up with something that all the members understand and agree to. Mr. Nick Van Stryk asked if they could possibly talk about adding antennas to these scenarios because antennas are something new that were probably not on that guideline. Ms. Crawford asked if Mr. Van Stryk was talking about small cell antennas. Mr. Van Stryk stated yes. Ms. Crawford stated she was thinking to discuss about fiber and antennas. Mr. Carrion stated that Crown Castle is not opposed to meeting offline, especially if the right people are on the call. He asked Mr. Serrato what he thought. Mr. Serrato stated that the interested parties should meet up and talk about it in detail, but that he would like to assign this an agenda item number. He stated that he thinks it is in the committee's interest to have a base on this regularly and that there is a lot to be said on this topic. He asked Ms. Pranata to assign a standing agenda number to this. Mr. Treepaisan asked if Frontier Communications could be added to that discussion as well. Mr. Brown stated he could include Mr. Treepaisan and asked Mr. Todaro who he was with again. Mr. Todaro stated he was with Motive, representing AT&T Mobility. Mr. Todaro stated he believed Mr. Harmon should be on the call as well. Ms. Pranata stated the new item is 1776 and asked what the subject or title the members would like to assign it. Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Carrion and Mr. Jones if they had a good suggestion for the title of the item. Mr. Carrion suggested "establishing a timeline and codified process for mutual benefit of pole replacements." New Item 1776: *Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual benefit of Pole Replacements* was created.

- Ms. Ortiz had a question for her clarification and understanding. She asked when a JPA is issued to replace a pole by the power company or whoever it is and they send it off back to the initiator, she wanted to know how they get notified that construction is scheduled, especially on the poles with antennas. She asked how they would know the pole is going to be replaced and that they need to take care of their equipment. She asked if it is scheduled ahead of time would they get notified via email or how does it work. Mr. Van Stryk stated that there should be a phone number on the antenna and that is usually written on the work order or onto the package when it is fielded. They will then call that phone number to schedule the moving of it. Which is what was stated by AT&T Mobility. Ms. Ortiz then asked if the same applies for SCE pole replacements. Mr. Brown stated that it did not. Mr. Serrato asked Ms. Ortiz to repeat her statement. Ms. Ortiz stated that she was wondering how, when they sign off a JPA on a pole replacement, how do they get notified when the work is going to be performed, especially for poles that have antennas on them. She wanted to know how they would know the construction is being scheduled. Mr. Brown stated he could explain what was happening, but that SCE stopped because people were not picking up the phone. He stated that SCE was calling prior to the outage, up to two to three weeks prior to the outage. People stopped picking up the phone and it was not beneficial for SCE to continue to call. He stated that they could work something else out if they would like to be notified ahead of time, possibly that it is stated on the JPA or something like that with the contact number. He stated SCE was doing that in the past and people were not picking up the phone. He stated that he was not sure if every district stopped but that in some areas where that was happening, they just discontinued trying to reach out and letting them know that they had a scheduled outage for the day on a pole replacement. Ms. Ortiz stated that the only way to get notified, is by providing the contact information on the JPA. Mr. Brown stated he did not want to say it was the only way, but that he is trying to come up with a way that maybe SCE could do it. He stated he was unable to guarantee that would be successful, and they could possibly come up with something together. Mr. Serrato asked if Ms. Ortiz wanted to propose something. Ms. Ortiz stated that if they could come up with a process, maybe an email or some type of notification ahead of time. Mr. Serrato stated that this could be in conjunction with Mr. Carrion's contact list to talk about how to be informed of replacements with antennas. Mr. Carrion asked Ms. Ortiz to make sure he was clear on her request that it was SCE proposing that they need to replace a pole that has one of their antennas on it. Ms. Ortiz in turn asking how they will be notified when that is complete so that they know to go out and transfer the antenna. Ms. Ortiz stated not when it is

complete, but when they are supposed to be out there at the same time to transfer the antennas. Mr. Carrion stated okay. Mr. Brown stated that on most cases with the antenna, SCE is asking for a joint meet for that specific reason. Mr. Bacon asked if the Form 48 would take care of any of this. Mr. Brown stated that the Form 48 is just to notify that the work is complete, and Ms. Ortiz is asking to be notified prior to the work being completed. Mr. Bacon asked if this would be for a pole that is pending a cell site or if it was strictly for pole that have an existing cell site. Ms. Ortiz stated it was for those with an existing cell site. Mr. Bacon stated okay. Mr. Van Stryk stated that a phone number on the form as well may help because when he puts a phone number, the foremen usually call him prior and schedule something. If they need to transfer their own, they would get a call to figure out timelines. Mr. Bacon stated that when LADWP's crews go out and do a JPA, they take down the note information as far as the contact number and everything else and that they are pretty good about calling to let them know when they are going to be taking it down. They will inquire whether or not it has a battery backup, but LADWP is pretty good with calling prior to killing the site. Ms. Ortiz asked Mr. Brown if they could work together and figure out some kind of notification process, that it would be appreciated. Mr. Brown stated it sounded good. Mr. Serrato asked Ms. Spencer if she could add this as a bullet point so they could do a status update at the next Compliance meeting. Ms. Spencer stated she could. Mr. Todaro stated that he just had this discussion with AT&T Mobility today and asked if there could be any way to have visibility to a construction schedule. Something that showed what was going to be done 45 days out or something along those lines. Mr. Brown stated that he was not sure but that he could check on SCE's part. Ms. Crawford stated that when AT&T California worked with SCE, the schedules changed so often, SCE recommended that it would not be of benefit to AT&T California. AT&T California then asked for two days' notice in advance and they have not received a phone call yet on the hotline they set up for this. Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Brown if he had a response to this. Mr. Brown stated that he did not know. Ms. Crawford stated she was not looking for a response but was trying to say a schedule would not be helpful. She stated that AT&T California has the right people to contact about not calling and that it is not Mr. Brown's issue. He had gotten AT&T California in contact with the right people and that she was just stating that she does not think that information would be helpful. Mr. Serrato thanked her for the information.

Mr. Serrato asked if there were any other miscellaneous topics. There were none at this time.

Agenda Item 7 – Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts -

- The members are to provide feedback on SCE's information provided in regards to their mesh wrap.
- The members are to provide feedback on the SCJPC landing text regarding authorization to attach to joint poles.
- Mr. Bacon from LADWP is going to bring the text from the GO95 changes regarding steps.
- Ms. Ortiz and SCE will get together to talk about notification for replacement antennas.
- SCE and several members are to circle up and discuss the pole replacement timeline and topics regarding to that. Mr. Brown asked if he would be scheduling this meeting or Mr. Carrion because he did not have a problem scheduling it and asked if they wanted him to take the lead. Mr. Carrion asked Mr. Brown to take the lead so he could make sure the right parties on SCE's end were present on the call. He stated if he were to schedule it, it would just be the two of them. Mr. Brown asked if Mr. Carrion will forward the information about the call to Mr. Jones and whomever else. Mr. Carrion stated he would.

The meeting adjourned at 1:34 p.m. until April 21, 2021.

Anali Spencer - Committee Staff

Members (menu)

Member Contact Information (Excel)

- JPA Contacts
 - Representatives
 - Billing
 - Forms
- 24-hr Emergency Contact
- Roster to Expedite
- Claims
- Contact: Dual poles in field (Link to *Dual Poles* page)
- Contact: Graffiti removal (Link to *Graffiti Removal* page)
- Contact: Pole inspections (Link to *Pole Inspection Resource* page)
- Contact: Intrusive inspection results request

Pole Inspection Resource (page)

- Pole Inspection Contacts

Contacts (menu)

- Emergency (same as 24-hr Emergency? Not updated?)
- Dual Poles
- Graffiti Removal

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC), _____ maintains attachment rights, if approved, ~~and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction~~, on distribution/communication poles ~~to with an~~ established joint-ownership record, between _____ and other members of the SCJPC.

For distribution/communication poles in which ~~a~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s), which must be approved by the pole owner(s).

The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates. As per SCJPA guidelines, a JPA becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed (unless there is a denial or hold), from the date in which the JPA was submitted.

Please note that tThe SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of **Crown Castle NG West** with the SCJPC.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The pole(s) listed on the attached permit have the following Companies listed as established Joint-Owners of record at the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC).

Joint Owners include:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed Owners grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) listed on the permit. This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a ~~standing M~~member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee ("SCJPC"), _____ maintains attachment rights ~~if approved, to and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction, attach equipment, and engage in construction,~~ on distribution/communication poles ("poles") ~~with an to with an~~ established ~~ed~~ joint-ownership record, between _____ and other ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC.

For ~~distribution/communication~~ poles in which ~~a-~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization ("JPA Form 2"), to the appropriate pole owners(s) ~~which must be approved by the pole owner(s).~~

~~The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates.~~ As per SCJPC ~~CA~~ guidelines, a JPA ~~Form 2~~ becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed ~~(unless there is a denial or hold)~~, from the date in which the JPA ~~Form 2~~ was submitted.

~~Please note that t~~The SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of ~~Crown Castle NG West~~ with the SCJPC.

Commented [CE1]: Open to misinterpretation from non-SCJPC parties that an approval request is repeatedly required, and that *explicit* approval is mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [EC2]: "to" implies that the action of attachment establishes joint-ownership, rather than the issuance of a JPA.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE3]: Open to misinterpretation that *explicit* approval is always mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE4]: Understood amongst Members, not pertinent to non-SCJPC parties.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Authorization Letter Terms of Use

THIS AUTHORIZATION LETTER TERMS OF USE (the “Terms”) is made on this ____ day of ____, 2020, by and between the **Members (“Members”) of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (“SCJPC”)**.

1. **Terms of Access.** Access to the Authorization Letter (hereinafter the “Letter”), and any iterations thereof, is granted exclusively to the Members of the SCJPC, their representatives and known associates.
2. **Description of Use.** The Letter is to be used for the purpose of demonstrating a Member’s basic attachment rights, as secured through membership with the SCJPC, to parties unassociated with the SCJPC.
3. **Limitations.** The Letter does not in any way supersede established processes, nor grant additional rights to any Member, beyond what is outlined within the SCJPC Routine Handbook (the “Routine”). The Letter may not be cited in a manner as to provide an alternate interpretation of the procedures of the Routine and does not imply that all necessary actions to obtain attachment rights have been met.
4. **Confidentiality.** Members acknowledge that the Terms herein are confidential to Members of the SCJPC and its operating staff.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) is made up of a group of Utility Companies, Communications Companies, and Municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed SCJPC Members grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) they own. The SCJPC Membership includes the following Companies:

ATC Outdoor Das, LLC	Frontier Communications
AT&T California	Golden State Water Company
AT&T Mobility	Mobilitie, LLC
CA-CLEC LLC	MCI Metro/ATS
City of Anaheim	MCI Telecommunications
City of Azusa	M-Power Communications
City of Banning	NewPath Networks
City of Burbank	Southern California Edison Company
City of Colton	Sprint Communications
City of Glendale	Sprint Nextel
City of Lompoc	T Mobile USA
City of Los Angeles	Teleport Communications America, LLC
City of Pasadena	Time Warner Cable (Spectrum)
City of Riverside	Verizon California
City of Vernon	Verizon Wireless
Crown Castle NG West., INC	XO Communications
ExTeNet Systems	

This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Friday, February 26, 2021 4:48 PM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: City of Commerce JPA Poles

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: PW Permit Counter <PWPermitCounter@ci.commerce.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 12:30 PM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Cc: Mohammad Mostahkami <mohammad.mostahkami@transtech.org>
Subject: City of Commerce JPA Poles

Good Afternoon Angela,

I am the permit technician at the City of Commerce for the department of Public Works. The City of Commerce has been requesting that our permit applicants submit a letter of authorization and/or form showing that they have received JPA authorization when proposing work on JPA owned poles. We have received several permits where the applicant is proposing the installation of fiber optic cable to the poles but before we issue the permits we would like to see a letter of authorization.

We are hoping you will be able to address a few questions for us since we have been having some difficulties receiving the requested JPA authorization.

- Are companies such as ATT, Charter Communication who are a members of JPA required to submit JPA Form 2 or a LOA from JPA for attachments to JPA poles before the City issues a Permit or is being a member of JPA sufficient?
- How about overlashing to the poles?

We just want to ensure we are following the correct protocol when issuing permits for work on JPA poles.

Please let us know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Karen Vigil | Associate Engineer | **City of Commerce**
2535 Commerce Way | Commerce, CA 90040

COI SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS

JANUARY 2021 REQUEST

Member Code	Company Name	ON FILE?	Expiration Date	NOTES
A	City of Glendale	Y	2/1/2022	
AMT	ATC-Outdoor DAS, LLC	Y	12/1/2021	AMERICAN TOWER
ATC	Verizon Wireless			
ATS	MCI Metro/ATS	Y	6/30/2021	
B	City of Burbank	Y	7/1/2021	
BVE	Bear Valley Electric, Inc	Y	2/1/2022	
COB	City of Banning	Y	7/1/2021	
D	City of Anaheim	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
E	So. Calif. Edison Co.	Y	No expiration date	SELF INSURED
EXT	ExteNet Systems, Inc.	Y	1/2/2022	
F	City of Colton			
FON	Sprint Comm, L.P.	Y	5/1/2021	
FTR	Frontier Communications	Y	6/1/2021	
H / T	AT&T California	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
ICG	Mpower Communications	Y	7/1/2021	US TELEPACIFIC HOLDINGS CORP DBA MPOWER
J	City of Riverside	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
LAC	AT&T Mobility	Y	6/1/2021	NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS LLC
LLW	City of Lompoc	Y	7/1/2021	SELF INSURED
M	City of Los Angeles			
MA	City of Azusa	Y	7/1/2021	SELF INSURED
MCI	MCI Telecommunications	Y	6/30/2021	
MOB	Mobilitie, LLC			
MP	City of Pasadena	Y	NONE	SELF INSURED
NG	Crown Castle NG West Inc.	y	4/1/2021	
NXT	XO Communications			
PBM	T-Mobile USA, Inc.			
SPR	Sprint Nextel Corporation			
TCA	Teleport Communications America, LLC	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
TWC	Time Warner Cable	Y	1/1/2022	CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS INC
V	City of Vernon	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
		23		

EMAIL YOUR COI to this inbox: coi@scjpc.net

Table updated 3/10/2021

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 2:01 PM
To: Serrato, Joe; Carrion, Earle; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; April Debarge; Bacon, John R.; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; CRAWFORD, CORY R; BLACK, KAY R; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Maria Ortiz; Alicia Smith; Yvonne Johnson; Jim Todaro; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Shawn Henderson
Cc: Kathleen Allen; Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Good afternoon to Compliance committee members,

I'm forwarding the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page from Joe Serrato. See below email.

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Serrato, Joe <Joe.Serrato@crowncastle.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 9:02 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Carrion, Earle <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>
Subject: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Hi Angela – this was one of Crown's action items. Here is the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page:

Members of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) maintain attachment rights, and the authorization to engage in construction, on distribution/communication poles with an established joint-ownership record, between other Members of the SCJPC. For distribution/communication poles in which a member is not an established joint-owner, the member obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s).

Thank you,

JOE SERRATO
Supervisor, Utility Relations
T: (408) 468-5564 | M: (408) 785-0411

CROWN CASTLE FIBER
1 Park Place, 3rd Floor, Dublin, CA 94568

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

Member Information

☐ New Member Information

☒ Update Information

Review your contact information on SCJPC website: <http://scjpc.net/members/membership-information/>
Complete below fields for any changes.

SCJPC Member Name	
-------------------	--

Member Code (new member: maximum 3 letters)	
--	--

Primary Representative

Full Name	
Mailing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
Email Address	

Alternate Representative

Full Name	
Mailing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
Email Address	

Authorized Signature on Bills of Sale – Forms 44

Full Name	
Mailing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
Email Address	

24 hour emergency phone number	
24 hour emergency email	

Contact Information to expedite JPA process

Full Name	
Mailing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
Email Address	

Contact Information for Claims Department

Full Name	
Mailing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
Email Address	

Contact Information of person to receive joint pole authorization Invoices (invoices from Members)

Full Name	
Billing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
Email Address	

Contact Information of person to receive monthly member assessments (invoices from SCJPC office)

Full Name	
Billing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
Email Address	

Single Point of Contact for Dual Poles Left in Field

Full Name	
Telephone Number	
Email Address	

Single Point of Contact for Graffiti Removal

Full Name	
Telephone Number	
Email Address	

Contact information of person to send requests for **intrusive inspection results**

Full Name	
Mailing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
Email Address	

Contact Information of person to receive Joint Pole forms (Preliminary JPA Form 2, Final Form 2 photocopy, Form 48, Form 7, Form 44 Bill of Sales, etc)

Email Address for all JPA related documents	
Full Name	
Mailing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	

Contact Information for Pole Inspections

Full Name	
Mailing Address	
City, State, Zip Code	
Telephone Number	
Fax Number	
Email Address	
Comments/Other info	

Fiber or Communication Cable Tag:

Please email your current cable or fiber tag picture to angela@scjpc.net

Please submit by email: Angela Pranata (angela@scjpc.net),

or by mail:

Angela Pranata

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., STE 104. San Dimas, CA 91773

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:17 AM
To: Anali Spencer; Serrato, Joe; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; John Bacon; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com); ASmith@motive-energy.com; Kay Black; Cory R. Crawford; Shawn Henderson; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Pedro Garganera; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us
Cc: Kathleen Allen
Subject: Re: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes
Attachments: Genics WFS Net - SDS.pdf; Q&A for Fire Mesh.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Good Morning,

I am forwarding an email from SCE (Wayne Brown) to the Compliance ad hoc. I will also upload the attached documents to the Agenda page for the next Compliance meeting.

From: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:07 AM
To: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Subject: Wire Mesh

Good morning Cory,

Attached you find a copy of the Q&A for wire mesh asked by AT&T, along with the Safety Data Sheet. Angela, can you please attached to the ad hoc for which this was a topic of discussion.

Thank you,

Gerald "Wayne" Brown
Agency Coordntn, Advisor
Pole Committee Governance & Projects- Joint Pole Organization
909-548-7195 | M. 951-323-2354
14005 S. Benson Ave, Chino, CA 91710

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee

Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>

Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>; Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie <Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>; JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com <asmith@motive-energy.com>; Kay Black <kb6314@att.com>; Cory R. Crawford <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson <shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com <jtodaro@motive-energy.com>; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us <carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us>

Cc: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good morning,

Attached are the February 17, 2021– Compliance Committee Meeting minutes for your review. If a response is not received prior to March 9, 2021 these minutes will be uploaded to the SCJPC website. After March 9th Members can suggest changes to minutes at the next meeting.

Thank you,

Anali Spencer

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone: (909) 599-3801 Ext. 204

Fax: (909) 599-3825

anali.spencer@scjpc.net



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Genics-WFS Net

SECTION 1: Identification

Product

Name Genics WFS Net
Product Code: WFS-03
Product use Fire Retardant
Manufacturer's Name: **GENICS INC.**
561 Acheson Rd. 53016 Hwy 60
Acheson Industrial Park.
Acheson, Alberta Canada
T7X 5A7
Genics Business Phone: (780) 962-1000
Emergency Phone: **CANUTEC : (613) 996-6666**

SDS Preparation Date: June 27, 2016

SECTION 2: Hazard Identification (toxicological properties)

Hazard Classification: Skin irritation Cat.3, Eye irritation Cat.2B

Warning Information: None

Pictogram: None.

Signal Words: Warning

Hazard Statement: May be harmful if swallowed
May be harmful if inhaled.
Causes mild skin irritation
Cause eye irritation

Precautionary statement:

1. If contact with eyes, wash immediately with plenty of water after contact medical care.
2. Wear suitable protective clothing and gloves.

Other Hazards:

Long-term exposure to skin rashes, eye gets the slight tingling, accidentally ingested, the stomach irritation and vomiting

SECTION 3: Composition / Information on Ingredients

<u>Ingredient(s)</u>	<u>CAS #</u>	<u>Percent (by weight)</u>
Acrylic Copolymer		35 - 56
Ammonium Polyphosphate	68333-79-9	3 - 21
Expandable graphite	12777-87-6	3 - 21
Silica	14808-60-7	<1
Wire Mesh/ Fiber	--	30 - 49



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

SECTION 4: First Aid Measures

Eye contact	Rinse with plenty of water for 10 to 15 minutes, occasionally opened to the upper and lower eyelids thoroughly washed, if the patient has pain, derogatory eyes, watery eyes, swelling and other phenomena to be taken to seek medical attention
Skin contact	Removal of clothing with plenty of water and soap thoroughly, then rinse with warm water 15 minutes, if the patient has an adverse effect or irritation occurs then they should be taken to seek medical attention
Inhalation	Move to fresh air if starting to feel dizzy. If symptoms persist then patient needs to be taken to seek medical attention
Ingestion	If a large volume is consumed, patient should consume 1 to 2 cups of water. If patients begins to lose consciousness or is unconscious, taken to seek medical attention
Notes to physician	Avoid gastric lavage or cause vomiting.
General advice	If you feel unwell, seek medical advice (show the label where possible). Ensure that medical personnel are aware of the material(s) involved, and take precautions to protect themselves. Show this safety data sheet to the doctor in attendance. Avoid contact with eyes and skin. Keep out of reach of children.

SECTION 5: Fire-Fighting Measures

Fire:	Fire Resistant
Explosion:	Not considered to be an explosion Hazard
Fire Extinguishing Media:	Not Required
Special fire fighting procedures:	1. Firefighter required to wear appropriate protective equipment and positive pressure self-contained breathing gas supply, extinguish fire at the up windward.

Special protective equipment for firefighters: Firefighters must wear breathing apparatus, fire protective clothing and gloves.

SECTION 6: Accidental Release Measures

Personal Precautions	1. Limit personnel to enter until area is completely clear and clean up spills. 2. Wear appropriate personal protective equipment
Environmental Precautions:	1. Leak area for ventilation. 2. Avoid contaminants from entering sewers.
Methods for cleaning up	For large spillages liquids should be contained with sand or earth and both liquids and solids transferred to salvage containers. Any residues should be treated as for small spillages.

SECTION 7: Handling and Storage Procedures

Handling:	1. Container must be labeled, closed containers when not in use. 2. Shall keep readily available to deal with the fire and emergency response device leakage.
Storage:	Placed at cool and dry area, away from heat, sparks and icy place.

SECTION 8: Exposure Controls – Personal Protection

Engineering Control:

N/A



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Control Factor:	N/A
Personal Respirators:	N/A
Skin Protection:	Protective gloves
Eye Protection:	Wear safety glasses or goggles

SECTION 9: Physical and Chemical Properties

Appearance	Dark grey-black
Odor	Not Applicable
Data relevant to safety:	Flash Point: Not Applicable Ignition temperature: Not Applicable Self-ignition temperature: Not Applicable Lower explosion Limit: Not Applicable Upper explosion limit: Not Applicable
Solubility:	Water miscible
Density:	Not Applicable
PH:	6.0 + 1.0
Viscosity:	Not Applicable
Solid Content:	100%

SECTION 10: Stability and Reactivity

Stability:	Stable under ordinary conditions of use and storage.
Incompatibilities:	Organic solvent
Materials to Avoid	Strong acid or alkali and oxidant
Hazardous decomposition products	Will emit smoke, CO, CO ₂ when fire

SECTION 11: Toxicological Information

Acute oral toxicity (LD ₅₀):	N/A
Subchronic effects:	N/A
Chronic Toxicity or Long Term Toxicity:	N/A

SECTION 12: Ecological Information

Ecological Effect:	Fish toxicity (LC ₅₀); None
Environmental effects	Do not use this product into the sewer water or contaminated soil

SECTION 13: Disposal Considerations

Dispose waste by sanitary landfill or incineration in accordance with appropriate regulations.

SECTION 14: Transportation Information

International Regulations:	Not a hazardous or restricted item for transport by road, rail, sea or air.
----------------------------	---



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Transportation Summary: These products are not regulated as hazardous materials
UN Classification Number:
IMDG code & Package Group: None
Marine Pollutant: Not applicable
Specific Precautionary transport Measures and Conditions: Not applicable

SECTION 15: Regulatory Information

Health Hazardous goods: NO
Environmental Hazardous goods: NO
Fire Hazardous goods: NO

SECTION 16: Other Information

Date of Issue: June 27, 2016 (Revision 001)
Supersedes: None

Prepared by: Genics Inc.
Phone: (780) 962-1000 or
Toll-free 1-877-943-6427
Fax: (780) 962-1052

Information contained in this SDS refers only to the specific material designated and does not relate to any process or use with any other materials. This information is furnished free of charge and is based on data believed to be reliable as of the date hereof. It is intended for use by persons possessing technical knowledge at their own discretion and risk. Since actual use is beyond our control, no guarantee, expressed or implied, and no liability is assumed by Genics Inc. in conjunction with the use of this information. Nothing herein is to be construed as a recommendation to infringe any patents.

Q&A with fire mesh:

1. Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole? What changes are needed in regard to bonding and grounding with the use of a metal mesh on what is thought to be a non-conductive pole? Can the pole now become energized and under what conditions?
 - The fire mesh is wrapped at least 8 feet from the primary, leaving an insulative section of wood between them. For the wrap to be hazardous, it would need to have a conductive path across this insulative section. Grounding practices are not different with the fire mesh wrapped on the wood pole. Cables operated at 750 V and less shall be protected in conduit when extending past the FR Wrap or within 8 feet of the top portion.
2. How will we perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
 - Hammer sound testing can be conducted in the same way as when the pole does not have the wrap on it. The wrap does not interfere with the sound of the pole when striking it.
 - To access the pole below the protective layer, use a utility knife or tin snips to shear 2.5" vertically and horizontally from the point of where the boring location will be. This creates an "L" cut into the Fire Mesh. Push the cut Fire Mesh back. This triangular flap should move very easily exposing the wood pole. When you are done with the boring, use a nail to fasten the flap back onto the wood pole to ensure long-term hold.



3. How will existing pole be wrapped; over our existing facilities or under?
 - Currently, SCE does not have a program to wrap in-service poles.
4. If cable attachments are needed below the 20' threshold, the metal mesh and our facilities will be in contact with each other making both susceptible of becoming energized.
 - If installed over fire mesh, cables operated at 750V and less shall be protected in conduit when extending past the FR Wrap or within 8 feet of the top portion.
 - If not attached over fire mesh, care must be taken to ensure the gap between the FR Wrap and the hardware attachments is no larger than 1/2-inch. Effective attachment of assets will include minimizing the surface area of exposed wood, so it does not impede the survivability of the pole and the performance of the FR Wrap in the event of a fire.
5. What kind of drill bits will be needed to drill through the metal mesh?
 - SCE is not aware that special tooling is required to drill through the metal mesh and does not require or specify any special tooling when it drills through the metal mesh.

6. Will the Buck squeeze climbing belts grab into mesh and stop tech from falling if tech was to cut out?
- Prior to climbing a pole with the protective barrier installed on it, check to make sure the barrier is securely attached to the pole.



7. What effects will the metal mesh cause on climbing belts & gaffs?
- Gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind.
 - SCE is not aware of any affects metal mesh has on climbing belts and gaffs. Routine checks of equipment should always be performed before climbing as part of the normal safety checks.
8. Climbing the mesh wrapped poles with gaffs will cause gaff marks that will have sharp edged wires protruding from the pole.
- This is expected when gaffing a pole with mesh wrap. If encountered, press and/or hammer the protrusions back into the pole.
9. When guying the pole the down guy bracket spikes will need to pierce mesh and into the wood to prevent the bracket from spinning while applying tension to down guy
- See answer to #4. If bracket spikes are temporary, and a piece of mesh is removed or peeled back to expose the wood, when completed, tack the mesh back down once the guy bracket spoke is removed.
10. Do all tech need official training in order to climb wrapped poles?
- SCE did not provide any special training to its employees prior to their climbing poles with protective wrap. Utilities shall decide to provide special training for their employees as they see fit.
11. Does this change the safety in any way for those that need to work or climb on the pole?
- Prior to climbing a pole with the FR Wrap installed on it, check to make sure the wrap is securely attached to the pole. Gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind.

12. Is it slick and oily, so it creates a hazard of a ladder or worker slipping?
- The protective layer is not slick or oily based on SCE's experience. The material is less slick than new treated wood pole.
13. Will it change how a technician climbs the pole?
- No, gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind. SCE has not implemented any changes to its climbing techniques for poles with protective wrap.
14. Does it present a burn hazard when it gets hot from being in the sun?
- Standard PPE is required. This has not been reported as an issue.
15. Is it toxic or give off toxic fumes? Can a technician get it on their hands? Will it stain clothing? etc.
- Safety data sheet provided.
 - Fire Wrap is non-toxic and does not emit toxic fumes before or after activation. The fire Wrap is chemically inert in the dry finished state found on the pole. Approximately 95% of the composition after activation is carbon, phosphorus and oxygen. None of elements found after activation pose any health risks to exposed individuals or livestock post fire and burn. Carbon and oxygen will be prevalent in any setting post fire as they are the primary compounds stored in trees and wood.
 - Neither form of the mesh (before or after activation) will transfer any harmful chemicals onto the hands or cloths of someone working or climbing the pole. The activated intumescent complex that has created the protective blanket around the pole will start to crumble when disturbed. This residue will not stain or leave residue. It can be simply washed or brushed off after exposure.
 - Manufacture's Recommended PPE: Gloves, Safety glasses, long sleeves.
16. If a technician climbs a pole using their hooks/gaffs over several times will the mesh be damaged such that it can result in sharp edges that may result in a cut hazard?
- If sharp edges are encountered, press and/or hammer them back into the pole.
17. If a technician climbs a pole using their hook/gaffs over several times, will the mesh be damaged and will that change the flame stopping ability of the mesh and if there is then a fire will that technicians company be held liable for damaging the mesh?
- The Fire Resistant (FR) Wrap is an intumescent (swelling up when heated) grid made of 23-gauge galvanized steel coated with a durable intumescent polymer. It is designed to protect the pole by expanding at temperatures greater than 300°F and creating a barrier that protects and shields the wooden structure from radiant heat and fire. The fire wrap on average swells up ½-inch in all directions when activated. This swell has proven to encapsulate damage caused by gaffing. Accordingly, SCE has no plans to hold other utilities responsible for minor gaps in the mesh caused by routine climbing activities.

Anali Spencer

From: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 12:59 PM
To: Angela Pranata; Anali Spencer; Serrato, Joe; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; John Bacon; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com); ASmith@motive-energy.com; BLACK, KAY R; Shawn Henderson; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Pedro Garganera; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us
Cc: Kathleen Allen
Subject: RE: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes
Attachments: Q&A for Fire Mesh.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: MTG, IMPORTANT

Wayne,

I didn't see the answer to the highlighted questions (below) in the response from your team:

The issues that we raised are:

Concerns with fire mesh wrap:

- Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole
- How will we perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
- How will existing pole be wrapped; over our existing facilities or under?
- If cable attachments are needed below the 20' threshold, the metal mesh and our facilities will be in contact with each other making both susceptible of becoming energized
- What kind of drill bits will be needed to drill through the metal mesh?
- Will the Buck squeeze climbing belts grab into mesh and stop tech from falling if tech was to cut out?
- What effects will the metal mesh cause on climbing belts & gaffs?
- Climbing the mesh wrapped poles with gaffs will cause gaff marks that will have sharp edged wires protruding from the pole
- When guying the pole the down guy bracket spikes will need to pierce mesh and into the wood to prevent the bracket from spinning while applying tension to down guy
- Do all tech need official training in order to climb wrapped poles?

As separate workgroup came up with an additional set of questions, although some items are on both lists:

- Does this change the safety in any way for those that need to work or climb on the pole? Is it slick and oily, so it creates a hazard of a ladder or worker slipping?
- Will it change how a technician climbs the pole?
- Does it present a burn hazard when it gets hot from being in the sun?
- Is it toxic or give off toxic fumes? Can a technician get it on their hands? Will it stain clothing? etc.
- Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole?

- What changes are needed in regard to bonding and grounding with the use of a metal mesh on what is thought to be a non-conductive pole? Can the pole now become energized and under what conditions?
- If a technician climbs a pole using their hooks/gaffs over several times will the mesh be damaged such that it can result in sharp edges that may result in a cut hazard?
- If a technician climbs a pole using their hook/gaffs over several times, will the mesh be damaged and will that change the flame stopping ability of the mesh and if there is then a fire will that technicians company be held liable for damaging the mesh?
- From an AT&T perspective there should be an M&P how to address working on a pole with this type of mesh. – Internal AT&T to answer
- How will AT&T perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
- How will existing pole be wrapped; over AT&T existing facilities or under?

From: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:17 AM

To: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>; Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie <Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com; BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>; CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson <shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us

Cc: Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: Re: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good Morning,

I am forwarding an email from SCE (Wayne Brown) to the Compliance ad hoc. I will also upload the attached documents to the Agenda page for the next Compliance meeting.

From: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:07 AM

To: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>

Subject: Wire Mesh

Good morning Cory,

Attached you find a copy of the Q&A for wire mesh asked by AT&T, along with the Safety Data Sheet. Angela, can you please attached to the ad hoc for which this was a topic of discussion.

Thank you,

Gerald "Wayne" Brown

Agency Coordntn, Advisor

Pole Committee Governance & Projects- Joint Pole Organization

909-548-7195 | M. 951-323-2354

14005 S. Benson Ave, Chino, CA 91710

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>

Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>;
Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie
<Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>;
lex.treepaisan@ftr.com <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>;
JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz
(mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com <asmith@motive-energy.com>; Kay Black <kb6314@att.com>; Cory R. Crawford <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson
<shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com <jtodaro@motive-energy.com>; Nicholas Van Stryk
(nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>;
carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us <carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us>

Cc: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good morning,

Attached are the February 17, 2021– Compliance Committee Meeting minutes for your review. If a response is not received prior to March 9, 2021 these minutes will be uploaded to the SCJPC website. After March 9th Members can suggest changes to minutes at the next meeting.

Thank you,

Anali Spencer
Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone: (909) 599-3801 Ext. 204
Fax: (909) 599-3825
anali.spencer@scjpc.net

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801
Fax (909) 599-3825

April 21, 2021

A meeting of the **ad hoc Compliance Committee** took place on the above date,
at 11:23 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Joe Serrato	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Alida Montiel	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Wesley Jones	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Wayne Brown	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Camile Bowie	Southern California Edison
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L.P
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Ms. Tara Andrews	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Mr. Joe Armstrong	City of Pasadena
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Jim Todaro	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. Pedro Garganera	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Claudia Arellano	City of Vernon
Mr. Hugo Murillo	City of Burbank
Ms. Amanda Lindgren	City of Glendale
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Mr. Serrato called the meeting to order at 11:23 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes – Mr. Serrato inquired if the members had any comments or concerns regarding the prior meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Item 1630: CPUC Data Requests Updates (2/14/17) – Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to CPUC activity and updates. Mr. Brown stated they have not had any updates lately. There were no further comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1658: Environmental Issues (1/16/2019, moved from Admin Board on 1/15/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to Environmental Issues. He asked the members if they were aware any Environmental Issues to talk about to the committee. There were no comments or concerns from any members at this time.

Agenda Item 4 – Item 1770: 3rd Party Inspection Notification (From Administrative Board meeting – 10/21/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened to Third Party Inspection Notification. Mr. Serrato stated that this is the item regarding the Excel sheet for the contact list. Mr. Carrion stated he had something prepared (see attached). Mr. Serrato stated that it should be tabled for the next Compliance meeting in the interest of time. Mr. Serrato confirmed that this item will be tabled for the next month’s Compliance meeting.

Agenda Item 5 – Item 1773: Concerns with fire mesh wrap (From Administrative Board meeting – 11/18/2020)– Mr. Serrato opened to Concerns with fire mesh wrap. Mr. Serrato stated that AT&T California had submitted question in which SCE had answered and the rest of the committee members wanted to have more time to provide their feedback and questions. Mr. Serrato stated he sent a list of additional questions and asked Ms. Pranata to display them (see attached). Mr. Serrato stated he understood that the question probably could not be answered at this time but wanted to give SCE the opportunity to take them back and provide answers for next time. Mr. Serrato stated if any other members had additional questions they may ask at the moment or add them to the list with Ms. Pranata. Mr. Brown asked if Mr. Serrato was going to send him the list. Mr. Serrato stated that he sent it to both Mr. Brown and Ms. Pranata at the same time that morning so it will be in his inbox. Mr. Bacon stated that when LADWP had to demo about two years ago on the fire mesh, he had a sample piece of it. He stated he noticed it on the agenda, and it said to provide a sample of it. He stated he does have a sample if any members were interested in seeing it, he could send the five-by-five-inch square to them.

Mr. Serrato thanked Mr. Bacon for the offer. Mr. Brown stated in regards to the question earlier about the pole being in the neighborhood which was a concern Mr. Armstrong had. It was about a pole being along the school walkway. The thought was that SCE was only going to do wire mesh in high fire areas. He stated Mr. Armstrong provided the pole number to SCE and it happens that the pole is in what is considered an SCE high fire area which is why it might be that it has wire mesh. He stated SCE is addressing to see if they should be meshing the poles along the school line. Mr. Armstrong stated that has seen a couple of others around that are obviously in urban areas. He stated that he understands the high fire danger and wind map all where it is. He stated he lives in the area and that it is not like the ground fire is going to come up because it would be in the hills that are above. He stated that there are a few others in Pasadena or Altadena that are in a similar situation. He stated he thought, "Odd space, odd place to be putting them." He stated if they are looking at just a map they will not know that without doing a little research. Mr. Brown stated that the team did take that into consideration when Mr. Armstrong provided the last poles. Mr. Brown stated that he believes the team will be addressing it internally to determine whether or not they should be putting mesh on that pole or not. Mr. Serrato stated that Ms. Pranata will be adding this set of questions to the minutes and if there were any additional ones the members can send them to Ms. Pranata and Mr. Brown.

Agenda Item 6 – Item 1776: Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual benefit of Pole Replacements (From Crown Castle – 03/17/2021)- Mr. Serrato opened up to Item 1776. Mr. Carrion stated that Crown Castle had a brief power point presentation to show the members. They wanted to go over points and bits of information that they wanted to review (see attached). Mr. Serrato stated to recall what Item 1776 was about, Crown Castle titled it 'Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements.' He stated this was to discuss the topic surrounding the outside dependency of a pole replacement to be conducted by a party other than the proposing member. How it would lead to inconsistent and unreliable timelines resulting in missed commitments and beyond customer expectations. He asked the members to draw their attention to one case study involving the JPAs shown in the last bullet point, NG142830-LAD051-10m1. This was a single pole JPA issued in February of 2017. With SCE to replace a pole under Section 7.3. That JPA was then approved the following month of March 2017. As of March 2021, four years later, the pole remains unreplaced resulting in customer termination later that same month. On the next slide he stated those were the things that Crown Castle would like to see which would address the issue while accommodating the needs and concerns of all parties. First, that members should have the right to replace poles given that member has the necessary

capacity to do so, effectively, and safely. Second, institute and reasonable timeline for the completion of a pole replacement. And third, introduce an agreeable path for the proposing member to conduct a replacement if the reasonable timeframe cannot be met, maintaining appropriate shared or non-shared costs. On the next slide were the next steps. Crown Castle recommends taking a look at Section 7.0 Replacement to see where a revision or update can be implemented. And Crown Castle is willing to volunteer to initiate that effort for discussion at the next month's meeting. In addition, Crown Castle would like to pose what they feel are four simple yet fair questions for consideration. "Question No. 1: What are the specific concerns that dictate a pole replacement to be conducted by once preferential member over another? Question No. 2: Are restrictions to who conducts a pole replacement limited to poles with H-class circuits, as currently described in Section 7.0? Question No. 3: What are the resources or contacts available to members today to definitively determine if and when a pole is scheduled for a completed replacement? Question No. 4: What do members consider to be a reasonable timeframe for a replacement to occur, from proposal to completion?" With that Mr. Carrion opened up the floor for any questions. Mr. Brown stated that he had a couple. One was timeframes of replacing. First, he stated there is something already in the Routine Handbook for the time limit involving a JPA and that a member can ask that JPA be canceled at any time, not meaning that it will be canceled, but the request can be made. He then stated that when it comes to pole replacements, SCE is not going to forfeit their safety and reliability on any other company. Mr. Brown stated that Crown Castle's management and SCE management have a meeting in place, and he suggested that they wait until after that meeting before they go down this road because they may get what they are wanting. He stated that he knows that SCE talked with Mr. Jones and there is a meeting scheduled with SCE's upper, upper management, their senior level management. SCE is not going to participate in this at no point in time right now. He stated that there are discussions on the table and until that has taken place, he thinks Crown Castle will get a better feel for SCE's position. Mr. Brown stated that SCE is not going to leave it up to the committee to put their safety and reliability in jeopardy. That they are just not going to do it. Mr. Serrato stated that this is a standing agenda Item 1776 and that he understands that SCE does not want to participate in this discussion. He stated that this is a committee wide issue that Crown Castle is bringing up. He stated if they may, the rest of the committee would like to continue to talk about it. Mr. Bacon stated right, and that SCE is not saying they are not willing to talk about or discuss it. That right now they are going to recognize the fact that they need to accommodate the communication companies as far as getting their poles replaced. They are saying that their number one priority is high wind and fire replacement poles at this time. Mr. Bacon stated that the communication companies do not fall under that priority as a top

priority. He stated it is not necessarily the same thing with LADWP. LADWP replaces poles in areas in bulk. All their resources are going in to preventing them from going bankrupt and getting sued in the high fire, wind, and flood areas. Right now, all utilities are on a major push or hardening to their system. Whether it be with the tree wire, the cover, the bigger, thicker poles, and updating their system. He stated that unfortunately that means the communication companies are waiting forever. Mr. Bacon stated that they know that Crown Castle has customers that they have to answer to and are waiting, probably pushing them to get these done. The resources for every one of LADWP's contract crews are sued for hardening that system. He further described that LADWP's timeline is if the pole is 25 years or older, they can replace it under a deteriorated pole contract. That is their position on what quantifies a pole to be changed out along with their inspection and maintenance inspections. Mr. Bacon stated that when Crown Castle says, "regular H-class circuits," that LADWP allows them to change their poles only it is an uncomplicated set. To have a qualified electrical company come out and set a pole, basically most pole sets, when they are going to be setting the pole, like for like or even five feet taller to accommodate their cell sites. When someone else has to set that pole, he stated that at least 80% of the time, they just cannot set that pole next to it. A hole has to be created. Meaning the high-power lines have to be relocated for them to even be able to get that pole up there. And that is where the power companies have a problem with them bringing in an outside contractor to set a pole. If they are qualified, they would be able to move LADWP's facilities. LADWP has major issues with that. No one, except for LADWP, is allowed to relocate their facilities unless it is an in-house contractor that is observed and controlled by them. He stated that is the problem that LADWP has with other members setting their own facilities with their own companies. One because there are guy strains that are going to be altered. If the pole is to be jarred or shaken, they lose the circuits. They lose the circuits, then they are liable. That is why they are tight fisted with who can set a pole next to their facilities. LADWP will give a little bit of length or a leash on clean sets where there is not a whole lot that has to be done on the pole, then they will let them set. If it involves relocating their facilities to be able to set it then that is the problem. Most poles have to have high voltage rearrangement for them to even get that pole in there so that LADWP can even have a chance at having a parallel transfer of all the conductors to the new pole. He was unsure if that makes sense to the other members. But he stated he thinks that is the hesitation for the power companies to allow them to go and try to find contractors that are licensed to be able to do that work. The problem is when they try to do the work on LADWP's facilities, also union issues and other issues of people working on their facilities that they cannot allow. Mr. Carrion stated that he understands what Mr. Bacon is saying and where LADWP is coming from. He stated that question that he had concerning this being limited

to poles with H-class circuits was more in line for Crown Castle and other members to understand which poles they may be able to replace and which they are not able to replace. He stated he mentioned this in the last month's meeting. If the pole happens to be an Edison pole but is a guy only pole; would that free for them to replace. If it is an Edison pole that only has a PCOM attached to it; would that okay for us to replace. Mr. Bacon stated that on a guy stub, LADWP's policy is, they not going to let Crown Castle go near it. If it is holding back a 4.8 and a 35 circuit, they are not going to trench in anywhere near that pole. Mr. Carrion stated that these are the details that Crown Castle needs to know so they know where they stand with what they are able to do and what they are not able to do and where they might be able to find some ways to work with each other on certain other poles. Now if LADWP is saying that if a pole has an H-class circuit on it and they are really adamant that only LADWP is able to transfer those facilities. Mr. Serrato stated that he believes that there should be an avenue for the communication companies to be able to initiate the process of the pole replacement to happen and maybe they are not calling a qualified contractor. Instead, maybe they are contacting LADWP directly to schedule whoever it is on their end that needs to do the transfer so that they are being scheduled in appropriately. This opposed to sending out a JPA proposing a replacement that might happen at some time in the future. He stated that when it comes to customer commitment, "might happen" and "might happen at some time in the future" does not cut it. If there is something in the Routine Handbook that can help definitely define those requirements or where they might be able to grasp onto, it would give Crown Castle a little bit more of a sense of where they can have a little bit of control as to when they can begin that process. Mr. Carrion conceded, that this could look like a number of different ways with a number of different options as to how it could work. But until Crown Castle has some straws to grasp at, it is going to be difficult to outline in any kind of process for them to be able to work together on how this can happen. Mr. Serrato stated that they should break this down into pieces just to move the discussion along. He asked Mr. Carrion what his first question was on his list. Mr. Carrion stated that the point was not really to have the questions addressed at this time or get an answer now because he knows a lot of the members would not be in the position or have the capacity to answer them right now. He stated that he could quickly run through them again. The first was asking what the specific concerns that dictate a pole replacement to be conducted by one preferential member over another. He stated safety and reliability is an answer, but it is not as detailed as he would like. The second question was if the restrictions as to who conducts the pole replacement was limited to those H-class circuits. He stated there is a little bit more detail as to which pole might be fair game or not because that would help Crown Castle understand the policies that might be within specific members. The third question was what are the resources or contacts available

to members today to definitively determine if and when a pole schedule for a completed replacement. If members had a contact to say, "Hey, is this pole being replaced any time soon? Okay. When is it gonna be replaced? What does that time frame look like?" That would greatly help all members of the committee. The last question was what do members consider to be a reasonable time frame for a replacement to occur from a proposal on a JPA to its actual completion. He stated this ties into what Crown Castle would like to take a look at Section 7.0 to see where they may be able to revise it or update it, which they are willing to do. Crown Castle can have something drawn up. If all the members can just start thinking about what might be reasonable for them and what Crown Castle may be able to put in the Routine Handbook is what that reasonable time frame looks like, they feel that would bring a little bit more structure to this process. Mr. Armstrong stated that having some structure around that would be beneficial. He stated that there are sometimes that he believes that they have a pole that is not in great shape but due to budget constraints, their workload, and other things, City of Pasadena does not get to it in a timely manner. He stated he wonders if there is a way to identify it, so they are not trying to bill on a pole that is not suitable. He stated they have had issues where development really throws a wrench in things. He stated that they have four poles that have been sitting for quite a long time because a developer was going to come in and do all the work. They were going to change the poles out to move them and rebuild things because of what the developer was going to do. The developer went bankrupt, sold to another person who came on and proposed different things. City of Pasadena gave them a dollar amount that it is going to cost to do all of this, and they have never gotten the go ahead or gotten any commitment from them. The poles are just sitting there, and he does not know if they are ever going to get changed. He stated those are a couple of items that they need to think about. Mr. Armstrong stated that he does not mind having a reasonable time frame but at the same time picking up the phone and talking to whoever the contact is may be that could help as well. Mr. Carrion stated that he is not trying to push an agenda in the way where it is going to replace communication and working with each other. He stated he is thinking having that structure kind of put in place gives everyone a stricter guideline as to what is supposed to happen with that communication to support it. Mr. Armstrong stated that City of Pasadena has been guilty of writing up poles that have not gotten done and they are working with other poles where he is thinking, "When is this gonna get done?" Mr. Carrion stated that it is somewhat unfair to have members waiting around for something to happen that they do not really have control over at this point. He stated that if there is a time, a reasonable time frame for this to happen. Mr. Armstrong stated he understood. Mr. Carrion stated if the time frame is not there then maybe that proposing member can begin a process that starts to get it moving. Whether it is working with vendors that are qualified from a specific vendor list,

from those members that “own the pole” or if it means contacting a specific department from that member’s company to start scheduling things. To be able to get hard dates on things so that Crown Castle can go back to their customers saying, “It’s gonna happen within this specific time frame,” as opposed to saying, “It’s gonna happen sometime soon,” without any definitive answer. That has not been working. Mr. Bacon stated he could also give Mr. Carrion the flipside of this. He stated with the concern right now in the high fire threat district areas, every power utility is scared to death right now as far as another fire breaking out. LADWP is one fire away from going bankrupt, so is SCE. So, their number one priority right now is hardening the system. He asked if that meant Crown Castle does not have a right to good service and stated of course they do. SCE does not allow Crown Castle to set poles near their facilities, so a lot of these questions go right out the door. Also, on Crown Castle’s end, he knows that they have customers that are getting ready for 5G and it is a major push right now. He stated he is noticing a lot of these companies are asking them to run the fiber or to lease off their poles if they could also on their end give them a realistic date and expectation according to what the current trend is right now with the utilities. He stated he understands they are under the gun and when projects do not go through, people have to answer. He stated he deals with every communication company that is out there in regards to cell sites, make readies, the applications, and everything else. And there does seem to be a lot of pressure that is put on every communication company that is out there to get the fiber in. LADWP is seeing it in just about every meeting that they are now centered around when are these make readies going to go through, when are the south sides going to be up. He stated also, on Crown Castle’s end, his point is to give them a realistic timeline of what they are working with, with current trends with the utilities. It is unfortunate that their focus right now is on the high fire and threat district areas and he thinks that just adds to their frustration of trying to get these poles in the ground. Mr. Carrion stated the case study JPA that he pointed out, that was issued in 2017 which in the grand scheme of things was not that long ago and if it has not been replaced last month being four years later, he stated he does not know what kind of realistic timeline he supposed to give their clients. Mr. Bacon agreed that four years later is a terrible timeline. Mr. Carrion stated that if a member has and can demonstrate that they have the necessary capacity to replace a pole safely and effectively according to all the regulations. Then, if a member is occupied with replacing poles in high fire threats, having something like this would only help everybody. This is from Crown Castle’s point of view. Mr. Bacon agreed that they should have some kind of expectation. Mr. Carrion stated that Crown Castle would like to take a look at Section 7. To take a closer look and insert something not so stringent but maybe putting a reasonable timeframe that will not be four years. They can then bring this back next month and have it for discussion when the members have had time to sit

on the four questions mentioned. Mr. Van Stryk stated he would like to see a demo of what they would submit as far as replacing a pole. If Crown Castle goes out and get a work order set up to replace a pole with H-Class circuits, what it may look like as far as what they would be sending, set locations, classes, pole loading. Or if it would just be the same JPA and pole loading, and they would have figure out the rest and if they would be transferring. Mr. Carrion stated that the root of it all, he clarified he was just giving an example. He stated if he finds a pole in the field that he needs to attach on, and it fails. It fails now, today, without Crown Castle's attachment on it. Right now, the process is Crown Castle has to submit that JPA with SCE to replace it because that is the preferred method as communicated by SCE. With something like this, it can go one or two ways. First, if SCE cannot conduct that replacement within the reasonable time frame that Crown Casts wants to throw out there, they should be able to begin the process of doing it. That is one way. The second way would be, Crown Castle just writes the JPA as NG to replace the pole and that is it. Everything else, the process of what needs to occur in order for that to happen, that happens off of the JPA because that is what is going happen off the JPA anyway. Getting all the permits for everything that is needed to replace the pole. Lining up who is actually going to be doing the transfer of the H-class circuits and getting those scheduled in the books. As opposed to just saying, "Edison to replace the poles 7.3 or 7.11," and all the communication companies just basically being in the dark as to when all that is going to get scheduled. If and when it happens and does it happen. Poles do get replaced, but they are in the dark as to when that happens. And that is kind of what Crown Castle wants to try to get to the root of. Mr. Serrato stated that Mr. Carrion introduced those questions. The members are going to take it back and let it roll around in their heads. Also, take it back to their teams. And they are going to discuss this again next time. He asked if any members had any other immediate reactions to that plan in order to break for lunch. There were no other comments or concerns from the members at this time.

The members reconvened at 12:45pm and Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Carrion what was next for this item. Mr. Carrion stated that he would like to look at Section 7 and see where if it can be revised or updated so that the minor changes can be inserted and take a look at that at the next month's meeting as well. Mr. Serrato reiterated that the members are going to take a look at Mr. Carrion's questions and also look at Section 7 and see where the opportunities are for revisions and to put more structure regarding Section 7 and the questions brought up. Mr. Carrion stated this was correct.

Agenda Item 7 – Miscellaneous –

- Mr. Serrato opened to the Certificate of Insurance Request sent to all the members. He asked Ms. Pranata if they were missing any currently. Ms. Pranata stated she created the packet a week before the meeting and since then she has received COIs from City of Colton, T-Mobile, and LADWP. She stated she is still missing Verizon Wireless and Sprint Nextel Corporation, just those two companies. Mr. Bacon asked if they have an ETA from Verizon and Sprint as to when they are going to be able to get the COI's in. Ms. Smith with Sprint stated she followed up already with Trevor and he stated he had to follow up with whomever is at his office that gets that information. She stated he would let her know as soon as he had it. She stated this conversation was as of last week. Mr. Serrato stated that once those are ready to make sure to send them to the correct email address, coi@scjpc.net. Ms. Pranata stated there was one more missing which was Mobilitie, LLC, they did not attend the meeting today. She stated she will reach out to them again.
- Mr. Serrato opened to the draft letter regarding getting permits from Cal Trans. He stated that this topic evolved into the proposed verbiage that they wanted to add to the SCJPC landing page. He stated that he mentioned that this was a text that did not warrant any revisions to the routine. He stated it is a very factual, simplified line describing how the SCJPC works. Last they left off with SCE was going to take this text back to their legal to see what they thought of it before they moved forward. He asked Mr. Brown or if anyone else from SCE had the chance to do that yet. Mr. Brown stated that he will follow up with their safety again and he reviewed the verbiage again. He stated without the words "upon approval," SCE was not going to agree to it. He stated that he did have the conversation with their attorney and that without the verbiage "upon approval," SCE was not going to agree to it. He stated just because they are a member does not mean they have the right to be on a pole. Mr. Serrato stated that he will fix the text and take it back to their side and revisit this next time. Mr. Bacon stated that they do not want to have this back and forth and that this is very important to the communication members and what they have to deal with logistically with all the different cities, BOE, and everyone else. Mr. Bacon stated that to Mr. Brown in order to save a step as far as language goes, if they could use the words "preexisting approval." He stated what will happen is they will take it to BOE or whomever it is and be asked where the approval is. If they were to use the words "preexisting approval," would that suffice. Mr. Brown stated he could send that to the attorney, but that it sounded good to him. Mr. Bacon asked if Mr. Brown could expedite this because it is needed for the communication members. They need this because it is causing delays for them even being able to break any concrete or asphalt or do any type of

work, they would like to do out there. Mr. Brown asked if the current version said preexisting. Mr. Bacon stated it did not. Mr. Brown stated once Crown Castle gets the one updated wording to him, he will send it over right away. Mr. Serrato thanked Mr. Bacon and Mr. Brown. Mr. Serrato stated that Crown Castle needs to provide SCE a revised statement with the words "preexisting approval." This should remedy Crown Castle having to provide the actual approval and also maybe prevent them from asking for the approvals that should already exist. Mr. Brown stated that he will send that to SCE's attorney to see what she says. Mr. Bacon stated that the language between the other members of the SCJPC clearly states "if you are a member." He stated that should suffice, but if they have a preexisting and maybe an asterisk next to it. Mr. Brown stated that it sufficed that because they are member it does not give them right to be on the pole. Mr. Bacon stated not on the pole and asked if this was more for trenching. Mr. Brown stated he thought this was for attaching to a pole. Mr. Serrato stated that this is regarding attaching to the pole. Mr. Bacon stated it was for strictly attaching to the pole. Mr. Carrion stated that he would like to ask Mr. Brown a question. He asked if it was worded in such a way where it states that the membership with the Joint Pole Committee is a requirement for attachments onto poles owned and maintained by other members of the SCJPC. Mr. Brown stated no. Mr. Carrion stated that it is one requirement. Mr. Brown agreed that it is a requirement that they be a member of the committee but upon approval, that they do not just have the right to be on the pole. He stated that basically they are letting them know this because the city will come back to SCE and tell them they gave approval for the member to be on the pole. They will say they did not give approval to be on the pole, they have to be approved to be on the pole and that is the bottom line. Mr. Bacon stated that before Crown Castle gets on the pole, they would have to have a JPA. Mr. Serrato stated that is correct. Mr. Carrion added before you provide a JPA you have to be a member. Mr. Bacon stated that they then provide the JPA and this statement. He thinks this would suffice with any company that is requiring them to show proof that they have the right to attach to the pole. The get the right to attach to SCE's signed JPA agreeing to Crown Castle being able to attach to it, and they take that along with the letter stating that they are member of the SCJPC. He asked if that would suffice with their dealings with the city entities. Mr. Carrion stated that it has in the past but supplying them with the copy of the JPA, then when they start talking about approvals and in cases where one was not received within 45 days and they are looking for a signature, it will not be there. Once they start talking approvals then they start to talk about the process which in turn will be a weeklong conversation. Mr. Brown stated that is what SCE has

done and explained the process to them. He stated that includes if a member does not reply within 45 days that they are automatically approved. Mr. Carrion stated that Crown Castle will start with Mr. Bacon's recommendation of adding "with preexisting approval" and hopefully that will suffice. Mr. Serrato stated this is for the text on the landing page of the SCJPC that they can direct everyone to. He stated that with Mr. Bacon they can possibly come up with a letter between LADWP and Crown Castle explaining something similar that will suite both their needs, if LADWP is open to that. Mr. Bacon replied yes. Mr. Serrato stated Crown Castle will reach out to Mr. Bacon.

- Ms. Serrato opened the discussion to Non-Wood poles and steps: GO 95 Rule change brought up by Ms. Black but it was not necessarily resolved last time. The issue was who was going to provide the poles and the steps on the poles. Mr. Serrato asked if there was any follow up on this topic from AT&T California or any other members. Ms. Black stated she believes what got resolved was that AT&T California is very clear now that they will be getting their own steps for those poles. They believe that the way the GO 95 was written was that non-wood poles have to be installed with holes so that they can put those steps, now that they are supplying them, in the poles. She stated she believes they are good with this now and asked the members if she captured this correctly. Mr. Serrato stated that last time there was some disagreement on the interpretation of the GO 95 rule, but that if it was resolved then they could go ahead and close it. Ms. Black stated that the power companies did not agree that they had to supply the holes in the pole. Ms. Black asked if they need to talk about that with the power companies because AT&T California was under the impression that looking at the way that GO 95 was written. She stated there was a member in the room who was at the CPUC meeting and it was discussed that way. Mr. Harmon stated that he wanted to add to this since Mr. Bacon and Mr. Williams were all together in the Rules Committee meeting. That the actual change was that a wood pole did not require steps, and a wood pole by definition is climbable. He stated there were certain actions, adding equipment and risers, that would have prescribed the steps. They are no longer required. He stated the actual change was there is no requirement to step a wood pole if they add a riser or etcetera. What he believes was discussed prior was that if they are going to take a wood pole that can be climbed without extra methods and put in a fiberglass or steel pole, that they make it climbable meaning put the holes there or provide methods to ascend or descend the pole without extraneous methods. Mr. Bacon agreed and stated that the rule did change for the wood pole was because of the buck squeeze and cinch log belts that they use to climb wood poles. He stated that it would be difficult climbing an 80-foot pole that had steps

every 18 inches and trying to have a cinch lock. That was one of the GO 95 rule changes on the wood poles. The wood steps would have to be drilled and done by the phone company if they wanted those steps going up to the column level, but power companies would not be required to have them. LADWP already for steel poles or alternative poles, when they preorder them, they have a drill hole pattern and they have always taken into account of having the holes there for steps and for removal after the work had been done up there. He stated AT&T California has to be careful with the steps because not all poles are the same. Some will have a $\frac{3}{4}$ inch holes and others a $\frac{5}{8}$ -inch holes. He stated to be aware of the different types that they would need for ascending and descending the pole. He stated they want to make sure they are ANZ safe rated for when they do this which he is sure they do anyways. He stated what he is trying to tell AT&T California is not all holes in poles are the same whether it is LADWP or SCE, to be careful on what they are ordering because what may work on one steel pole may not work on another. Ms. Black asked if Mr. Bacon could put that in an email for her because they are writing M&P right now for their construction crew and she is unsure of what they have ordered. Mr. Bacon stated that he will give her a breakdown of the different types of steps that LADWP uses for different applications. Ms. Black thanked Mr. Bacon. Mr. Bacon stated that he believes that LADWP and SCE order from a lot of the same vendors, but SCE has a lot of engineered steel poles that do not comply to anything that LADWP has. He stated he will allow SCE to answer for themselves with what they do with their steps going up steel poles. Ms. Black stated that with an engineered steel pole AT&T California should not be climbing it because they cannot add to them. She stated that the loading cannot be changed if she remembers correctly. Mr. Harmon stated that is not quite the case because he knows that there is some question about being able to get existing calculations from engineered poles, especially if there is a foundation on that, but that GO 95 does allow them to add. The minimum safety factor when they install is 1.5 and they can raise it to $\frac{2}{3}$ of that which would be one, but that he knows SCE normally installs their steel poles with safety factors closer to two or greater. Per the code there is room within the materials safety factor. The question is do they have access to certain calculations to vet whether that additional load will drop the safety factor below minimum. Ms. Black thanked Mr. Harmon and let Mr. Bacon know she appreciated his help with what he informed her of. Mr. Bacon stated that he will give her a breakdown of LADWP's steps and the different sizes that they have. He stated he may be able to get her to the vendors that they actually purchase them from. He stated across the spectrum AT&T California has a large territory and they could be dealing with San Diego, LADWP, SCE or PG&E

at any given time. There may be different specifications across the board for each utility's steps. Ms. Black stated that SCE did provide vendors via email. Ms. Black stated that she sent that to the folks that are writing their M&P and is assuming they contacted those vendors. Mr. Bacon stated that AT&T California is probably covered. Ms. Black stated she does not want to assume that they did. Mr. Bacon stated that there a lot of similarities between LADWP's step holes and SCE's as well, so AT&T California is probably covered if they go all the vendor and steps that SCE is using. Ms. Black stated that the takeaway was that they are all in agreement that if they are placing a non-wood pole, all the companies that do place the non-wood poles are providing the holes and asked if this was correct. Mr. Bacon stated that this was with LADWP but did not know about SCE. Mr. Brown stated that he reached out to Mr. Sam Stonerock, but he is out of the office today so when he gets a reply, he will let the committee know. Ms. Black stated that what she thinks Mr. Harmon was saying that if they are not placing the holes for steps then that is a GO 95 because the ruling only impacted wood poles. She stated this is how she is understanding this. Mr. Serrato asked Ms. Black if she would like to bring this up again next month or if she considered it a closed matter for the committee. Ms. Black stated she would like to wait for SCE to confirm that they have the holes in their non-wood poles. Mr. Brown stated it should be left open. Mr. Serrato stated it will stay open.

- Mr. Serrato opened to getting notified of replacements that they have antennas on, brought up by Ms. Ortiz. Ms. Ortiz was going to talk about some kind of notification process and Mr. Serrato asked if there were any updated on that. Ms. Ortiz stated that have not had a chance to get it together, but that this went in line with what Mr. Harmon had brought up earlier. She stated they will get together with SCE to come up with a process or a forecast of future replacement.
- Mr. Serrato opened to asking the members for advice on how to convince homeowners to grant them access to poles in their backyards where they are owners of. He stated Crown Castle has been having issues trying to get to their pole and asked what the other members do, if Crown Castle should provide them a notice because they are getting a lot of doors slammed in their faces. Mr. Bacon stated that typically what LADWP does is 48 hours before they will set out and place door hangers on doors that say they will be accessing the poles. He was unsure how it applied to the communication companies but usually they have a right to access the pole. If the pole is on someone's property, they will have the onus to provide LADWP with access. If LADWP needs to change out the pole, they will leave a card on the door and leave coat hangers on the door. They will also reach out and try to call them by looking up their number. If after several

attempts of trying to contact without a response, depending on the urgency, they may even at a worst-case scenario they go and have a police escort onto the property. He stated that is the worst-case scenario which they have had to do in a lot of cases because a lot of people do not want the tall pole in their backyard. Mr. Todaro with AT&T Mobility stated that according to law enforcement it is their right to be there. Mr. Harmon stated that he would like to be clear that what Mr. Bacon was saying was right to primarily to the IOU'S, POU's, and IOX are basically the first ones there because those companies are normally listed on the title of the deed. If they are not specified under those then they do not have easement rights. He stated the best thing that they could use would be something called a prescriptive right which is kind of like "I want it and I'm taking it." He further stated their approval to attach to a pole is no way an approval to access private property which is explained in the right of way rules. If they have cables up there, they got up there potentially without any sort of access rights. He stated this may be the name of the game because he knew of recently with the Falcon cable thing, cable tv has now moved into an area where they have similar prescriptive type of rights. He stated he was pretty certain that anybody other than those companies do not have any default rights other than a defined public utility easement. It would have to say those words. Mr. Bacon stated that even prescriptive rights are weak. If they talk with a lawyer, it is weak in a courtroom. They can for the customers stand by saying they have prescriptive rights. They would have to use their government affairs people to get out and canvas the neighborhood, a lot of prewarning letting them know several times that they are going to have access to the backyard to access these poles. They may have to put a fence on yard to access a pole that is in the other yard. They get creative about it and it is how LADWP deals with it. Mr. Brown stated that he brought something like this up a couple of years ago about being on governmental land. The government was coming to SCE saying they did not have the right to be on the poles. He stated that they explain that from a joint pole perspective they do. It is up to them to get their own easement rights. He stated that is what they probably have to do is get some type of an easement or prescriptive rights. SCE does not want to be the ones that says they have permission to be on a pole based on easement criteria. Mr. Van Stryk stated even in cases where they have an easement or even prescriptive rights, he has had security guards pull guns on their guys. He stated they still want to give them notice and have a contact or try to contact someone because they do not want their guys showing up and get into a dangerous situation. Mr. Serrato agreed and thanked him for that. Mr. Bacon stated that one of the other issues is each easement has its own language. If they do not have a recorded right of way, and they

may just have a certain type of easement with the language, a lot of the easements that they have out there point to, going city by city, that they can only maintain what is existing. They cannot add anything new. He stated a lot of times they are going to get hit with being told they are not supposed to add anything and only supposed to maintain what is there. When they go string new fiber even those where it is on a public utility right of way, the language for each pole is absolutely different depending on what city they are in. They may say that they can only maintain what is existing and cannot add wire. Some even stated that basically prescriptive rights when they lower that wire to the ground, and it hits the ground they have lost their prescriptive rights to that pole. He stated LADWP has had that happen because the wire came down and they wanted to change it out. As soon as the wire came down an attorney came out of the house and told them they lost their right to have it up there and LADWP lost the case. He told the fiber stringers to beware. Mr. Consulter asked in the case of replacing poles, how that would come into play. Mr. Bacon stated that they have the right to maintain existing and to change it out. He stated that LADWP gives the customer plenty of notice and send someone out there to talk to them and also try calling them. He stated that at some point if they are still refusing LADWP to go in there, the call the city police, and they will come out and escort LADWP onto the property. Mr. Consulter stated that is what their guys have had. Mr. Bacon asked Mr. Van Stryk if he has had any. Mr. Van Stryk stated they have had same hole set and they have to do everything like for like. So, they put the pole back where it was, make sure none of the lines changed their angles because they do not want to violate the easement that has already been written. Mr. Consulter stated the existing equipment is open and notorious, which is what he believed the term was. If they had any problems with it, they would have had a chance to address it. Mr. Brown stated that a lot of the time the pole replacements in those situations that are safety driven. SCE will inform the customer that they are putting themselves in an unsafe situation if that pole had deteriorated or something like that, anything could happen. Mr. Serrato thanked the members for the information and suggestions. He stated he will let their team know. He stated he will leave this bullet point open in case Crown Castle has any follow-up discussion for the next meeting. Mr. Serrato asked if there were any other miscellaneous topics. There were none at this time.

Agenda Item 7 – Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts -

- SCE to review the additional questions regarding their fire mesh material.
- Crown Castle is going to take the questions that Mr. Carrion brought up regarding pole replacements back to their companies for further discussion next time.
- CROAC Section 7 and propose revisions or talk opportunities for revision.
- Crown Castle to provide a demo or example of a pole replacement work order requested by Mr. Van Stryk with City of Vernon.
- Verizon, Sprint, and AT&T Mobility to be followed up on for their COI's.
- Crown Castle to send revised verbiage of the text on the SCJPC website landing page to add the words "preexisting approval."
- Crown Castle is going to reach out will also reach out to LADWP regarding a letter that Crown Castle can use between them to remedy both of their issues.
- SCE to get back to AT&T California on their confirmation about placing holes for steps on poles.
- Ms. Ortiz to get with SCE regarding notifications of pole replacements with antennas on them.

The meeting adjourned at 1:16 p.m. until May 19, 2021.

Anali Spencer - Committee Staff

Contact Information Consolidation

Proposed Actions

- Rename *Member Contact Information* [link] to *JPA*
- Move link to *Contact* category (currently under *Members*)
 - See new spreadsheet with only JPA-related contact information
- Rename *Emergency* [link] to *Emergency and Claims*
 - Add to include *Claims Department* contact
- Fix *Dual Poles* broken link (error 404)
- Create additional link: *Inspections* (for inspections contacts)
 - Move *Pole Inspections Contacts* [spreadsheet link], from *Pole Inspections Resources* to new *Inspections* link
 - Add *Intrusive Inspections Results Request* tab to contacts spreadsheet
 - See new proposed spreadsheet
- Create additional link: *Field Assistance/Joint Meet*
 - Request contact information from Members
 - Create similar
- Reorganize to new proposed hierarchy (see below)
 - Contacts
 - Staff
 - JPA (Internal)
 - Inspections (Internal)
 - Field Assistance/Joint Meet (Internal?)
 - Emergency and Claims
 - Dual Poles
 - Graffiti Removal
 - Update website header (*Contact* dropdown) to mirror above

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:17 AM
To: Anali Spencer; Serrato, Joe; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; John Bacon; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com); ASmith@motive-energy.com; Kay Black; Cory R. Crawford; Shawn Henderson; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Pedro Garganera; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us
Cc: Kathleen Allen
Subject: Re: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes
Attachments: Genics WFS Net - SDS.pdf; Q&A for Fire Mesh.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Good Morning,

I am forwarding an email from SCE (Wayne Brown) to the Compliance ad hoc. I will also upload the attached documents to the Agenda page for the next Compliance meeting.

From: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:07 AM
To: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Subject: Wire Mesh

Good morning Cory,

Attached you find a copy of the Q&A for wire mesh asked by AT&T, along with the Safety Data Sheet. Angela, can you please attached to the ad hoc for which this was a topic of discussion.

Thank you,

Gerald "Wayne" Brown
Agency Coordntn, Advisor
Pole Committee Governance & Projects- Joint Pole Organization
909-548-7195 | M. 951-323-2354
14005 S. Benson Ave, Chino, CA 91710

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee

Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>

Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>; Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie <Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>; JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com <asmith@motive-energy.com>; Kay Black <kb6314@att.com>; Cory R. Crawford <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson <shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com <jtodaro@motive-energy.com>; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us <carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us>

Cc: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good morning,

Attached are the February 17, 2021– Compliance Committee Meeting minutes for your review. If a response is not received prior to March 9, 2021 these minutes will be uploaded to the SCJPC website. After March 9th Members can suggest changes to minutes at the next meeting.

Thank you,

Anali Spencer

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone: (909) 599-3801 Ext. 204

Fax: (909) 599-3825

anali.spencer@scjpc.net



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Genics-WFS Net

SECTION 1: Identification

Product

Name Genics WFS Net
Product Code: WFS-03
Product use Fire Retardant
Manufacturer's Name: **GENICS INC.**
561 Acheson Rd. 53016 Hwy 60
Acheson Industrial Park.
Acheson, Alberta Canada
T7X 5A7
Genics Business Phone: (780) 962-1000
Emergency Phone: **CANUTEC : (613) 996-6666**

SDS Preparation Date: June 27, 2016

SECTION 2: Hazard Identification (toxicological properties)

Hazard Classification: Skin irritation Cat.3, Eye irritation Cat.2B

Warning Information: None

Pictogram: None.

Signal Words: Warning

Hazard Statement: May be harmful if swallowed
May be harmful if inhaled.
Causes mild skin irritation
Cause eye irritation

Precautionary statement:

1. If contact with eyes, wash immediately with plenty of water after contact medical care.
2. Wear suitable protective clothing and gloves.

Other Hazards:

Long-term exposure to skin rashes, eye gets the slight tingling, accidentally ingested, the stomach irritation and vomiting

SECTION 3: Composition / Information on Ingredients

<u>Ingredient(s)</u>	<u>CAS #</u>	<u>Percent (by weight)</u>
Acrylic Copolymer		35 - 56
Ammonium Polyphosphate	68333-79-9	3 - 21
Expandable graphite	12777-87-6	3 - 21
Silica	14808-60-7	<1
Wire Mesh/ Fiber	--	30 - 49



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

SECTION 4: First Aid Measures

Eye contact	Rinse with plenty of water for 10 to 15 minutes, occasionally opened to the upper and lower eyelids thoroughly washed, if the patient has pain, derogatory eyes, watery eyes, swelling and other phenomena to be taken to seek medical attention
Skin contact	Removal of clothing with plenty of water and soap thoroughly, then rinse with warm water 15 minutes, if the patient has an adverse effect or irritation occurs then they should be taken to seek medical attention
Inhalation	Move to fresh air if starting to feel dizzy. If symptoms persist then patient needs to be taken to seek medical attention
Ingestion	If a large volume is consumed, patient should consume 1 to 2 cups of water. If patients begins to lose consciousness or is unconscious, taken to seek medical attention
Notes to physician	Avoid gastric lavage or cause vomiting.
General advice	If you feel unwell, seek medical advice (show the label where possible). Ensure that medical personnel are aware of the material(s) involved, and take precautions to protect themselves. Show this safety data sheet to the doctor in attendance. Avoid contact with eyes and skin. Keep out of reach of children.

SECTION 5: Fire-Fighting Measures

Fire:	Fire Resistant
Explosion:	Not considered to be an explosion Hazard
Fire Extinguishing Media:	Not Required
Special fire fighting procedures:	1. Firefighter required to wear appropriate protective equipment and positive pressure self-contained breathing gas supply, extinguish fire at the up windward.

Special protective equipment for firefighters: Firefighters must wear breathing apparatus, fire protective clothing and gloves.

SECTION 6: Accidental Release Measures

Personal Precautions	1. Limit personnel to enter until area is completely clear and clean up spills. 2. Wear appropriate personal protective equipment
Environmental Precautions:	1. Leak area for ventilation. 2. Avoid contaminants from entering sewers.
Methods for cleaning up	For large spillages liquids should be contained with sand or earth and both liquids and solids transferred to salvage containers. Any residues should be treated as for small spillages.

SECTION 7: Handling and Storage Procedures

Handling:	1. Container must be labeled, closed containers when not in use. 2. Shall keep readily available to deal with the fire and emergency response device leakage.
Storage:	Placed at cool and dry area, away from heat, sparks and icy place.

SECTION 8: Exposure Controls – Personal Protection

Engineering Control:

N/A



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Control Factor:	N/A
Personal Respirators:	N/A
Skin Protection:	Protective gloves
Eye Protection:	Wear safety glasses or goggles

SECTION 9: Physical and Chemical Properties

Appearance	Dark grey-black
Odor	Not Applicable
Data relevant to safety:	Flash Point: Not Applicable Ignition temperature: Not Applicable Self-ignition temperature: Not Applicable Lower explosion Limit: Not Applicable Upper explosion limit: Not Applicable
Solubility:	Water miscible
Density:	Not Applicable
PH:	6.0 + 1.0
Viscosity:	Not Applicable
Solid Content:	100%

SECTION 10: Stability and Reactivity

Stability:	Stable under ordinary conditions of use and storage.
Incompatibilities:	Organic solvent
Materials to Avoid	Strong acid or alkali and oxidant
Hazardous decomposition products	Will emit smoke, CO, CO ₂ when fire

SECTION 11: Toxicological Information

Acute oral toxicity (LD ₅₀):	N/A
Subchronic effects:	N/A
Chronic Toxicity or Long Term Toxicity:	N/A

SECTION 12: Ecological Information

Ecological Effect:	Fish toxicity (LC ₅₀); None
Environmental effects	Do not use this product into the sewer water or contaminated soil

SECTION 13: Disposal Considerations

Dispose waste by sanitary landfill or incineration in accordance with appropriate regulations.

SECTION 14: Transportation Information

International Regulations:	Not a hazardous or restricted item for transport by road, rail, sea or air.
----------------------------	---



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Transportation Summary: These products are not regulated as hazardous materials
UN Classification Number:
IMDG code & Package Group: None
Marine Pollutant: Not applicable
Specific Precautionary transport Measures and Conditions: Not applicable

SECTION 15: Regulatory Information

Health Hazardous goods: NO
Environmental Hazardous goods: NO
Fire Hazardous goods: NO

SECTION 16: Other Information

Date of Issue: June 27, 2016 (Revision 001)
Supersedes: None

Prepared by: Genics Inc.
Phone: (780) 962-1000 or
Toll-free 1-877-943-6427
Fax: (780) 962-1052

Information contained in this SDS refers only to the specific material designated and does not relate to any process or use with any other materials. This information is furnished free of charge and is based on data believed to be reliable as of the date hereof. It is intended for use by persons possessing technical knowledge at their own discretion and risk. Since actual use is beyond our control, no guarantee, expressed or implied, and no liability is assumed by Genics Inc. in conjunction with the use of this information. Nothing herein is to be construed as a recommendation to infringe any patents.

Q&A with fire mesh:

1. Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole? What changes are needed in regard to bonding and grounding with the use of a metal mesh on what is thought to be a non-conductive pole? Can the pole now become energized and under what conditions?
 - The fire mesh is wrapped at least 8 feet from the primary, leaving an insulative section of wood between them. For the wrap to be hazardous, it would need to have a conductive path across this insulative section. Grounding practices are not different with the fire mesh wrapped on the wood pole. Cables operated at 750 V and less shall be protected in conduit when extending past the FR Wrap or within 8 feet of the top portion.
2. How will we perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
 - Hammer sound testing can be conducted in the same way as when the pole does not have the wrap on it. The wrap does not interfere with the sound of the pole when striking it.
 - To access the pole below the protective layer, use a utility knife or tin snips to shear 2.5" vertically and horizontally from the point of where the boring location will be. This creates an "L" cut into the Fire Mesh. Push the cut Fire Mesh back. This triangular flap should move very easily exposing the wood pole. When you are done with the boring, use a nail to fasten the flap back onto the wood pole to ensure long-term hold.



3. How will existing pole be wrapped; over our existing facilities or under?
 - Currently, SCE does not have a program to wrap in-service poles.
4. If cable attachments are needed below the 20' threshold, the metal mesh and our facilities will be in contact with each other making both susceptible of becoming energized.
 - If installed over fire mesh, cables operated at 750V and less shall be protected in conduit when extending past the FR Wrap or within 8 feet of the top portion.
 - If not attached over fire mesh, care must be taken to ensure the gap between the FR Wrap and the hardware attachments is no larger than 1/2-inch. Effective attachment of assets will include minimizing the surface area of exposed wood, so it does not impede the survivability of the pole and the performance of the FR Wrap in the event of a fire.
5. What kind of drill bits will be needed to drill through the metal mesh?
 - SCE is not aware that special tooling is required to drill through the metal mesh and does not require or specify any special tooling when it drills through the metal mesh.

6. Will the Buck squeeze climbing belts grab into mesh and stop tech from falling if tech was to cut out?
- Prior to climbing a pole with the protective barrier installed on it, check to make sure the barrier is securely attached to the pole.



7. What effects will the metal mesh cause on climbing belts & gaffs?
- Gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind.
 - SCE is not aware of any affects metal mesh has on climbing belts and gaffs. Routine checks of equipment should always be performed before climbing as part of the normal safety checks.
8. Climbing the mesh wrapped poles with gaffs will cause gaff marks that will have sharp edged wires protruding from the pole.
- This is expected when gaffing a pole with mesh wrap. If encountered, press and/or hammer the protrusions back into the pole.
9. When guying the pole the down guy bracket spikes will need to pierce mesh and into the wood to prevent the bracket from spinning while applying tension to down guy
- See answer to #4. If bracket spikes are temporary, and a piece of mesh is removed or peeled back to expose the wood, when completed, tack the mesh back down once the guy bracket spoke is removed.
10. Do all tech need official training in order to climb wrapped poles?
- SCE did not provide any special training to its employees prior to their climbing poles with protective wrap. Utilities shall decide to provide special training for their employees as they see fit.
11. Does this change the safety in any way for those that need to work or climb on the pole?
- Prior to climbing a pole with the FR Wrap installed on it, check to make sure the wrap is securely attached to the pole. Gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind.

12. Is it slick and oily, so it creates a hazard of a ladder or worker slipping?
- The protective layer is not slick or oily based on SCE's experience. The material is less slick than new treated wood pole.
13. Will it change how a technician climbs the pole?
- No, gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind. SCE has not implemented any changes to its climbing techniques for poles with protective wrap.
14. Does it present a burn hazard when it gets hot from being in the sun?
- Standard PPE is required. This has not been reported as an issue.
15. Is it toxic or give off toxic fumes? Can a technician get it on their hands? Will it stain clothing? etc.
- Safety data sheet provided.
 - Fire Wrap is non-toxic and does not emit toxic fumes before or after activation. The fire Wrap is chemically inert in the dry finished state found on the pole. Approximately 95% of the composition after activation is carbon, phosphorus and oxygen. None of elements found after activation pose any health risks to exposed individuals or livestock post fire and burn. Carbon and oxygen will be prevalent in any setting post fire as they are the primary compounds stored in trees and wood.
 - Neither form of the mesh (before or after activation) will transfer any harmful chemicals onto the hands or cloths of someone working or climbing the pole. The activated intumescent complex that has created the protective blanket around the pole will start to crumble when disturbed. This residue will not stain or leave residue. It can be simply washed or brushed off after exposure.
 - Manufacture's Recommended PPE: Gloves, Safety glasses, long sleeves.
16. If a technician climbs a pole using their hooks/gaffs over several times will the mesh be damaged such that it can result in sharp edges that may result in a cut hazard?
- If sharp edges are encountered, press and/or hammer them back into the pole.
17. If a technician climbs a pole using their hook/gaffs over several times, will the mesh be damaged and will that change the flame stopping ability of the mesh and if there is then a fire will that technicians company be held liable for damaging the mesh?
- The Fire Resistant (FR) Wrap is an intumescent (swelling up when heated) grid made of 23-gauge galvanized steel coated with a durable intumescent polymer. It is designed to protect the pole by expanding at temperatures greater than 300°F and creating a barrier that protects and shields the wooden structure from radiant heat and fire. The fire wrap on average swells up ½-inch in all directions when activated. This swell has proven to encapsulate damage caused by gaffing. Accordingly, SCE has no plans to hold other utilities responsible for minor gaps in the mesh caused by routine climbing activities.

Anali Spencer

From: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 12:59 PM
To: Angela Pranata; Anali Spencer; Serrato, Joe; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; John Bacon; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com); ASmith@motive-energy.com; BLACK, KAY R; Shawn Henderson; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Pedro Garganera; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us
Cc: Kathleen Allen
Subject: RE: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes
Attachments: Q&A for Fire Mesh.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: MTG, IMPORTANT

Wayne,

I didn't see the answer to the highlighted questions (below) in the response from your team:

The issues that we raised are:

Concerns with fire mesh wrap:

- Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole
- How will we perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
- How will existing pole be wrapped; over our existing facilities or under?
- If cable attachments are needed below the 20' threshold, the metal mesh and our facilities will be in contact with each other making both susceptible of becoming energized
- What kind of drill bits will be needed to drill through the metal mesh?
- Will the Buck squeeze climbing belts grab into mesh and stop tech from falling if tech was to cut out?
- What effects will the metal mesh cause on climbing belts & gaffs?
- Climbing the mesh wrapped poles with gaffs will cause gaff marks that will have sharp edged wires protruding from the pole
- When guying the pole the down guy bracket spikes will need to pierce mesh and into the wood to prevent the bracket from spinning while applying tension to down guy
- Do all tech need official training in order to climb wrapped poles?

As separate workgroup came up with an additional set of questions, although some items are on both lists:

- Does this change the safety in any way for those that need to work or climb on the pole? Is it slick and oily, so it creates a hazard of a ladder or worker slipping?
- Will it change how a technician climbs the pole?
- Does it present a burn hazard when it gets hot from being in the sun?
- Is it toxic or give off toxic fumes? Can a technician get it on their hands? Will it stain clothing? etc.
- Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole?

- What changes are needed in regard to bonding and grounding with the use of a metal mesh on what is thought to be a non-conductive pole? Can the pole now become energized and under what conditions?
- If a technician climbs a pole using their hooks/gaffs over several times will the mesh be damaged such that it can result in sharp edges that may result in a cut hazard?
- If a technician climbs a pole using their hook/gaffs over several times, will the mesh be damaged and will that change the flame stopping ability of the mesh and if there is then a fire will that technicians company be held liable for damaging the mesh?
- From an AT&T perspective there should be an M&P how to address working on a pole with this type of mesh. – Internal AT&T to answer
- How will AT&T perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
- How will existing pole be wrapped; over AT&T existing facilities or under?

From: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:17 AM

To: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>; Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie <Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com; BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>; CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson <shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us

Cc: Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: Re: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good Morning,

I am forwarding an email from SCE (Wayne Brown) to the Compliance ad hoc. I will also upload the attached documents to the Agenda page for the next Compliance meeting.

From: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:07 AM

To: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>

Subject: Wire Mesh

Good morning Cory,

Attached you find a copy of the Q&A for wire mesh asked by AT&T, along with the Safety Data Sheet. Angela, can you please attached to the ad hoc for which this was a topic of discussion.

Thank you,

Gerald "Wayne" Brown

Agency Coordntn, Advisor

Pole Committee Governance & Projects- Joint Pole Organization

909-548-7195 | M. 951-323-2354

14005 S. Benson Ave, Chino, CA 91710

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>

Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>;
Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie
<Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>;
lex.treepaisan@ftr.com <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>;
JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz
(mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com <asmith@motive-energy.com>; Kay Black <kb6314@att.com>; Cory R. Crawford <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson
<shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com <jtodaro@motive-energy.com>; Nicholas Van Stryk
(nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>;
carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us <carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us>

Cc: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good morning,

Attached are the February 17, 2021– Compliance Committee Meeting minutes for your review. If a response is not received prior to March 9, 2021 these minutes will be uploaded to the SCJPC website. After March 9th Members can suggest changes to minutes at the next meeting.

Thank you,

Anali Spencer
Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone: (909) 599-3801 Ext. 204
Fax: (909) 599-3825
anali.spencer@scjpc.net

COI SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS

JANUARY 2021 REQUEST

Member Code	Company Name	ON FILE?	Expiration Date	NOTES
A	City of Glendale	Y	2/1/2022	
AMT	ATC-Outdoor DAS, LLC	Y	12/1/2021	AMERICAN TOWER
ATC	Verizon Wireless			
ATS	MCI Metro/ATS	Y	6/30/2021	
B	City of Burbank	Y	7/1/2021	
BVE	Bear Valley Electric, Inc	Y	2/1/2022	
COB	City of Banning	Y	7/1/2021	
D	City of Anaheim	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
E	So. Calif. Edison Co.	Y	No expiration date	SELF INSURED
EXT	ExteNet Systems, Inc.	Y	1/2/2022	
F	City of Colton			
FON	Sprint Comm, L.P.	Y	5/1/2021	
FTR	Frontier Communications	Y	6/1/2021	
H / T	AT&T California	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
ICG	Mpower Communications	Y	7/1/2021	US TELEPACIFIC HOLDINGS CORP DBA MPOWER
J	City of Riverside	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
LAC	AT&T Mobility	Y	6/1/2021	NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS LLC
LLW	City of Lompoc	Y	7/1/2021	SELF INSURED
M	City of Los Angeles	Y	4/14/2021	SELF INSURED
MA	City of Azusa	Y	7/1/2021	SELF INSURED
MCI	MCI Telecommunications	Y	6/30/2021	
MOB	Mobilitie, LLC			
MP	City of Pasadena	Y	NONE	SELF INSURED
NG	Crown Castle NG West Inc.	Y	4/1/2021	
NXT	XO Communications	Y	3/18/2021	
PBM	T-Mobile USA, Inc.			
SPR	Sprint Nextel Corporation			
TCA	Teleport Communications America, LLC	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
TWC	Time Warner Cable	Y	1/1/2022	CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS INC
V	City of Vernon	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
		25		

EMAIL YOUR COI to this inbox: coi@scjpc.net

Table updated 4/14/2021

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC), _____ maintains attachment rights, if approved, ~~and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction~~, on distribution/communication poles ~~to with an~~ established joint-ownership record, between _____ and other members of the SCJPC.

For distribution/communication poles in which ~~a~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s), which must be approved by the pole owner(s).

The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates. As per SCJPA guidelines, a JPA becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed (unless there is a denial or hold), from the date in which the JPA was submitted.

Please note that tThe SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of **Crown Castle NG West** with the SCJPC.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The pole(s) listed on the attached permit have the following Companies listed as established Joint-Owners of record at the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC).

Joint Owners include:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed Owners grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) listed on the permit. This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a ~~standing M~~member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee ("SCJPC"), _____ maintains attachment rights ~~if approved, to and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction, attach equipment, and engage in construction,~~ on distribution/communication poles ("poles") ~~with an to with an~~ established ~~ed~~ joint-ownership record, between _____ and other ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC.

For ~~distribution/communication~~ poles in which ~~a-~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization ("JPA Form 2"), to the appropriate pole owners(s) ~~which must be approved by the pole owner(s).~~

~~The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates.~~ As per SCJPC ~~CA~~ guidelines, a JPA ~~Form 2~~ becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed ~~(unless there is a denial or hold)~~, from the date in which the JPA ~~Form 2~~ was submitted.

~~Please note that t~~The SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of ~~Crown Castle NG West~~ with the SCJPC.

Commented [CE1]: Open to misinterpretation from non-SCJPC parties that an approval request is repeatedly required, and that *explicit* approval is mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [EC2]: "to" implies that the action of attachment establishes joint-ownership, rather than the issuance of a JPA.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE3]: Open to misinterpretation that *explicit* approval is always mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE4]: Understood amongst Members, not pertinent to non-SCJPC parties.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Authorization Letter Terms of Use

THIS AUTHORIZATION LETTER TERMS OF USE (the “Terms”) is made on this ____ day of ____, 2020, by and between the **Members (“Members”) of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (“SCJPC”)**.

1. **Terms of Access.** Access to the Authorization Letter (hereinafter the “Letter”), and any iterations thereof, is granted exclusively to the Members of the SCJPC, their representatives and known associates.
2. **Description of Use.** The Letter is to be used for the purpose of demonstrating a Member’s basic attachment rights, as secured through membership with the SCJPC, to parties unassociated with the SCJPC.
3. **Limitations.** The Letter does not in any way supersede established processes, nor grant additional rights to any Member, beyond what is outlined within the SCJPC Routine Handbook (the “Routine”). The Letter may not be cited in a manner as to provide an alternate interpretation of the procedures of the Routine and does not imply that all necessary actions to obtain attachment rights have been met.
4. **Confidentiality.** Members acknowledge that the Terms herein are confidential to Members of the SCJPC and its operating staff.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) is made up of a group of Utility Companies, Communications Companies, and Municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed SCJPC Members grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) they own. The SCJPC Membership includes the following Companies:

ATC Outdoor Das, LLC	Frontier Communications
AT&T California	Golden State Water Company
AT&T Mobility	Mobilitie, LLC
CA-CLEC LLC	MCI Metro/ATS
City of Anaheim	MCI Telecommunications
City of Azusa	M-Power Communications
City of Banning	NewPath Networks
City of Burbank	Southern California Edison Company
City of Colton	Sprint Communications
City of Glendale	Sprint Nextel
City of Lompoc	T Mobile USA
City of Los Angeles	Teleport Communications America, LLC
City of Pasadena	Time Warner Cable (Spectrum)
City of Riverside	Verizon California
City of Vernon	Verizon Wireless
Crown Castle NG West., INC	XO Communications
ExTeNet Systems	

This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 2:01 PM
To: Serrato, Joe; Carrion, Earle; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; April Debarge; Bacon, John R.; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; CRAWFORD, CORY R; BLACK, KAY R; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Maria Ortiz; Alicia Smith; Yvonne Johnson; Jim Todaro; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Shawn Henderson
Cc: Kathleen Allen; Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Good afternoon to Compliance committee members,

I'm forwarding the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page from Joe Serrato. See below email.

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Serrato, Joe <Joe.Serrato@crowncastle.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 9:02 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Carrion, Earle <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>
Subject: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Hi Angela – this was one of Crown's action items. Here is the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page:

Members of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) maintain attachment rights, and the authorization to engage in construction, on distribution/communication poles with an established joint-ownership record, between other Members of the SCJPC. For distribution/communication poles in which a member is not an established joint-owner, the member obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s).

Thank you,

JOE SERRATO
Supervisor, Utility Relations
T: (408) 468-5564 | M: (408) 785-0411

CROWN CASTLE FIBER
1 Park Place, 3rd Floor, Dublin, CA 94568

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 11:31 AM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: COMPLIANCE Fw: Item 1773: Crown Castle feedback/questions on Edison's Fire Mesh

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

From: Serrato, Joe <Joe.Serrato@crowncastle.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 8:55 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Cc: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>
Subject: Item 1773: Crown Castle feedback/questions on Edison's Fire Mesh

Hi Angela – I will reference this list later during compliance. No need to place it in the packet yet.

- How much of the pole will be wrapped and which part of the pole?
- Does this wrap take up/affect the amount of space available to us for our equipment?
- Are there specific instructions or guidelines on attaching to poles with this wrap installed?
- Does this wrap affect how we conduct pole loading analyses?
- Would this material affect our RF signals? Has there been any tests?
- Will replacements that take place in response to damaged poles include installation of this wrap?
- How will this mesh impact pole transfers? Additional steps that may not have existed on a pole without the mesh? Will the new pole replacement automatically come with the mesh or will this be a two-step process, delaying the attachment of the equipment(delay in restoring service to the customer)? Will we be able to simply attach all equipment over the mesh without any issues?
- What are the safety concerns, based on section 2 of the Genics WFS Net there are some potential hazards that require first aid measures(section 4)? Field techs do not climb poles but they are near the poles for an extended period of time when repairing a radio on the pole(or troubleshooting).
- Will training be required to safely work around these mesh poles?
- Will field techs be required to wear additional protective gear when working around these mesh poles? If so, what is that gear?
- Is the assumption that this mesh will be placed on new pole in the high fire risk areas only?
- Will there be any associated costs relate to section 7 (pole replacements) specific to this scope
- How do you pole load these poles as ground line circumference will be impacted for measurement
- Where will the pole brand related to pole class and pole type be placed (will it be covered by mesh)

Thank you,

JOE SERRATO
Supervisor, Utility Relations
T: (408) 468-5564 | M: (408) 785-0411

CROWN CASTLE FIBER

1 Park Place, 3rd Floor, Dublin, CA 94568
Fiber.CrownCastle.com

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

Item 1776

April
2021

Item 1776

Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements

- Outside dependency of a pole replacement
- Inconsistent/unreliable timelines
- Missed customer commitments
- *NG142830-LAD051-10m1*

Item 1776

Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements

- Members should have the right to replace poles, given that Member has the necessary capacity to do so, effectively and safely.
- Institute a reasonable timeline for the completion of a pole replacement.
- Introduce an agreeable path for the proposing Member to conduct a replacement, if the reasonable timeframe cannot be met, maintaining appropriate shared/non-shared costs.

Item 1776

Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements

Next Steps

- Revise/update Section 7.0 Replacement
- Review updates to Section 7.0 for discussion in May Committee Meeting
- Questions for consideration

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801
Fax (909) 599-3825

May 19, 2021

A meeting of the **ad hoc Compliance Committee** took place on the above date,
at 12:30 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Joe Serrato	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Wesley Jones	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Wayne Brown	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Camile Bowie	Southern California Edison
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L.P
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Ms. Cory Crawford	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Amanda Lindgren	City of Glendale
Mr. Charles Trimble	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Mr. Richard Soriano	City of Banning
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Mr. Serrato called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes – Mr. Serrato inquired if the members had any comments or concerns regarding the prior meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Item 1630: CPUC Data Requests Updates (2/14/17) – Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to CPUC activity and updates. He stated if any members had any current CPUC updates to share. He then asked Mr. Bacon if he knew if there was anyone designated to report on this subject. Mr. Brown stated it had been Mr. Williams, Mr. Plaskey, and himself but as of lately there had not been any meeting that he knew of. Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Treepaisan if he would know if there was anything as well. He stated that they have Mr. Treepaisan, Mr. Brown, Mr. Plaskey, and Mr. Williams who attend. Mr. Bacon stated that he will check with their Regs person who usually goes to the CUPC meetings, but that he believes they were cancelled due to COVID and he was unsure where they were at with this. There were no further comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1658: Environmental Issues (1/16/2019, moved from Admin Board on 1/15/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to Environmental Issues. He asked the members if they were aware any Environmental Issues updates to talk about to the committee. He asked if there were any local fires affecting any businesses. Mr. Brown stated there was a fire down this way, but there was no update yet. Mr. Bacon stated that for most of them in the utility if there was a place to burn down, Pacific Palisades would be high ranking. There were no comments or concerns from any members at this time.

Agenda Item 4 – Item 1770: 3rd Party Inspection Notification (From Administrative Board meeting – 10/21/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened to 3rd Party Inspection Notification. Mr. Serrato stated that there was an action item from the last meeting, and this was regarding the contact list, it was possibly from several meetings ago. He asked Mr. Carrion if there was an update for this. Mr. Carrion asked to table this for the next Compliance meeting because he wanted to work on a few more things to get it truly set. Mr. Serrato confirmed this was about creating and solidifying the contact list in an Excel format as opposed to how it is currently laid out on the website and would be tabled for the next meeting. Mr. Carrion confirmed this was correct. This item will be tabled for the next month's Compliance meeting.

Agenda Item 5 – Item 1773: Concerns with fire mesh wrap (From Administrative Board meeting – 11/18/2020)– Mr. Serrato opened to Concerns with fire mesh wrap. Mr. Serrato stated that there have been several opportunities for the members to pose questions. At the last meeting Crown Castle provided an additional list for SCE to take back. He asked Mr. Brown if he had a chance to visit with his company. Mr. Brown stated the mesh team has it and has not responded yet. He stated he will follow up with them to see where

they are with it, that it normally takes them a while. Mr. Serrato stated that when Mr. Brown gets the follow up, he can send it out so that the members can review it next time. Mr. Serrato asked if there was anything else on this topic that any members would like to bring up. There were no other concerns. This item will be tabled for the next month's Compliance meeting.

Agenda Item 6 – Item 1776: Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual benefit of Pole Replacements (From Crown Castle – 03/17/2021)-

Mr. Serrato opened up to Item 1776. Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Carrion or Mr. Jones if they had any updates. Mr. Carrion stated that at the last meeting they had some discussions about the timelines and the general protocols surrounding pole replacements. Crown Castle posted a few questions to the committee as food for thought. He stated he hoped the members were able to take the questions and digest on them in the hopes that they could get a healthy discussion surrounding the action item they took on which was to take a look at Section 7 for opportunities to revise and put more structure to it. He stated that presented on the screen (see attached) is what Crown Castle proposes as amendments to Section 7 replacement. He stated by and large it does remain the same. The only sentence that is struck out is in reference to Section 2.7e which no longer exists in the Routine Handbook. He stated at the end is what they added in red. He stated to continue from the last sentence in Section 7, as it stands, the member maintaining Class H Circuits on a jointly owned pole should preferably make the replacement. From there Crown Castle added more verbiage. "If the member maintaining Supply Circuits is unable to schedule and perform the replacement withing 120 days of the submitted JPA, the Member proposing the replacement may then schedule the replacement with a Qualified Electrical Worker to conduct the work, in accordance with any shared and/or non-shared costs where applicable." He stated that is where Crown Castle stands on the amendments. He allowed the members to read and ask questions they may have regarding their proposed verbiage. Mr. Brown stated that Mr. Jones had a scheduled meeting with SCE higher ups to discuss this. He stated he was not privy to any details of what happened in the meeting so he stated Edison would not comment on this at the time. Mr. Jones stated that he could provide a quick overview. Crown Castle meet with Mr. Michael Sefkis and Ms. Nicole Keke, their account representative. They talked about a specific project which was the pipeline, but they did not get into specifics over pole replacement timelines. He stated that Crown Castle was asked by Mr. Sefkis if they were given a timeline for pole replacements and Mr. Jones told him "You know, it does vary. We don't have a specific timeline that we typically work from. We just try to work with the appropriate folks at the JPA. But there's no solidified timeline." He stated that they did let Ms. Keke know of two projects that have a four-year timeline that they are yet to see a pole replacement in those four years. He stated Ms. Keke

was going to do some homework on what the situation was with those projects but that they were only a couple of examples to be able to continue the dialogue. He stated the big picture was that Crown Castle did not get any assurances from SCE that there was going to be any change in the process. He stated that this is why they would like to continue to move forward through the committee process to try and establish a solidified timeline that they can all agree upon as members. Mr. Jones informed Mr. Brown that this was his summary of what transpired between SCE and Crown Castle in the last three weeks or so. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California is interested in what is being proposed by Crown Castle. She stated they have hit roadblocks with trying to get poles replaced at a different timeline than the base owner. They have also had roadblocks with getting some sort of cooperation as into the process to try and get poles replaced on a timeline that works for their build. She stated AT&T California is in support of this. Mr. Bacon stated that SCE is mum on this because they have ongoing meetings. He gave the perspective from the power sides. He stated that they have a policy in place. The policy is if they are unable to attend to their timeline, the other member is allowed to bring in a qualified electrical worker to their pole. He stated they do have limitations on that, and it is on a case-by-case basis. This meant that if the work is suspect to blowing out multiple circuits or a customer's power, LADWP would prefer to do it on their own. He stated the 120 days, especially when they get into different voltages. He stated SCE has a 66 and a 16 as well. A lot of times SCE is not allowed to work on them hot and they have to deenergize them in order to go up and work on the circuits. The 120 days with the load that they have to keep on the lines, which means if they shut down one line the load will be put on another line. The continuity or power is no longer reliable. It goes back to having an outage and then they cannot transfer it over to another line because those lines are out. He stated that on the utility side the 120 days was not even feasible. The ECC (Energy Control Commission) will not let them have the line during the summer months making 120 days hard to deal with. He stated LADWP allows it, but SCE does not. He stated they will have to deal with SCE and their rules for who they allow and who they do not allow to set poles. This was to give the members an idea of what they are up against as far as a utility and being able to replace the old pole, the 120 days, and the hardening of the system for the high fire threat areas predominantly. Mr. Jones stated he appreciates Mr. Bacon's perspective and agreed with many of the points. He stated he came from a power utility and understands the challenges of replacing poles and keeping customers energized and what is required to do in terms of notifications and other things. He asked Mr. Bacon what he thinks is a reasonable timeline, because four years is not. He stated Crown Castle is looking for assurances because as a company who has to bring in critical infrastructure as well to the same areas the power companies serve. He stated they are being hindered in their ability to do that because of those timelines. Mr. Bacon stated

that he cannot speak for SCE because they have an agenda and priority. To break off major contract crews to go off and set a pole here and there probably does not fall into their scheme and neither does it with LADWP to have to go out and replace poles. He stated that what is needed is manpower and that they have a labor shortage of linemen. The tools are not as accessible. He stated with LADWP they give the option to set poles that they do not have to worry about making the 120-day standard but with SCE it is going to have to be between the members in SCE as to what they want to do. He stated a reasonable amount of time depends on the utility's priority. He stated four years, it seems extreme and how can a company that wants to provide their services their backbone built with such an unachievable date for implementation. Mr. Jones stated it is not just based on their priorities because there are rules in the handbook that govern if the pole is failing it has to get changed out in a certain amount of time. He stated it is not just the priority of the utility alone and asked if this was accurate. Mr. Bacon stated that it is not just the priority of the utility alone, but for circuit continuity and as long as they are electrically qualified, it is up to SCE and their rules and regulations. Mr. Jones stated fair enough and he wanted to clarify that point. Mr. Bacon stated that he would be shooting in the dark if he were to give 18 months to get a pole replacement because he cannot pinpoint on that. Mr. Jones stated he understood. Mr. Serrato stated to add clarity to what is being proposed, Crown Castle is not proposing to do the replacement, it states "scheduling, scheduling a qualified electrical worker to conduct the work." That it would probably be a vendor of the choosing or from a list of approved ones by the electrical company. He stated that is what he sees is being proposed. Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP supplies a list of qualified electrical companies that they accept. Mr. Brown stated he would like to make it clear that no one speaks on SCE's behalf and for this particular subject, SCE will not have any conversation at this time. He is going to take it up to management and legal if necessary. This was all SCE had to say on the subject. Mr. Bacon stated this was understood. Mr. Treepaisan stated that Frontier's stance on this is they generally agree on what is being said and done. He stated he thinks the time frames are a little aspirational and if he were forced or pressed into providing some data, he would probably lean towards Rule 18 and GO95 to start looking at some sort of dates. The only other issue he would have with this would be just some sort of oversight, for example like with an inspector review. He stated in general he thinks this is great other than the time frames and some sort of verbiage about oversight. Mr. Serrato asked if any other members would like to weigh in. Mr. Van Stryk asked if they could change worker to workers because not only one person was going to do it. Mr. Serrato agreed with that. Mr. Bacon stated that if Crown Castle finds some qualified electrical workers that are actually available, to give LADWP their contact because they need them to since they are not easy to come by. Mr. Serrato stated that he is hearing a general

support of the direction Crown Castle is going in. LADWP mentioned challenges but that the general support was a need for some sort of timeline. He stated SCE is remaining silent as their right to do so. He stated that this is a topic that was brought up before the whole committee and that they do not have all the members here today because attendance is not required at the ad-hoc's currently. Crown Castle would like to continue the discussion with all of the members. He asked if anyone else would like to weigh in on this and if there were any motions to move this to discussion for the rest of the members to participate in. Ms. Black with AT&T California stated that listening to what Mr. Brown stated, she understands that there are rules that the company who is the base owner want to proceed with. She stated if they took on a different approach and asked the electric companies or base owners of these companies, if they will not allow another member to replace their poles, then they create some sort of internal system or process that is mutually beneficial for the pole replacement that is mutually beneficial. She stated that if this is taken from the electric company's perspective, they are replacing poles on their timelines for various reasons; fire, what not. The priority or whatever reasons are the other members participate in the cost of the pole replacement. She stated until now the other members have never had an opportunity to help prioritize the work. This is what they are asking for, something reasonable and that will allow them to proceed in a manageable process to keep their timelines on their builds. She asked if there was an opposition to creating a process internally at the electric companies. Mr. Brown stated that sounds great and is something he could take to the team. That this had some kind of feasibility to it and that he could maybe talk to Ms. Black offline to get more from her to take back to the team. Ms. Black stated that what she meant by a process was if they could say "Here's an overloaded pole. Can it be replaced by X amount of days?" Not putting 120 days on it because that does not seem to work for the electric companies but for them to say what does work in order to build it in. She stated that this is what she means by a process, that they can go to the electric companies and tell them the poles and dates they would like, then actually have it happen. She stated she thinks they have tried it before where they have gone to different work groups that have been created but it has not really happened. Mr. Brown stated he will take that back to the team and get their thoughts on it. Mr. Jones stated he wanted to bring something up on Ms. Black's point, and possibly Frontier mentioning something like this before as well. He stated that GO95 Rule 18 does have timelines for this type of situation. He stated theoretically SCE, as it is regulated, should already have a process for that. He stated the problem is they are not seeing that play out and they have two projects with a four-year cycle. He stated he is not against a process either and he does not think Crown Castle is. They need more assurances than saying they should develop a process that should already be baked in under Rule 18. He stated the attempt in changing/modifying the

language is to provide assurances for all members that there is going to be a commitment made. Not just that they are going to make a process because there is already a process. He stated he was unsure what the process to move this forward for a larger discussion was because he believes it is necessary due to having enough ramifications to the members to move it forward. He asked the members what the process to move this forward at another level through the committee was. Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Jones and Mr. Carrion if they thought the topic should be weighed in by all members to vote on whether it should go through or not. He stated if so, it would need to be motioned to be put on the discussion calendar for the next month's Administrative Board meeting. He stated that that is the only way they can get all the members to weigh in. He stated Crown Castle knows that SCE is remaining silent on the issue but there will be a point in time where they will have to vote on this situation and that would make it official whether the verbiage passes or not. He stated if the answer is yes, then a motion has to be made to move to discussion to be talked about where attendance is mandatory. Mr. Jones stated that he thinks they should, and he could he made a motion to move forward. He stated this does not preclude that they still have conversations, per Ms. Black and Mr. Brown's thought. He stated this enables them to keep the item moving forward and exposing it to more members. He stated he made a motion to move forward. Mr. Serrato stated that he could technically make the motion and that they need a second for it to be moved to discussion. Mr. Brown asked if Mr. Jones could actually make a motion. He stated Mr. Serrato and Mr. Carrion could but if Mr. Jones could actually make a motion. Mr. Serrato stated Mr. Jones could and did not see why he could not, but asked Mr. Carrion if he would like to make a motion. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California would like to make a motion to move this to discussion and then someone would need to second it. Mr. Serrato asked if Mr. Carrion would second that. Mr. Carrion stated he would second that. Mr. Serrato stated the motion was made and he would bring it up at discussion at the next month's Administrative Board meeting. Mr. Carrion stated that at the end of the day this is an important issue. He stated it is not just important to Crown Castle and SCE, but to all members. It is not just between two parties. He further stated that unfortunately because the ad-hoc meetings, the attendance is significantly less than what they get at the Administrative Board meetings. In order to get a collective opinion and healthy discussion on the issue, moving it to discussion at the Administrative Board is important as well. Mr. Serrato stated he would like to remind the members that this is actually the normal process that was built into the 1998 agreement so that all the processes could be challenged regularly. If the current process is truly the best process, then it will remain. But that at least they will have participation from everyone as the 1998 agreement intended. Mr. Bacon stated he agreed and asked if the motion was accepted. Mr. Serrato stated the motion was made and it will be discussed at the

Administrative Board next month. He stated following that it will be discussed once or twice then someone has to make a motion to move it to consent. He stated by that time there may be more consensus reached.

Agenda Item 7 – Miscellaneous –

- Mr. Serrato opened to the Certificate of Insurance Request. He stated he believed some were still pending. Ms. Pranata stated she is only waiting for Sprint Nextel Corporation. She stated she sent the fourth notice and is still waiting for them. It is just one more company and then they are done. Mr. Serrato thanked Ms. Pranata for the update.
- Mr. Serrato opened to the draft letter that evolved into a statement on the SCJPC landing page. He stated it will only be thrown up if everyone agrees to SCE's proposal of adding "if approval" is obtained. He stated he thinks that it is fair to have it on the landing page and if any other utilities like LADWP want to have an individual letter to be approved between each other, Crown Castle can generate one. He stated that will be the letter to be used in LADWP markets. He asked if this was correct and for SCE the verbiage will only go up if "if approved, preexisting approval" or "if approval" obtained are added. Mr. Brown stated this was correct and if they have the letter up to review. Mr. Serrato stated they would need to have "if approved" inserted somewhere. Ms. Pranata stated she would need to copy and paste it to Microsoft Word to be able to edit it. Mr. Brown stated that with the new verbiage he would just drop it off at SCE's attorney and get her approval on it. Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Brown where he would like "if approved" inserted in the statement. Mr. Brown stated he would like "upon approval" added after the words "and the authorization to engage in construction." Mr. Carrion asked if they need approval if they are a joint owner to work on the pole. Mr. Brown stated no, not to work on it but to attach to it. Mr. Carrion stated that if they are an existing joint owner on the pole and have an existing fiber on there and they need to conduct work on the pole they do not need approval. Mr. Brown asked why the city or county after them if they are already a joint owner. Mr. Carrion stated they do not understand the committee's process. That they are under the impression that SCE owns 100% of all the poles which is what Crown Castle is dealing with. Mr. Bacon stated that he thought it was for the undergrounding where when they are putting in their conduit to go to the poles and before they allow them to, they want to make sure that they have permission to get the base of the pole to run the conduit. Mr. Carrion stated this was not exactly the issue. He stated if they need to conduct any type of work on a pole. He stated they may have an antenna site on there and they want to add an antenna or replace it. They may already own the

four of five feet necessary on the pole and the city/county are then asking for a JPA approval to work on the pole. They are already a member and that is not necessarily a requirement. Mr. Brown asked if they are going to add an antenna to the space they own. Mr. Carrion stated this was correct that they already have an antenna on the pole and own the four or five feet necessary for the antenna. They plan to add another or replace the antenna like for like. He stated that is where the issue is and that does not require approval. He stated where Mr. Serrato was initially adding it is where he thinks it belongs because that is a scenario where a member owns less than the necessary feet required or is not already an existing joint owner with the necessary space. Mr. Brown stated okay. Mr. Carrion stated if they are going to add "upon approval" then he would like to add verbiage along the line of, "upon approval withing a 45-day time limit." Mr. Brown stated that after the 45th day if there do not have response they are automatically approved. Mr. Carrion stated that is something that needs to be explicitly explained in some form to the people who do not understand the committee's process. Mr. Brown stated that Mr. Carrion was correct that upon approval did not belong where he originally stated and that it should go where it stated for distribution/communication poles. Mr. Carrion stated that was right. He wanted to give more perspective on this because in the past week he was being pinged about an issue Crown Castle is having in PV about a pole where they do have ownership rights on for the correct amount of space and they provided the joint record directly from the website and they are still being asked for a JPA. He stated that is why this is pretty important as to the way it is formatted and worded. Mr. Brown stated that they do not need a JPA to work in their own space. Mr. Carrion stated this was correct and this is the issue they are dealing with where this could help resolve. Mr. Bacon stated that GO95 rules still apply and pole record for space still applies. He stated this is just a permission letter to show that they have the right to work on their own facilities on their pole. He stated that power companies worry is if this is going to give them some right to attach to the pole, change sizes, and change the original agreement on the JPA. He stated he says no and that everything there is a record of what they built, and they have all their construction specs. All the members know GO95, and this does not give them any more or less rights. It just gives them the right to access their facilities and be out there on the street. Mr. Carrion stated that is the way Crown Castle sees it as well. He stated this is not intended to circumvent any rules. They are still bound to play by the same rules whether it be GO95 or what is in the Routine. This is just to explain it to parties who are not part of the organization and do not understand the committee process. Mr. Bacon agreed. Mr. Serrato stated the other

option is they always send the city/county to the base owner which would then have to go and confirm each time. Mr. Bacon stated that he will grab the Form 9 if they have one or that he has written plenty of "Hey they are a member let them on," letters for communication companies. Mr. Brown stated that SCE's position is if they are already a member on the pole then they are not against any of that. It is when they are not a joint owner on a pole and want to establish ownership, then they need approval. Mr. Carrion stated the Crown Castle agrees with Mr. Brown. He stated to add on to this, it also includes if they need additional space to what is owned. If they have one foot and want to put an antenna but need to get the extra four or five feet necessary does require a JPA which requires approval. He stated this is for the parties that do not understand this process and they are looking for a way to explain it to get things rolling. Mr. Carrion stated upon approval should move back down after second mention of construction. To add "upon approval withing the 45-day time limit." Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Brown if he had to take this back. Mr. Brown stated he was pretty sure the attorney would not have an issue with this but that he wanted to make sure. Mr. Serrato stated that they are not proposing any changes to the routine or any other rules. They are just adding text to the landing page. He stated it is not necessarily going to need a vote so once Mr. Brown gives it back and unless anyone else expresses any other resistance towards this, he believes Ms. Pranata can add this to the landing page. Ms. Pranata asked where the members wanted it placed since there are two paragraphs already. Mr. Serrato stated towards the bottom, so it is hovering above the list of members. Ms. Pranata asked if this would be a third paragraph. Mr. Serrato agreed. Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Carrion if it should be in italics. Mr. Carrion stated he was unsure, but that he would think about it while they wait for Mr. Brown to get it back. He stated they should come up with a good title that will draw the eyes of those that need to see this. Mr. Serrato stated that they are going to wait for Mr. Brown to confirm it is ok and once confirmed they can advise on the title and style of font before posting. Mr. Brown asked Ms. Pranata to send him the verbiage so he could forward it to the attorney. Ms. Pranata stated she will send it to him.

- Ms. Serrato opened the discussion to Non-Wood poles and steps. He stated he vaguely remembered this being concluded unless there was another action item to revisit. He asked Ms. Black. Mr. Brown asked if he initiated some communication with Ms. Black on this. Ms. Black stated AT&T California was good on this, unless another member wanted to leave it open. Ms. Pranata stated that they could be removed from the agenda.
- Mr. Serrato opened to getting notified of replacements that they have antennas on, brought up by Ms. Ortiz. He asked if there was an update or

if it should be left on the action item list. Ms. Ortiz asked to leave it open because they did not have a chance to meet.

- Mr. Serrato opened to asking the members for advice on how to convince homeowners to grant them access to poles in their backyards where they are owners of. He stated that Crown Castle reported the members advise back to the job owner, and they did not have any additional questions after that. This seemed to be resolved and the bullet could be removed.

Agenda Item 7 – Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts -

- SCE to provide answers to the additional set of questions regarding their fire mesh material.
- Mr. Brown is to double check with newly revised verbiage for SCJPC landing page regarding the members right to work on poles.
- Ms. Ortiz to get with SCE regarding notifications of pole with antennas on them.

The meeting adjourned at 1:13 p.m. until June 16, 2021.

Anali Spencer - Committee Staff

Contact Information Consolidation

Proposed Actions

- Rename *Member Contact Information* [link] to *JPA*
- Move link to *Contact* category (currently under *Members*)
 - See new spreadsheet with only JPA-related contact information
- Rename *Emergency* [link] to *Emergency and Claims*
 - Add to include *Claims Department* contact
- Fix *Dual Poles* broken link (error 404)
- Create additional link: *Inspections* (for inspections contacts)
 - Move *Pole Inspections Contacts* [spreadsheet link], from *Pole Inspections Resources* to new *Inspections* link
 - Add *Intrusive Inspections Results Request* tab to contacts spreadsheet
 - See new proposed spreadsheet
- Create additional link: *Field Assistance/Joint Meet*
 - Request contact information from Members
 - Create similar
- Reorganize to new proposed hierarchy (see below)
 - Contacts
 - Staff
 - JPA (Internal)
 - Inspections (Internal)
 - Field Assistance/Joint Meet (Internal?)
 - Emergency and Claims
 - Dual Poles
 - Graffiti Removal
 - Update website header (*Contact* dropdown) to mirror above

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 11:31 AM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: COMPLIANCE Fw: Item 1773: Crown Castle feedback/questions on Edison's Fire Mesh

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

From: Serrato, Joe <Joe.Serrato@crowncastle.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 8:55 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Cc: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>
Subject: Item 1773: Crown Castle feedback/questions on Edison's Fire Mesh

Hi Angela – I will reference this list later during compliance. No need to place it in the packet yet.

- How much of the pole will be wrapped and which part of the pole?
- Does this wrap take up/affect the amount of space available to us for our equipment?
- Are there specific instructions or guidelines on attaching to poles with this wrap installed?
- Does this wrap affect how we conduct pole loading analyses?
- Would this material affect our RF signals? Has there been any tests?
- Will replacements that take place in response to damaged poles include installation of this wrap?
- How will this mesh impact pole transfers? Additional steps that may not have existed on a pole without the mesh? Will the new pole replacement automatically come with the mesh or will this be a two-step process, delaying the attachment of the equipment(delay in restoring service to the customer)? Will we be able to simply attach all equipment over the mesh without any issues?
- What are the safety concerns, based on section 2 of the Genics WFS Net there are some potential hazards that require first aid measures(section 4)? Field techs do not climb poles but they are near the poles for an extended period of time when repairing a radio on the pole(or troubleshooting).
- Will training be required to safely work around these mesh poles?
- Will field techs be required to wear additional protective gear when working around these mesh poles? If so, what is that gear?
- Is the assumption that this mesh will be placed on new pole in the high fire risk areas only?
- Will there be any associated costs relate to section 7 (pole replacements) specific to this scope
- How do you pole load these poles as ground line circumference will be impacted for measurement
- Where will the pole brand related to pole class and pole type be placed (will it be covered by mesh)

Thank you,

JOE SERRATO
Supervisor, Utility Relations
T: (408) 468-5564 | M: (408) 785-0411

CROWN CASTLE FIBER

1 Park Place, 3rd Floor, Dublin, CA 94568
Fiber.CrownCastle.com

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:17 AM
To: Anali Spencer; Serrato, Joe; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; John Bacon; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com); ASmith@motive-energy.com; Kay Black; Cory R. Crawford; Shawn Henderson; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Pedro Garganera; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us
Cc: Kathleen Allen
Subject: Re: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes
Attachments: Genics WFS Net - SDS.pdf; Q&A for Fire Mesh.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Good Morning,

I am forwarding an email from SCE (Wayne Brown) to the Compliance ad hoc. I will also upload the attached documents to the Agenda page for the next Compliance meeting.

From: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:07 AM
To: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Subject: Wire Mesh

Good morning Cory,

Attached you find a copy of the Q&A for wire mesh asked by AT&T, along with the Safety Data Sheet. Angela, can you please attached to the ad hoc for which this was a topic of discussion.

Thank you,

Gerald "Wayne" Brown
Agency Coordntn, Advisor
Pole Committee Governance & Projects- Joint Pole Organization
909-548-7195 | M. 951-323-2354
14005 S. Benson Ave, Chino, CA 91710

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee

Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>

Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>; Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie <Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>; JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com <asmith@motive-energy.com>; Kay Black <kb6314@att.com>; Cory R. Crawford <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson <shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com <jtodaro@motive-energy.com>; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us <carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us>

Cc: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good morning,

Attached are the February 17, 2021– Compliance Committee Meeting minutes for your review. If a response is not received prior to March 9, 2021 these minutes will be uploaded to the SCJPC website. After March 9th Members can suggest changes to minutes at the next meeting.

Thank you,

Anali Spencer

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone: (909) 599-3801 Ext. 204

Fax: (909) 599-3825

anali.spencer@scjpc.net



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Genics-WFS Net

SECTION 1: Identification

Product

Name Genics WFS Net
Product Code: WFS-03
Product use Fire Retardant
Manufacturer's Name: **GENICS INC.**
561 Acheson Rd. 53016 Hwy 60
Acheson Industrial Park.
Acheson, Alberta Canada
T7X 5A7
Genics Business Phone: (780) 962-1000
Emergency Phone: **CANUTEC : (613) 996-6666**

SDS Preparation Date: June 27, 2016

SECTION 2: Hazard Identification (toxicological properties)

Hazard Classification: Skin irritation Cat.3, Eye irritation Cat.2B

Warning Information: None

Pictogram: None.

Signal Words: Warning

Hazard Statement: May be harmful if swallowed
May be harmful if inhaled.
Causes mild skin irritation
Cause eye irritation

Precautionary statement:

1. If contact with eyes, wash immediately with plenty of water after contact medical care.
2. Wear suitable protective clothing and gloves.

Other Hazards:

Long-term exposure to skin rashes, eye gets the slight tingling, accidentally ingested, the stomach irritation and vomiting

SECTION 3: Composition / Information on Ingredients

<u>Ingredient(s)</u>	<u>CAS #</u>	<u>Percent (by weight)</u>
Acrylic Copolymer		35 - 56
Ammonium Polyphosphate	68333-79-9	3 - 21
Expandable graphite	12777-87-6	3 - 21
Silica	14808-60-7	<1
Wire Mesh/ Fiber	--	30 - 49



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

SECTION 4: First Aid Measures

Eye contact	Rinse with plenty of water for 10 to 15 minutes, occasionally opened to the upper and lower eyelids thoroughly washed, if the patient has pain, derogatory eyes, watery eyes, swelling and other phenomena to be taken to seek medical attention
Skin contact	Removal of clothing with plenty of water and soap thoroughly, then rinse with warm water 15 minutes, if the patient has an adverse effect or irritation occurs then they should be taken to seek medical attention
Inhalation	Move to fresh air if starting to feel dizzy. If symptoms persist then patient needs to be taken to seek medical attention
Ingestion	If a large volume is consumed, patient should consume 1 to 2 cups of water. If patients begins to lose consciousness or is unconscious, taken to seek medical attention
Notes to physician	Avoid gastric lavage or cause vomiting.
General advice	If you feel unwell, seek medical advice (show the label where possible). Ensure that medical personnel are aware of the material(s) involved, and take precautions to protect themselves. Show this safety data sheet to the doctor in attendance. Avoid contact with eyes and skin. Keep out of reach of children.

SECTION 5: Fire-Fighting Measures

Fire:	Fire Resistant
Explosion:	Not considered to be an explosion Hazard
Fire Extinguishing Media:	Not Required
Special fire fighting procedures:	1. Firefighter required to wear appropriate protective equipment and positive pressure self-contained breathing gas supply, extinguish fire at the up windward.

Special protective equipment for firefighters: Firefighters must wear breathing apparatus, fire protective clothing and gloves.

SECTION 6: Accidental Release Measures

Personal Precautions	1. Limit personnel to enter until area is completely clear and clean up spills. 2. Wear appropriate personal protective equipment
Environmental Precautions:	1. Leak area for ventilation. 2. Avoid contaminants from entering sewers.
Methods for cleaning up	For large spillages liquids should be contained with sand or earth and both liquids and solids transferred to salvage containers. Any residues should be treated as for small spillages.

SECTION 7: Handling and Storage Procedures

Handling:	1. Container must be labeled, closed containers when not in use. 2. Shall keep readily available to deal with the fire and emergency response device leakage.
Storage:	Placed at cool and dry area, away from heat, sparks and icy place.

SECTION 8: Exposure Controls – Personal Protection

Engineering Control:

N/A



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Control Factor:	N/A
Personal Respirators:	N/A
Skin Protection:	Protective gloves
Eye Protection:	Wear safety glasses or goggles

SECTION 9: Physical and Chemical Properties

Appearance	Dark grey-black
Odor	Not Applicable
Data relevant to safety:	Flash Point: Not Applicable Ignition temperature: Not Applicable Self-ignition temperature: Not Applicable Lower explosion Limit: Not Applicable Upper explosion limit: Not Applicable
Solubility:	Water miscible
Density:	Not Applicable
PH:	6.0 + 1.0
Viscosity:	Not Applicable
Solid Content:	100%

SECTION 10: Stability and Reactivity

Stability:	Stable under ordinary conditions of use and storage.
Incompatibilities:	Organic solvent
Materials to Avoid	Strong acid or alkali and oxidant
Hazardous decomposition products	Will emit smoke, CO, CO ₂ when fire

SECTION 11: Toxicological Information

Acute oral toxicity (LD ₅₀):	N/A
Subchronic effects:	N/A
Chronic Toxicity or Long Term Toxicity:	N/A

SECTION 12: Ecological Information

Ecological Effect:	Fish toxicity (LC ₅₀); None
Environmental effects	Do not use this product into the sewer water or contaminated soil

SECTION 13: Disposal Considerations

Dispose waste by sanitary landfill or incineration in accordance with appropriate regulations.

SECTION 14: Transportation Information

International Regulations:	Not a hazardous or restricted item for transport by road, rail, sea or air.
----------------------------	---



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Transportation Summary: These products are not regulated as hazardous materials
UN Classification Number:
IMDG code & Package Group: None
Marine Pollutant: Not applicable
Specific Precautionary transport Measures and Conditions: Not applicable

SECTION 15: Regulatory Information

Health Hazardous goods: NO
Environmental Hazardous goods: NO
Fire Hazardous goods: NO

SECTION 16: Other Information

Date of Issue: June 27, 2016 (Revision 001)
Supersedes: None

Prepared by: Genics Inc.
Phone: (780) 962-1000 or
Toll-free 1-877-943-6427
Fax: (780) 962-1052

Information contained in this SDS refers only to the specific material designated and does not relate to any process or use with any other materials. This information is furnished free of charge and is based on data believed to be reliable as of the date hereof. It is intended for use by persons possessing technical knowledge at their own discretion and risk. Since actual use is beyond our control, no guarantee, expressed or implied, and no liability is assumed by Genics Inc. in conjunction with the use of this information. Nothing herein is to be construed as a recommendation to infringe any patents.

Q&A with fire mesh:

1. Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole? What changes are needed in regard to bonding and grounding with the use of a metal mesh on what is thought to be a non-conductive pole? Can the pole now become energized and under what conditions?
 - The fire mesh is wrapped at least 8 feet from the primary, leaving an insulative section of wood between them. For the wrap to be hazardous, it would need to have a conductive path across this insulative section. Grounding practices are not different with the fire mesh wrapped on the wood pole. Cables operated at 750 V and less shall be protected in conduit when extending past the FR Wrap or within 8 feet of the top portion.
2. How will we perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
 - Hammer sound testing can be conducted in the same way as when the pole does not have the wrap on it. The wrap does not interfere with the sound of the pole when striking it.
 - To access the pole below the protective layer, use a utility knife or tin snips to shear 2.5" vertically and horizontally from the point of where the boring location will be. This creates an "L" cut into the Fire Mesh. Push the cut Fire Mesh back. This triangular flap should move very easily exposing the wood pole. When you are done with the boring, use a nail to fasten the flap back onto the wood pole to ensure long-term hold.



3. How will existing pole be wrapped; over our existing facilities or under?
 - Currently, SCE does not have a program to wrap in-service poles.
4. If cable attachments are needed below the 20' threshold, the metal mesh and our facilities will be in contact with each other making both susceptible of becoming energized.
 - If installed over fire mesh, cables operated at 750V and less shall be protected in conduit when extending past the FR Wrap or within 8 feet of the top portion.
 - If not attached over fire mesh, care must be taken to ensure the gap between the FR Wrap and the hardware attachments is no larger than 1/2-inch. Effective attachment of assets will include minimizing the surface area of exposed wood, so it does not impede the survivability of the pole and the performance of the FR Wrap in the event of a fire.
5. What kind of drill bits will be needed to drill through the metal mesh?
 - SCE is not aware that special tooling is required to drill through the metal mesh and does not require or specify any special tooling when it drills through the metal mesh.

6. Will the Buck squeeze climbing belts grab into mesh and stop tech from falling if tech was to cut out?

- Prior to climbing a pole with the protective barrier installed on it, check to make sure the barrier is securely attached to the pole.



7. What effects will the metal mesh cause on climbing belts & gaffs?

- Gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind.
- SCE is not aware of any affects metal mesh has on climbing belts and gaffs. Routine checks of equipment should always be performed before climbing as part of the normal safety checks.

8. Climbing the mesh wrapped poles with gaffs will cause gaff marks that will have sharp edged wires protruding from the pole.

- This is expected when gaffing a pole with mesh wrap. If encountered, press and/or hammer the protrusions back into the pole.

9. When guying the pole the down guy bracket spikes will need to pierce mesh and into the wood to prevent the bracket from spinning while applying tension to down guy

- See answer to #4. If bracket spikes are temporary, and a piece of mesh is removed or peeled back to expose the wood, when completed, tack the mesh back down once the guy bracket spoke is removed.

10. Do all tech need official training in order to climb wrapped poles?

- SCE did not provide any special training to its employees prior to their climbing poles with protective wrap. Utilities shall decide to provide special training for their employees as they see fit.

11. Does this change the safety in any way for those that need to work or climb on the pole?

- Prior to climbing a pole with the FR Wrap installed on it, check to make sure the wrap is securely attached to the pole. Gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind.

12. Is it slick and oily, so it creates a hazard of a ladder or worker slipping?
- The protective layer is not slick or oily based on SCE's experience. The material is less slick than new treated wood pole.
13. Will it change how a technician climbs the pole?
- No, gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind. SCE has not implemented any changes to its climbing techniques for poles with protective wrap.
14. Does it present a burn hazard when it gets hot from being in the sun?
- Standard PPE is required. This has not been reported as an issue.
15. Is it toxic or give off toxic fumes? Can a technician get it on their hands? Will it stain clothing? etc.
- Safety data sheet provided.
 - Fire Wrap is non-toxic and does not emit toxic fumes before or after activation. The fire Wrap is chemically inert in the dry finished state found on the pole. Approximately 95% of the composition after activation is carbon, phosphorus and oxygen. None of elements found after activation pose any health risks to exposed individuals or livestock post fire and burn. Carbon and oxygen will be prevalent in any setting post fire as they are the primary compounds stored in trees and wood.
 - Neither form of the mesh (before or after activation) will transfer any harmful chemicals onto the hands or cloths of someone working or climbing the pole. The activated intumescent complex that has created the protective blanket around the pole will start to crumble when disturbed. This residue will not stain or leave residue. It can be simply washed or brushed off after exposure.
 - Manufacture's Recommended PPE: Gloves, Safety glasses, long sleeves.
16. If a technician climbs a pole using their hooks/gaffs over several times will the mesh be damaged such that it can result in sharp edges that may result in a cut hazard?
- If sharp edges are encountered, press and/or hammer them back into the pole.
17. If a technician climbs a pole using their hook/gaffs over several times, will the mesh be damaged and will that change the flame stopping ability of the mesh and if there is then a fire will that technicians company be held liable for damaging the mesh?
- The Fire Resistant (FR) Wrap is an intumescent (swelling up when heated) grid made of 23-gauge galvanized steel coated with a durable intumescent polymer. It is designed to protect the pole by expanding at temperatures greater than 300°F and creating a barrier that protects and shields the wooden structure from radiant heat and fire. The fire wrap on average swells up ½-inch in all directions when activated. This swell has proven to encapsulate damage caused by gaffing. Accordingly, SCE has no plans to hold other utilities responsible for minor gaps in the mesh caused by routine climbing activities.

Anali Spencer

From: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 12:59 PM
To: Angela Pranata; Anali Spencer; Serrato, Joe; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; John Bacon; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com); ASmith@motive-energy.com; BLACK, KAY R; Shawn Henderson; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Pedro Garganera; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us
Cc: Kathleen Allen
Subject: RE: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes
Attachments: Q&A for Fire Mesh.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: MTG, IMPORTANT

Wayne,

I didn't see the answer to the highlighted questions (below) in the response from your team:

The issues that we raised are:

Concerns with fire mesh wrap:

- Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole
- How will we perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
- How will existing pole be wrapped; over our existing facilities or under?
- If cable attachments are needed below the 20' threshold, the metal mesh and our facilities will be in contact with each other making both susceptible of becoming energized
- What kind of drill bits will be needed to drill through the metal mesh?
- Will the Buck squeeze climbing belts grab into mesh and stop tech from falling if tech was to cut out?
- What effects will the metal mesh cause on climbing belts & gaffs?
- Climbing the mesh wrapped poles with gaffs will cause gaff marks that will have sharp edged wires protruding from the pole
- When guying the pole the down guy bracket spikes will need to pierce mesh and into the wood to prevent the bracket from spinning while applying tension to down guy
- Do all tech need official training in order to climb wrapped poles?

As separate workgroup came up with an additional set of questions, although some items are on both lists:

- Does this change the safety in any way for those that need to work or climb on the pole? Is it slick and oily, so it creates a hazard of a ladder or worker slipping?
- Will it change how a technician climbs the pole?
- Does it present a burn hazard when it gets hot from being in the sun?
- Is it toxic or give off toxic fumes? Can a technician get it on their hands? Will it stain clothing? etc.
- Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole?

- What changes are needed in regard to bonding and grounding with the use of a metal mesh on what is thought to be a non-conductive pole? Can the pole now become energized and under what conditions?
- If a technician climbs a pole using their hooks/gaffs over several times will the mesh be damaged such that it can result in sharp edges that may result in a cut hazard?
- If a technician climbs a pole using their hook/gaffs over several times, will the mesh be damaged and will that change the flame stopping ability of the mesh and if there is then a fire will that technicians company be held liable for damaging the mesh?
- From an AT&T perspective there should be an M&P how to address working on a pole with this type of mesh. – Internal AT&T to answer
- How will AT&T perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
- How will existing pole be wrapped; over AT&T existing facilities or under?

From: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:17 AM

To: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>; Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie <Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com; BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>; CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson <shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us

Cc: Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: Re: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good Morning,

I am forwarding an email from SCE (Wayne Brown) to the Compliance ad hoc. I will also upload the attached documents to the Agenda page for the next Compliance meeting.

From: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:07 AM

To: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>

Subject: Wire Mesh

Good morning Cory,

Attached you find a copy of the Q&A for wire mesh asked by AT&T, along with the Safety Data Sheet. Angela, can you please attached to the ad hoc for which this was a topic of discussion.

Thank you,

Gerald "Wayne" Brown

Agency Coordntn, Advisor

Pole Committee Governance & Projects- Joint Pole Organization

909-548-7195 | M. 951-323-2354

14005 S. Benson Ave, Chino, CA 91710

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>

Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>;
Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie
<Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>;
lex.treepaisan@ftr.com <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>;
JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz
(mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com <asmith@motive-energy.com>; Kay Black <kb6314@att.com>; Cory R. Crawford <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson
<shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com <jtodaro@motive-energy.com>; Nicholas Van Stryk
(nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>;
carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us <carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us>

Cc: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good morning,

Attached are the February 17, 2021– Compliance Committee Meeting minutes for your review. If a response is not received prior to March 9, 2021 these minutes will be uploaded to the SCJPC website. After March 9th Members can suggest changes to minutes at the next meeting.

Thank you,

Anali Spencer
Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone: (909) 599-3801 Ext. 204
Fax: (909) 599-3825
anali.spencer@scjpc.net

7.0 Replacement

Replacement may be made at the request of any Member, and adjustment as to sales, salvage, pulling, transportation, and transfer costs shall be at current prices as per date of replacement. Salvage shall be prorated in accordance with recorded ownership. Pulling and transportation charges shall be prorated in accordance with Section 2.1C. Any Member, by agreement, may be designated as the replacing Member under the Routine regardless of original ownership. ~~Any pole shown as replaced on a JPA which refers to Section 18.1 Automatic Approval must show space and grade allocated in accordance with Section 2.7E.~~ The Member maintaining Class H Circuits on a jointly owned pole should preferably make the replacement. **If the Member maintaining Supply Circuits is unable to schedule and perform the replacement within 120 days of the submitted JPA, the Member proposing the replacement may schedule the replacement with a Qualified Electrical Worker to conduct the work, in accordance with any shared and/or non-shared costs where applicable.**

COI SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS

JANUARY 2021 REQUEST

Member Code	Company Name	ON FILE?	Expiration Date	NOTES
A	City of Glendale	Y	2/1/2022	
AMT	ATC-Outdoor DAS, LLC	Y	12/1/2021	AMERICAN TOWER
ATC	Verizon Wireless	Y	6/30/2021	
ATS	MCI Metro/ATS	Y	6/30/2021	
B	City of Burbank	Y	7/1/2021	
BVE	Bear Valley Electric, Inc	Y	2/1/2022	
COB	City of Banning	Y	7/1/2021	
D	City of Anaheim	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
E	So. Calif. Edison Co.	Y	No expiration date	SELF INSURED
EXT	ExteNet Systems, Inc.	Y	1/2/2022	
F	City of Colton	Y	7/1/2021	
FON	Sprint Comm, L.P.	Y	5/1/2021	
FTR	Frontier Communications	Y	6/1/2021	
H / T	AT&T California	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
ICG	Mpower Communications	Y	7/1/2021	US TELEPACIFIC HOLDINGS CORP DBA MPOWER
J	City of Riverside	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
LAC	AT&T Mobility	Y	6/1/2021	NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS LLC
LLW	City of Lompoc	Y	7/1/2021	SELF INSURED
M	City of Los Angeles	Y	4/14/2021	SELF INSURED
MA	City of Azusa	Y	7/1/2021	SELF INSURED
MCI	MCI Telecommunications	Y	6/30/2021	
MOB	Mobilitie, LLC	Y	11/11/2021	
MP	City of Pasadena	Y	NONE	SELF INSURED
NG	Crown Castle NG West Inc.	Y	4/1/2021	
NXT	XO Communications	Y	3/18/2021	
PBM	T-Mobile USA, Inc.	Y	5/1/2021	
SPR	Sprint Nextel Corporation			Sent 4th notice
TCA	Teleport Communications America, LLC	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
TWC	Time Warner Cable	Y	1/1/2022	CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS INC
V	City of Vernon	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
		29		

EMAIL YOUR COI to this inbox: coi@scjpc.net

Table updated 5/18/2021

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC), _____ maintains attachment rights, if approved, ~~and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction~~, on distribution/communication poles ~~to with an~~ established joint-ownership record, between _____ and other members of the SCJPC.

For distribution/communication poles in which ~~a~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s), which must be approved by the pole owner(s).

The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates. As per SCJPA guidelines, a JPA becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed (unless there is a denial or hold), from the date in which the JPA was submitted.

Please note that tThe SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of **Crown Castle NG West** with the SCJPC.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The pole(s) listed on the attached permit have the following Companies listed as established Joint-Owners of record at the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC).

Joint Owners include:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed Owners grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) listed on the permit. This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a ~~standing M~~member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee ("SCJPC"), _____ maintains attachment rights ~~if approved, to and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction, attach equipment, and engage in construction,~~ on distribution/communication poles ("poles") ~~with an to with an~~ established ~~ed~~ joint-ownership record, between _____ and other ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC.

For ~~distribution/communication~~ poles in which ~~a-~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization ("JPA Form 2"), to the appropriate pole owners(s) ~~which must be approved by the pole owner(s).~~

~~The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates.~~ As per SCJPC ~~CA~~ guidelines, a JPA ~~Form 2~~ becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed ~~(unless there is a denial or hold)~~, from the date in which the JPA ~~Form 2~~ was submitted.

~~Please note that t~~The SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of ~~Crown Castle NG West~~ with the SCJPC.

Commented [CE1]: Open to misinterpretation from non-SCJPC parties that an approval request is repeatedly required, and that *explicit* approval is mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [EC2]: "to" implies that the action of attachment establishes joint-ownership, rather than the issuance of a JPA.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE3]: Open to misinterpretation that *explicit* approval is always mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE4]: Understood amongst Members, not pertinent to non-SCJPC parties.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Authorization Letter Terms of Use

THIS AUTHORIZATION LETTER TERMS OF USE (the “Terms”) is made on this ____ day of ____, 2020, by and between the **Members (“Members”) of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (“SCJPC”)**.

1. **Terms of Access.** Access to the Authorization Letter (hereinafter the “Letter”), and any iterations thereof, is granted exclusively to the Members of the SCJPC, their representatives and known associates.
2. **Description of Use.** The Letter is to be used for the purpose of demonstrating a Member’s basic attachment rights, as secured through membership with the SCJPC, to parties unassociated with the SCJPC.
3. **Limitations.** The Letter does not in any way supersede established processes, nor grant additional rights to any Member, beyond what is outlined within the SCJPC Routine Handbook (the “Routine”). The Letter may not be cited in a manner as to provide an alternate interpretation of the procedures of the Routine and does not imply that all necessary actions to obtain attachment rights have been met.
4. **Confidentiality.** Members acknowledge that the Terms herein are confidential to Members of the SCJPC and its operating staff.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) is made up of a group of Utility Companies, Communications Companies, and Municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed SCJPC Members grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) they own. The SCJPC Membership includes the following Companies:

ATC Outdoor Das, LLC	Frontier Communications
AT&T California	Golden State Water Company
AT&T Mobility	Mobilitie, LLC
CA-CLEC LLC	MCI Metro/ATS
City of Anaheim	MCI Telecommunications
City of Azusa	M-Power Communications
City of Banning	NewPath Networks
City of Burbank	Southern California Edison Company
City of Colton	Sprint Communications
City of Glendale	Sprint Nextel
City of Lompoc	T Mobile USA
City of Los Angeles	Teleport Communications America, LLC
City of Pasadena	Time Warner Cable (Spectrum)
City of Riverside	Verizon California
City of Vernon	Verizon Wireless
Crown Castle NG West., INC	XO Communications
ExTeNet Systems	

This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 2:01 PM
To: Serrato, Joe; Carrion, Earle; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; April Debarge; Bacon, John R.; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; CRAWFORD, CORY R; BLACK, KAY R; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Maria Ortiz; Alicia Smith; Yvonne Johnson; Jim Todaro; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Shawn Henderson
Cc: Kathleen Allen; Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Good afternoon to Compliance committee members,

I'm forwarding the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page from Joe Serrato. See below email.

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Serrato, Joe <Joe.Serrato@crowncastle.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 9:02 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Carrion, Earle <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>
Subject: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Hi Angela – this was one of Crown's action items. Here is the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page:

Members of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) maintain attachment rights, and the authorization to engage in construction, on distribution/communication poles with an established joint-ownership record, between other Members of the SCJPC. For distribution/communication poles in which a member is not an established joint-owner, the member obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s).

Thank you,

JOE SERRATO
Supervisor, Utility Relations
T: (408) 468-5564 | M: (408) 785-0411

CROWN CASTLE FIBER
1 Park Place, 3rd Floor, Dublin, CA 94568

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

Item 1776

April
2021

The pathway to possible.

Item 1776

Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements

- Outside dependency of a pole replacement
- Inconsistent/unreliable timelines
- Missed customer commitments
- *NG142830-LAD051-10m1*

Item 1776

Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements

- Members should have the right to replace poles, given that Member has the necessary capacity to do so, effectively and safely.
- Institute a reasonable timeline for the completion of a pole replacement.
- Introduce an agreeable path for the proposing Member to conduct a replacement, if the reasonable timeframe cannot be met, maintaining appropriate shared/non-shared costs.

Item 1776

Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements

Next Steps

- **Revise/update Section 7.0 Replacement**
- **Review updates to Section 7.0 for discussion in May Committee Meeting**
- **Questions for consideration**

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 2:01 PM
To: Serrato, Joe; Carrion, Earle; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; April Debarge; Bacon, John R.; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; CRAWFORD, CORY R; BLACK, KAY R; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Maria Ortiz; Alicia Smith; Yvonne Johnson; Jim Todaro; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Shawn Henderson
Cc: Kathleen Allen; Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Good afternoon to Compliance committee members,

I'm forwarding the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page from Joe Serrato. See below email.

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Serrato, Joe <Joe.Serrato@crowncastle.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 9:02 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Carrion, Earle <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>
Subject: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Hi Angela – this was one of Crown's action items. Here is the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page:

Members of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) maintain attachment rights, and the authorization to engage in construction, on distribution/communication poles with an established joint-ownership record, between other Members of the SCJPC. For distribution/communication poles in which a member is not an established joint-owner, the member obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s).

Thank you,

JOE SERRATO
Supervisor, Utility Relations
T: (408) 468-5564 | M: (408) 785-0411

CROWN CASTLE FIBER
1 Park Place, 3rd Floor, Dublin, CA 94568

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone (909) 599-3801
Fax (909) 599-3825

June 16, 2021

A meeting of the **ad hoc Compliance Committee** took place on the above date,
at 1:15 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Mr. Joe Serrato	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Wayne Brown	Southern California Edison
Ms. Camile Bowie	Southern California Edison
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Ms. Tara Andrews	AT&T California
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Mr. Victor Cortez Jasso	City of Banning
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. Pedro Garganera	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Claudia Arellano	City of Vernon
Ms. Jacki Rhodes	Mobilitie, LLC
Mr. Richard Soriano	City of Banning
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Mr. Serrato called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes – Mr. Serrato inquired if the members had any comments or concerns regarding the prior meeting minutes. There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Item 1630: CPUC Updates (2/14/17– title changed 04/17/2019) – Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to CPUC activity and updates. He stated if any members had any comments or current CPUC updates to share. There were no comments or concerns from any members at this time.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1658: Environmental Issues (1/16/2019, moved from Admin Board on 1/15/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened the discussion to Environmental Issues. He asked the members if they had any comments or updates. There were no comments or concerns from any members at this time.

Agenda Item 4 – Item 1770: 3rd Party Inspection Notification (From Administrative Board meeting – 10/21/2020) – Mr. Serrato opened to 3rd Party Inspection Notification. Mr. Serrato stated that there was an action item from the last meeting. Mr. Carrion was to convert the file contact list format into an Excel spreadsheet with two different tabs, one for public and one for internal use for the members. Mr. Carrion asked Ms. Pranata to pull up his PowerPoint presentation (see attached). He stated it required a bit of reorganization and would be best shown visually. First would be to rename the *Member Contact Information* link to JPA and move that link into the *Contact* category at the bottom left. He stated the new spreadsheet contact list for JPA only includes JPA related contact information which he would review at the end. Next would be renaming the *Emergency* link to *Emergency and Claims*. He stated that the underlying action here would be to include the *Claims Department Contacts* which is currently in the *Member Contact Information Excel* and move it to the *Emergency and Claims* page. The next action would be to create an additional link titled *Inspections* and that would be specifically for inspections contacts. They would then need to move the *Pole Inspections Contacts* spreadsheet link from where it currently is under the *Pole Inspection Resources* to the new *Inspections* link and also add *Intrusive Inspections Results Requests* on the new spreadsheet. He stated that *Intrusive Inspections Results* is also currently under the *Member Contact Information*. The next item of action would be to create an additional link or contact sheet for *Field Assistance/Joint Meet*. The information for this would need to be requested from all the members to create a similar spreadsheet for the new contacts. Ms. Black asked the members if what Mr. Carrion was calling the *Field Meet* was the *Roster to Expedite* from the *Member Contacts List*. Mr. Carrion stated he thought the *Roster to Expedite* was for cases in which the members needed to expedite the processing of the JPA. Ms. Black stated that she had her names wrong and this was good because she really did not know what *Roster to Expedite* was. She stated she thought this was where people would for their field meets. Mr. Carrion stated that he did not know either which is why he asked the member previously what *Roster to Expedite* exactly was. At the last meeting it was clarified that it was to expedite the processing of

a JPA if needed. Ms. Black stated that she will need to check their names listed then. On the next slide he stated he reorganized the links to a new proposed hierarchy. The first three links would be internal only that can only be accessed with a log in. The bottom four are open to public view. Under *Contacts* on the header menu, is where the publicly accessible links for contacts would be. He stated that this is the proposed contacts revision. He asked Ms. Pranata to now open up the new spreadsheets (see attached). The first was the *JPA Spreadsheet* which was a revision of what is currently referred to as the *Member Contact Info*. This spreadsheet would be for JPA only information. It would contain member representative, primaries, secondary, where the bill of sale Form 48s are going to go, and submission emails. Mr. Harmon asked if this was the most updated version because Ms. Prescott was showing but if should be himself and the new company name. To remove Cable Engineering Services and go with Motive Infrastructure Solutions. Mr. Carrion stated many updates have happened since this was first being created. Ms. Ortiz stated that the version posted on the website was updated and this was just the copy Mr. Carrion has been working off of. Mr. Carrion stated that the point of what was being shown was to show that only the JPA related information would be on there. For anything else that is needed if they figure out who the contact is for field assistance or to organize a joint meet, there will be a new link for this. Anything inspections related will also have a new link. This way it will be organized and separated in a more friendly manner. Ms. Black stated she loved it and that the confusing verbiage was changed to *Request to Expedite JPA*. Mr. Carrion stated that there was also another contact sheet that was updated, the *Intrusive Inspections* tab. He stated all this was pulled straight from what was available on the website. The first tab is *Pole Inspection Contacts* along with a new tab for *Intrusive Inspections*. If there is a need to request an intrusive inspection it is part of the spreadsheet because it is inspection related. Everything is from what was already on the website, just separated to be more easily located. He stated the only thing missing is a contact sheet for *Field Assistance and Joint Meet*. He stated that for SCE it may not be a single person so once that is created SCE could probably put a note to see whoever the contact is for that district which should suffice because it is what it is. For companies that may have a single point of contact for a *Joint Meet* or any kind of *Field Assistance* request, that would be the place to put it. He stated this was it and hopefully it addressed what was needed for this item number. Mr. Serrato, Ms. Ortiz, and Ms. Black stated they like it. Ms. Black thanked Mr. Carrion for all the work. She asked if there could be a minor change that would be a duplicate. She stated that Mr. Carrion showed what was publicly accessible, like the information for graffiti people. She asked if they could maybe duplicate that link under the *Members* link because her team just goes there. She was unaware of the other link. Mr. Carrion asked if she meant the top right link. Ms. Black confirmed and asked if there was a problem with duplicating those under

the member link. Mr. Carrion stated that everything on the top right of the website for the *Contacts* drop down, would be the links that are publicly accessible. He asked if Ms. Black wanted the internal links to also be listed there and stated that he is worried that may confuse anyone outside of the organization going into the website. Ms. Black stated that was not her suggestion and did not want the public to get all of their contact information. Ms. Black asked Ms. Pranata to show the *Contact* drop down. She asked if the *Single Point of Contact for Dual Poles* is something a member wants if that is listed anywhere for the members under the *Members* link. Ms. Pranata stated that is only under contacts. Mr. Carrion stated that all the *Contact* links on the drop down are also listed at the links on the bottom of the page that also has internal links for the members. Ms. Pranata asked Mr. Carrion to clarify that he did not want the members only links under contacts. Mr. Carrion stated this was correct. She asked if he wanted to keep the members only contacts under members. Mr. Carrion stated that *Member Contact Information* should no longer be under members at all. Ms. Pranata asked if it should be under *Contacts*. Mr. Carrion stated from their previous discussions he was under the assumption that under the *Contacts* drop down that would only be public. Ms. Pranata stated this was public only. Mr. Carrion stated that under *Members*, the *Member Contact Information* would no longer be there. Ms. Pranata asked where the file would go. Mr. Carrion stated that at the bottom of the page and everything that is internal for the members, contacts that the members would need would be there. He stated it was shown on one of his slides. Ms. Pranata stated that the bottom is the footer which automatically shows whatever is on top. She gave the example of adding an option of *Angela* under the *Contacts* tab, that this would automatically be listed at the bottom. The website programmer programmed it that way. Mr. Carrion asked if they mirrored everything he was proposing to be under contacts, would it be okay to put JPA and internal only in parentheses. Ms. Pranata stated she would need to ask the web programmer. She believes he could probably do a little programming to make it member access only on some of the links. Mr. Serrato asked Ms. Pranata if she had some capability herself to add and subtract what is available for people who log in and what is available for the public. Ms. Pranata let Mr. Serrato know she did but that the edit where they would make some links not public, she believes she would have to ask the programmer how to do it. She stated that right now anything under *Contacts* was public and anything under *Members* was members only. She stated that if the members wanted to mix it where for example the first three menus are members only and then the last one is public, she believes she would have to ask how to do it. Mr. Serrato stated that Mr. Carrion should get with Ms. Pranata at some point so they can work out what they can and cannot add also what Ms. Pranata will need to take back to the web programmer. He stated to also keep in mind Ms. Black's ideas to keep it separate but to have access to everything that

is available to the public for the members. He stated that if Mr. Carrion and Ms. Pranata could get that together it would just be a matter of showing it to the members next time and adopt it. Mr. Carrion stated he will work with Ms. Pranata to see where things can appropriately live on the website. Ms. Black stated that her issue was only a training issue for her team, and they could disregard. She will just bring it to her teams' attention. Mr. Harmon asked how old the *Contact for Dual poles* was. Ms. Pranata stated that she only updates when a member emails her updates and it is up to each individual member to send her their updates. Mr. Harmon stated that what he meant to ask was how long that option had been available at the public facing contact level. If it has always been there because buddy poles have not always been as much of a focus as they have been lately, and he was wondering when the website was updated to add that function for the public to contact a party about a dual pole. Mr. Carrion stated that it has been there as long as he can remember. Ms. Pranata stated that it has been there at least eight years. Mr. Harmon stated that it is good that the SCJPC has an acronym that few people know. Mr. Brown stated that it started off as dual poles before they started calling them buddy poles. Mr. Harman stated he does not recall getting a call from a public entity saying they found his contact information about a dual pole and that is why he was wondering how new it was. Mr. Serrato stated that the action item for this will be for Mr. Carrion to work with Ms. Pranata to see how everything fits. Mr. Serrato stated that he felt there was a general consensus on the context and format of how things should be laid out. Mr. Carrion stated that it sounded like it. This item will be tabled for the next month's Compliance meeting.

Agenda Item 5 – Item 1773: Concerns with fire mesh wrap (From Administrative Board meeting – 11/18/2020)– Mr. Serrato opened to Concerns with fire mesh wrap. Mr. Serrato stated that were they left off last time was the Crown Castle had sent SCE another handful of inquiries about the new material. SCE was going to come back with a response. Mr. Serrato stated that the last update was Mr. Brown had sent it over and was waiting for a response. Mr. Brown stated that the person who normally responds, he has been getting an out of office message, so he reached out to his manager who said the person has been out and that new manager will have to look into it now. Mr. Brown stated that the manager is new, and Mr. Brown was unsure if the manager was reaching out to the other individual who may have FMLA issues at this time. Mr. Bacon asked Mr. Serrato what Crown Castle's concerns were with the mesh since this item has been there for a while. Mr. Serrato stated that there were some basic questions and asked Ms. Pranata to display them (see attached). Mr. Serrato stated that they were just general questions with no major issues or concerns. That the questions were just posed when they brought them back to their internal team, so they collected them and forwarded it to SCE. Mr. Brown

stated that he will have to work with the new manager. He stated that last time they had the attorneys on the call to see what SCE could/could not provide. He stated that maybe he will reach out to the attorney to help the new manager with answering the questions, because the other person would be the only one who could answer, and he is not available. Mr. Harmon stated that Mr. Sam Stonerock definitely has an opinion on this, and he was sure Mr. Stonerock could help because there are a lot of things to talk about, such as fiberglass is not an exempt part of climbing space. If SCE is going to wrap the pole on it, how would they say that portion of the pole is climbable. Mr. Bacon stated that they are not allowed to set a fiberglass pole in the high wind and fire area so he would assume this would not be a fiberglass pole option. Mr. Harmon asked if they are talking about a wood pole that they would wrap the bottom seven or eight feet of it with fiberglass. The section of the pole is already climbable but when fiberglass is wrapped around it, per law, the fiberglass itself is not an allowable climbing space obstruction. He asked how they would have climbing space on a pole that has fiberglass surrounding it. Mr. Bacon asked if Mr. Harmon was calling the mesh wrap fiberglass. Mr. Harmon asked what it is made of. Mr. Bacon stated it was not fiberglass but was more of a composite kind of very thin chicken wire. Mr. Harmon stated the only exempt material is wood. Ms. Black stated that SCE stated that this will not impact the technician's gaffs. Mr. Bacon stated that they can gaff right through them and that it was not a climbing problem. It will not inhibit them in any way of climbing. Ms. Black stated this was one of AT&T California's questions to SCE and they were informed that they were free to climb. Mr. Harmon stated it is good that AT&T California's personnel have met whatever threshold they need to feel it is climbable, but the reality is if the law says it is not a climbable obstruction, then it would make sense to get that into the rules committee and get it accommodated. He stated if they are using a restraint or some kind of ground line reinforcement, they would like the portion exempted because it is climbable. To establish the best management practices and even though by law in the black and white it violates the climbing space, note that it should be modified. Mr. Bacon stated that the interpretation of whether or not it invades the climbing space because it is definitely climbable. The person stuck the gaff right in there and asked what Mr. Harmon meant when he stated by law it's affecting climbing space. Mr. Harmon stated it is GO95. Mr. Bacon asked as far as what, that it is fiberglass. Mr. Harmon stated yes, and that the only allowable climbing space obstructions are wood or defined by that and asked if they gaff climb a fiberglass pole. Mr. Bacon stated they do not. Mr. Harmon stated that was the whole purpose, if fiberglass was climbable by definition, then it would not be a problem, but they do not gaff climb fiberglass poles, any portion of it, the first seven or eight feet, theoretically they could fall off. He stated the point is GO95 does not allow fiberglass as an allowable climbing space obstructions but that he would support it becoming one. Mr. Brown stated

Mr. Harmon keeps stating fiberglass, but that it is not fiberglass. Mr. Bacon stated that it is a wood pole application and would not apply to a fiberglass pole. Mr. Harmon stated that it is not wood though and wood is the only material that is climbable by definition. Mr. Brown stated it was approved by the SED. Mr. Harmon stated that if it was approved by SED, which is a preliminary adjudicated green light, and if they say yes to using it, then they should go ahead and use it. Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP only had two concerns which using it. First was using them in public areas because when they gaff up and down it leaves little burs sticking out away from the pole and they are worried about people scratching themselves. That it would be more on trails and mountainous areas where they do not have a lot of foot traffic. The other concern was from an electrical point of view, a lot of times they have ground wires that come down a pole. For those ground wires would there be the potential for electricity to go through it. He stated those were LADWP's two concerns and from what was gathered neither of them was a concern other than the little, pointy barbs that stick out after use. Other than that, LADWP was happy with it. Mr. Serrato stated that if there are additional questions to add to the list that the members be sure to send them to him so he could forward them to Mr. Brown, so they can get answered by next the next Compliance meeting. Mr. Brown asked that Mr. Harmon's concern be added to the list. Mr. Serrato asked Mr. Harmon to word his concern for him. Mr. Harmon stated that he would like to make sure all the members are on board with it not impairing any sort of gaff climbing and if so that it be part of a climbing space allowable obstruction or something where there is no potential for a new SED inspector to interpret it a different way. Mr. Serrato stated they will add that. Ms. Black commented to Mr. Bacon that even though the wire mesh is for high fire districts it is not just for rural areas. She stated that Mr. Armstrong had brought up that there were some by school zones. She stated this was an issue they need to worry about because if there is a customer complaint who would be liable. Would it be SCE since they placed it and AT&T California/other owners did not have any control. Or is it all owners on the pole. She stated this was AT&T California's concern. Mr. Brown stated that the one that was in the school brought up by Mr. Armstrong, it was considered one of SCE's high fire areas. Mr. Brown stated SCE did take a look at it to see that even though it is a high fire area, maybe it should not have been a wire mesh candidate. Mr. Serrato asked for the minutes for the members to clarify it was Mr. Joe Armstrong they were speaking about and not Mr. Joe Serrato. Mr. Brown confirmed it was Mr. Joe Armstrong with the City of Pasadena. Mr. Brown stated that he did forward the poles to be reviewed. He does not know what the decision about the fire mesh but that they were addressing it. Ms. Black stated that from AT&T California's perspective should there be customer complaints/claims against the pokey things injuring someone, she asked if SCE will be putting something in writing for the

membership that they will take responsibility for that. Mr. Brown asked Mr. Serrato to put that question as well for him to forward. Ms. Black asked Mr. Serrato if he needed her to email it. Mr. Serrato stated he wrote down that SCE has to confirm if they are going to put it in writing that they are going to be answering to or be liable for, Mr. Brown stated he did not say SCE was going to confirm, but that he was going to address it. Mr. Serrato clarified address this concern. Mr. Brown stated it will be on the list so SCE can provide a response. Mr. Serrato stated that SCE will address the question who the customer complaints will go to regarding poles wrapped in the fire mesh material. Mr. Brown stated that was correct. This item will be tabled for the next month's Compliance meeting.

Agenda Item 6 – Item 1776: Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual benefit of Pole Replacements (From Crown Castle – 03/17/2021)- Mr. Serrato opened up to Item 1776. Mr. Serrato stated that this proceeded to the Admin Board meeting as a discussion item and there was nothing further on this.

Agenda Item 7 – Miscellaneous –

- Mr. Serrato opened to the Certificate of Insurance Request. He asked if there was an update for Sprint Nextel. Ms. Pranata stated she sent out a fifth notice and had not received anything. She asked where she would go after this. She stated that Ms. Smith was not on the call today so she could not ask her. Ms. Ortiz stated that she is still their contact, and they keep coming up every time there are ramifications, so they will follow up with them again. Mr. Serrato thanked Ms. Ortiz. Mr. Serrato stated that this may be in the category of what is considered a member in good standing. He stated that this would need to be explored at the next meeting pending any Sprint Nextel updates.
- Mr. Serrato opened to the draft letter regarding permits from Cal Trans. He stated that this evolved into a statement on the SCJPC landing page. It went through several revisions and the last draft was to include the words “upon approval.” At the last meeting it was discussed where it should be placed and asked Ms. Pranata to present the newest version of the statement (see attached). Ms. Pranata asked if the old draft could be deleted. Mr. Serrato stated it could. Mr. Serrato stated that the line “upon approval withing the 45-day time limit period” was added to appease SCE’s requests and concerns for it. SCE needed to get this back to their legal for their opinion or approval of it. He asked Mr. Brown if he had an update. Mr. Brown stated that legal has it to review but not returned it due to being busy at this time. Mr. Serrato stated that this will be revisited at the next

Compliance meeting with another request for status on the letter from SCE.

Ms. Black stated Cal Trans is pushing AT&T California really hard up in the north. They are being bombarded with internal meetings. The Cal Trans handbook changes to be that AT&T California has to get the pole replaced within 15 days. AT&T California is unable to get a permit from Cal Trans in six months though. She stated it is getting to the point where it is escalating and becoming so difficult to work with Cal Trans. She stated she was unsure how it was for any other members but that it is really bad for AT&T California. Mr. Brown asked if AT&T California is having the same problem in the South as well. He stated he has been working with Cal Trans and giving them, the process and they have been okay with it. He stated Cal Trans has been reaching out to him to see if it is okay and he will take a look and let them know SCE approved the JPA for attachment to the pole or if they have one pending. He stated he will let Cal Trans know of what SCE has at the time. He asked Ms. Black if AT&T California is having that issue in the South as well. Ms. Black thanked Mr. Brown and stated this could be why AT&T California is not having the same sorts of problems in the South. Ms. Black stated she has heard that there are districts and is unsure how Cal Trans is formatted, but that she hopes what is happening in the North does not move down South. This is why she is concerned and if this could be resolved she thinks it will help if the same issues should migrate to the South. Mr. Brown stated that they moved from a monthly meeting with Cal Trans to a quarterly meeting. Or that he attends the quarterly meeting not the monthly because it is not always regarding those issues. When he attends the quarterly meeting, he tries to give Cal Trans an update on the process, and he stated it will speak to what the letter being proposed says. Ms. Black stated that sounded good. Mr. Serrato asked Ms. Black if there was an action item she would like to add. Ms. Black stated she did not but wanted to let the members know of what is happening in the North. She stated she is meeting with PG&E to try and fix it together. Mr. Serrato asked if there were any other comments or concerns. There were no others at this time.

- Mr. Serrato asked Ms. Ortiz if there was anything to be said for the bullet regarding getting together with SCE to talk about notification for replacement antennas. Mr. Harmon stated there was and stated he would like to add to this. He stated to Mr. Brown that they would love to see if they could get a list of pending pole replacements with sites on it so they can try to get their customers motivated and get those stars aligned per se. Mr. Brown stated that he could see if he could get a list because it is doable, but he would have to reach out to all 32 districts for an IMS. He stated that he would reach out to see if it was doable. He stated that he

thought this meeting was to get together and talk about replacing poles that there may be certain guidelines and timeframes. Ms. Ortiz stated that it was also to create a process to notify everyone when it is ready to be replaced. Mr. Brown stated that he will reach out to IMS and see. He asked if they are still looking for the meeting or if they just need the projections. Ms. Ortiz stated that they should still meet just to put a process together, but she has been so busy. She stated that they should in the next month schedule a meeting with Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Harmon to come up with a process. Mr. Serrato stated that this will be kept open as an action item to be reviewed at the next Compliance meeting.

Agenda Item 7 – Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts -

- Mr. Carrion to meet with Ms. Pranata to talk about fitting the new contact format into the SCJPC website.
- SCE to provide answers to the additional set of questions regarding their fire mesh material. Mr. Serrato to forward the two additional questions to Mr. Brown and copy all the members.
- Ms. Ortiz to meet with SCE and Mr. Harmon regarding notifications of poles with antennas on them.

The meeting adjourned at 1:56 p.m. until July 21, 2021.

Anali Spencer - Committee Staff

Contact Information Consolidation

Proposed Actions

- Rename *Member Contact Information* [link] to *JPA*
- Move link to *Contact* category (currently under *Members*)
 - See new spreadsheet with only JPA-related contact information
- Rename *Emergency* [link] to *Emergency and Claims*
 - Add to include *Claims Department* contact
- Fix *Dual Poles* broken link (error 404)
- Create additional link: *Inspections* (for inspections contacts)
 - Move *Pole Inspections Contacts* [spreadsheet link], from *Pole Inspections Resources* to new *Inspections* link
 - Add *Intrusive Inspections Results Request* tab to contacts spreadsheet
 - See new proposed spreadsheet
- Create additional link: *Field Assistance/Joint Meet*
 - Request contact information from Members
 - Create similar
- Reorganize to new proposed hierarchy (see below)
 - Contacts
 - Staff
 - JPA (Internal)
 - Inspections (Internal)
 - Field Assistance/Joint Meet (Internal?)
 - Emergency and Claims
 - Dual Poles
 - Graffiti Removal
 - Update website header (*Contact* dropdown) to mirror above

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 11:31 AM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: COMPLIANCE Fw: Item 1773: Crown Castle feedback/questions on Edison's Fire Mesh

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

From: Serrato, Joe <Joe.Serrato@crowncastle.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 8:55 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Cc: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>
Subject: Item 1773: Crown Castle feedback/questions on Edison's Fire Mesh

Hi Angela – I will reference this list later during compliance. No need to place it in the packet yet.

- How much of the pole will be wrapped and which part of the pole?
- Does this wrap take up/affect the amount of space available to us for our equipment?
- Are there specific instructions or guidelines on attaching to poles with this wrap installed?
- Does this wrap affect how we conduct pole loading analyses?
- Would this material affect our RF signals? Has there been any tests?
- Will replacements that take place in response to damaged poles include installation of this wrap?
- How will this mesh impact pole transfers? Additional steps that may not have existed on a pole without the mesh? Will the new pole replacement automatically come with the mesh or will this be a two-step process, delaying the attachment of the equipment(delay in restoring service to the customer)? Will we be able to simply attach all equipment over the mesh without any issues?
- What are the safety concerns, based on section 2 of the Genics WFS Net there are some potential hazards that require first aid measures(section 4)? Field techs do not climb poles but they are near the poles for an extended period of time when repairing a radio on the pole(or troubleshooting).
- Will training be required to safely work around these mesh poles?
- Will field techs be required to wear additional protective gear when working around these mesh poles? If so, what is that gear?
- Is the assumption that this mesh will be placed on new pole in the high fire risk areas only?
- Will there be any associated costs relate to section 7 (pole replacements) specific to this scope
- How do you pole load these poles as ground line circumference will be impacted for measurement
- Where will the pole brand related to pole class and pole type be placed (will it be covered by mesh)

Thank you,

JOE SERRATO
Supervisor, Utility Relations
T: (408) 468-5564 | M: (408) 785-0411

CROWN CASTLE FIBER

1 Park Place, 3rd Floor, Dublin, CA 94568
Fiber.CrownCastle.com

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:17 AM
To: Anali Spencer; Serrato, Joe; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; John Bacon; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com); ASmith@motive-energy.com; Kay Black; Cory R. Crawford; Shawn Henderson; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Pedro Garganera; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us
Cc: Kathleen Allen
Subject: Re: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes
Attachments: Genics WFS Net - SDS.pdf; Q&A for Fire Mesh.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Good Morning,

I am forwarding an email from SCE (Wayne Brown) to the Compliance ad hoc. I will also upload the attached documents to the Agenda page for the next Compliance meeting.

From: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>
Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:07 AM
To: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>
Subject: Wire Mesh

Good morning Cory,

Attached you find a copy of the Q&A for wire mesh asked by AT&T, along with the Safety Data Sheet. Angela, can you please attached to the ad hoc for which this was a topic of discussion.

Thank you,

Gerald "Wayne" Brown
Agency Coordntn, Advisor
Pole Committee Governance & Projects- Joint Pole Organization
909-548-7195 | M. 951-323-2354
14005 S. Benson Ave, Chino, CA 91710

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee

Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>

Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>; Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie <Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>; JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com <asmith@motive-energy.com>; Kay Black <kb6314@att.com>; Cory R. Crawford <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson <shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com <jtodaro@motive-energy.com>; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us <carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us>

Cc: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good morning,

Attached are the February 17, 2021– Compliance Committee Meeting minutes for your review. If a response is not received prior to March 9, 2021 these minutes will be uploaded to the SCJPC website. After March 9th Members can suggest changes to minutes at the next meeting.

Thank you,

Anali Spencer

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone: (909) 599-3801 Ext. 204

Fax: (909) 599-3825

anali.spencer@scjpc.net



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Genics-WFS Net

SECTION 1: Identification

Product

Name Genics WFS Net
Product Code: WFS-03
Product use Fire Retardant
Manufacturer's Name: **GENICS INC.**
561 Acheson Rd. 53016 Hwy 60
Acheson Industrial Park.
Acheson, Alberta Canada
T7X 5A7
Genics Business Phone: (780) 962-1000
Emergency Phone: **CANUTEC : (613) 996-6666**

SDS Preparation Date: June 27, 2016

SECTION 2: Hazard Identification (toxicological properties)

Hazard Classification: Skin irritation Cat.3, Eye irritation Cat.2B

Warning Information: None

Pictogram: None.

Signal Words: Warning

Hazard Statement: May be harmful if swallowed
May be harmful if inhaled.
Causes mild skin irritation
Cause eye irritation

Precautionary statement:

1. If contact with eyes, wash immediately with plenty of water after contact medical care.
2. Wear suitable protective clothing and gloves.

Other Hazards:

Long-term exposure to skin rashes, eye gets the slight tingling, accidentally ingested, the stomach irritation and vomiting

SECTION 3: Composition / Information on Ingredients

<u>Ingredient(s)</u>	<u>CAS #</u>	<u>Percent (by weight)</u>
Acrylic Copolymer		35 - 56
Ammonium Polyphosphate	68333-79-9	3 - 21
Expandable graphite	12777-87-6	3 - 21
Silica	14808-60-7	<1
Wire Mesh/ Fiber	--	30 - 49



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

SECTION 4: First Aid Measures

Eye contact	Rinse with plenty of water for 10 to 15 minutes, occasionally opened to the upper and lower eyelids thoroughly washed, if the patient has pain, derogatory eyes, watery eyes, swelling and other phenomena to be taken to seek medical attention
Skin contact	Removal of clothing with plenty of water and soap thoroughly, then rinse with warm water 15 minutes, if the patient has an adverse effect or irritation occurs then they should be taken to seek medical attention
Inhalation	Move to fresh air if starting to feel dizzy. If symptoms persist then patient needs to be taken to seek medical attention
Ingestion	If a large volume is consumed, patient should consume 1 to 2 cups of water. If patients begins to lose consciousness or is unconscious, taken to seek medical attention
Notes to physician	Avoid gastric lavage or cause vomiting.
General advice	If you feel unwell, seek medical advice (show the label where possible). Ensure that medical personnel are aware of the material(s) involved, and take precautions to protect themselves. Show this safety data sheet to the doctor in attendance. Avoid contact with eyes and skin. Keep out of reach of children.

SECTION 5: Fire-Fighting Measures

Fire:	Fire Resistant
Explosion:	Not considered to be an explosion Hazard
Fire Extinguishing Media:	Not Required
Special fire fighting procedures:	1. Firefighter required to wear appropriate protective equipment and positive pressure self-contained breathing gas supply, extinguish fire at the up windward.

Special protective equipment for firefighters: Firefighters must wear breathing apparatus, fire protective clothing and gloves.

SECTION 6: Accidental Release Measures

Personal Precautions	1. Limit personnel to enter until area is completely clear and clean up spills. 2. Wear appropriate personal protective equipment
Environmental Precautions:	1. Leak area for ventilation. 2. Avoid contaminants from entering sewers.
Methods for cleaning up	For large spillages liquids should be contained with sand or earth and both liquids and solids transferred to salvage containers. Any residues should be treated as for small spillages.

SECTION 7: Handling and Storage Procedures

Handling:	1. Container must be labeled, closed containers when not in use. 2. Shall keep readily available to deal with the fire and emergency response device leakage.
Storage:	Placed at cool and dry area, away from heat, sparks and icy place.

SECTION 8: Exposure Controls – Personal Protection

Engineering Control:

N/A



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Control Factor:	N/A
Personal Respirators:	N/A
Skin Protection:	Protective gloves
Eye Protection:	Wear safety glasses or goggles

SECTION 9: Physical and Chemical Properties

Appearance	Dark grey-black
Odor	Not Applicable
Data relevant to safety:	Flash Point: Not Applicable Ignition temperature: Not Applicable Self-ignition temperature: Not Applicable Lower explosion Limit: Not Applicable Upper explosion limit: Not Applicable
Solubility:	Water miscible
Density:	Not Applicable
PH:	6.0 + 1.0
Viscosity:	Not Applicable
Solid Content:	100%

SECTION 10: Stability and Reactivity

Stability:	Stable under ordinary conditions of use and storage.
Incompatibilities:	Organic solvent
Materials to Avoid	Strong acid or alkali and oxidant
Hazardous decomposition products	Will emit smoke, CO, CO ₂ when fire

SECTION 11: Toxicological Information

Acute oral toxicity (LD ₅₀):	N/A
Subchronic effects:	N/A
Chronic Toxicity or Long Term Toxicity:	N/A

SECTION 12: Ecological Information

Ecological Effect:	Fish toxicity (LC ₅₀); None
Environmental effects	Do not use this product into the sewer water or contaminated soil

SECTION 13: Disposal Considerations

Dispose waste by sanitary landfill or incineration in accordance with appropriate regulations.

SECTION 14: Transportation Information

International Regulations:	Not a hazardous or restricted item for transport by road, rail, sea or air.
----------------------------	---



Safety Data Sheet

Genics WFS Net
Genics, Inc.

DATE OF ISSUE JUNE 2015
Revision 01

Transportation Summary: These products are not regulated as hazardous materials
UN Classification Number:
IMDG code & Package Group: None
Marine Pollutant: Not applicable
Specific Precautionary transport Measures and Conditions: Not applicable

SECTION 15: Regulatory Information

Health Hazardous goods: NO
Environmental Hazardous goods: NO
Fire Hazardous goods: NO

SECTION 16: Other Information

Date of Issue: June 27, 2016 (Revision 001)
Supersedes: None

Prepared by: Genics Inc.
Phone: (780) 962-1000 or
Toll-free 1-877-943-6427
Fax: (780) 962-1052

Information contained in this SDS refers only to the specific material designated and does not relate to any process or use with any other materials. This information is furnished free of charge and is based on data believed to be reliable as of the date hereof. It is intended for use by persons possessing technical knowledge at their own discretion and risk. Since actual use is beyond our control, no guarantee, expressed or implied, and no liability is assumed by Genics Inc. in conjunction with the use of this information. Nothing herein is to be construed as a recommendation to infringe any patents.

Q&A with fire mesh:

1. Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole? What changes are needed in regard to bonding and grounding with the use of a metal mesh on what is thought to be a non-conductive pole? Can the pole now become energized and under what conditions?
 - The fire mesh is wrapped at least 8 feet from the primary, leaving an insulative section of wood between them. For the wrap to be hazardous, it would need to have a conductive path across this insulative section. Grounding practices are not different with the fire mesh wrapped on the wood pole. Cables operated at 750 V and less shall be protected in conduit when extending past the FR Wrap or within 8 feet of the top portion.
2. How will we perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
 - Hammer sound testing can be conducted in the same way as when the pole does not have the wrap on it. The wrap does not interfere with the sound of the pole when striking it.
 - To access the pole below the protective layer, use a utility knife or tin snips to shear 2.5" vertically and horizontally from the point of where the boring location will be. This creates an "L" cut into the Fire Mesh. Push the cut Fire Mesh back. This triangular flap should move very easily exposing the wood pole. When you are done with the boring, use a nail to fasten the flap back onto the wood pole to ensure long-term hold.



3. How will existing pole be wrapped; over our existing facilities or under?
 - Currently, SCE does not have a program to wrap in-service poles.
4. If cable attachments are needed below the 20' threshold, the metal mesh and our facilities will be in contact with each other making both susceptible of becoming energized.
 - If installed over fire mesh, cables operated at 750V and less shall be protected in conduit when extending past the FR Wrap or within 8 feet of the top portion.
 - If not attached over fire mesh, care must be taken to ensure the gap between the FR Wrap and the hardware attachments is no larger than 1/2-inch. Effective attachment of assets will include minimizing the surface area of exposed wood, so it does not impede the survivability of the pole and the performance of the FR Wrap in the event of a fire.
5. What kind of drill bits will be needed to drill through the metal mesh?
 - SCE is not aware that special tooling is required to drill through the metal mesh and does not require or specify any special tooling when it drills through the metal mesh.

6. Will the Buck squeeze climbing belts grab into mesh and stop tech from falling if tech was to cut out?
- Prior to climbing a pole with the protective barrier installed on it, check to make sure the barrier is securely attached to the pole.



7. What effects will the metal mesh cause on climbing belts & gaffs?
- Gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind.
 - SCE is not aware of any affects metal mesh has on climbing belts and gaffs. Routine checks of equipment should always be performed before climbing as part of the normal safety checks.
8. Climbing the mesh wrapped poles with gaffs will cause gaff marks that will have sharp edged wires protruding from the pole.
- This is expected when gaffing a pole with mesh wrap. If encountered, press and/or hammer the protrusions back into the pole.
9. When guying the pole the down guy bracket spikes will need to pierce mesh and into the wood to prevent the bracket from spinning while applying tension to down guy
- See answer to #4. If bracket spikes are temporary, and a piece of mesh is removed or peeled back to expose the wood, when completed, tack the mesh back down once the guy bracket spoke is removed.
10. Do all tech need official training in order to climb wrapped poles?
- SCE did not provide any special training to its employees prior to their climbing poles with protective wrap. Utilities shall decide to provide special training for their employees as they see fit.
11. Does this change the safety in any way for those that need to work or climb on the pole?
- Prior to climbing a pole with the FR Wrap installed on it, check to make sure the wrap is securely attached to the pole. Gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind.

12. Is it slick and oily, so it creates a hazard of a ladder or worker slipping?
- The protective layer is not slick or oily based on SCE's experience. The material is less slick than new treated wood pole.
13. Will it change how a technician climbs the pole?
- No, gaffs can easily penetrate through the 23-gauge wrap and make good contact with the wooden pole behind. SCE has not implemented any changes to its climbing techniques for poles with protective wrap.
14. Does it present a burn hazard when it gets hot from being in the sun?
- Standard PPE is required. This has not been reported as an issue.
15. Is it toxic or give off toxic fumes? Can a technician get it on their hands? Will it stain clothing? etc.
- Safety data sheet provided.
 - Fire Wrap is non-toxic and does not emit toxic fumes before or after activation. The fire Wrap is chemically inert in the dry finished state found on the pole. Approximately 95% of the composition after activation is carbon, phosphorus and oxygen. None of elements found after activation pose any health risks to exposed individuals or livestock post fire and burn. Carbon and oxygen will be prevalent in any setting post fire as they are the primary compounds stored in trees and wood.
 - Neither form of the mesh (before or after activation) will transfer any harmful chemicals onto the hands or cloths of someone working or climbing the pole. The activated intumescent complex that has created the protective blanket around the pole will start to crumble when disturbed. This residue will not stain or leave residue. It can be simply washed or brushed off after exposure.
 - Manufacture's Recommended PPE: Gloves, Safety glasses, long sleeves.
16. If a technician climbs a pole using their hooks/gaffs over several times will the mesh be damaged such that it can result in sharp edges that may result in a cut hazard?
- If sharp edges are encountered, press and/or hammer them back into the pole.
17. If a technician climbs a pole using their hook/gaffs over several times, will the mesh be damaged and will that change the flame stopping ability of the mesh and if there is then a fire will that technicians company be held liable for damaging the mesh?
- The Fire Resistant (FR) Wrap is an intumescent (swelling up when heated) grid made of 23-gauge galvanized steel coated with a durable intumescent polymer. It is designed to protect the pole by expanding at temperatures greater than 300°F and creating a barrier that protects and shields the wooden structure from radiant heat and fire. The fire wrap on average swells up ½-inch in all directions when activated. This swell has proven to encapsulate damage caused by gaffing. Accordingly, SCE has no plans to hold other utilities responsible for minor gaps in the mesh caused by routine climbing activities.

Anali Spencer

From: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 12:59 PM
To: Angela Pranata; Anali Spencer; Serrato, Joe; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; John Bacon; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com); ASmith@motive-energy.com; BLACK, KAY R; Shawn Henderson; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Pedro Garganera; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us
Cc: Kathleen Allen
Subject: RE: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes
Attachments: Q&A for Fire Mesh.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: MTG, IMPORTANT

Wayne,

I didn't see the answer to the highlighted questions (below) in the response from your team:

The issues that we raised are:

Concerns with fire mesh wrap:

- Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole
- How will we perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
- How will existing pole be wrapped; over our existing facilities or under?
- If cable attachments are needed below the 20' threshold, the metal mesh and our facilities will be in contact with each other making both susceptible of becoming energized
- What kind of drill bits will be needed to drill through the metal mesh?
- Will the Buck squeeze climbing belts grab into mesh and stop tech from falling if tech was to cut out?
- What effects will the metal mesh cause on climbing belts & gaffs?
- Climbing the mesh wrapped poles with gaffs will cause gaff marks that will have sharp edged wires protruding from the pole
- When guying the pole the down guy bracket spikes will need to pierce mesh and into the wood to prevent the bracket from spinning while applying tension to down guy
- Do all tech need official training in order to climb wrapped poles?

As separate workgroup came up with an additional set of questions, although some items are on both lists:

- Does this change the safety in any way for those that need to work or climb on the pole? Is it slick and oily, so it creates a hazard of a ladder or worker slipping?
- Will it change how a technician climbs the pole?
- Does it present a burn hazard when it gets hot from being in the sun?
- Is it toxic or give off toxic fumes? Can a technician get it on their hands? Will it stain clothing? etc.
- Metal fire mesh wrapped around a nonconductive wooden pole will now make it into a conductive pole?

- What changes are needed in regard to bonding and grounding with the use of a metal mesh on what is thought to be a non-conductive pole? Can the pole now become energized and under what conditions?
- If a technician climbs a pole using their hooks/gaffs over several times will the mesh be damaged such that it can result in sharp edges that may result in a cut hazard?
- If a technician climbs a pole using their hook/gaffs over several times, will the mesh be damaged and will that change the flame stopping ability of the mesh and if there is then a fire will that technicians company be held liable for damaging the mesh?
- From an AT&T perspective there should be an M&P how to address working on a pole with this type of mesh. – Internal AT&T to answer
- How will AT&T perform sound & prod test on pole before climbing?
- How will existing pole be wrapped; over AT&T existing facilities or under?

From: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:17 AM

To: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>; Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com; Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie <Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz (mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com; BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>; CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson <shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>; carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us

Cc: Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: Re: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good Morning,

I am forwarding an email from SCE (Wayne Brown) to the Compliance ad hoc. I will also upload the attached documents to the Agenda page for the next Compliance meeting.

From: Gerald Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>

Sent: Monday, March 15, 2021 8:07 AM

To: CRAWFORD, CORY R <ck1358@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>

Subject: Wire Mesh

Good morning Cory,

Attached you find a copy of the Q&A for wire mesh asked by AT&T, along with the Safety Data Sheet. Angela, can you please attached to the ad hoc for which this was a topic of discussion.

Thank you,

Gerald "Wayne" Brown

Agency Coordntn, Advisor

Pole Committee Governance & Projects- Joint Pole Organization

909-548-7195 | M. 951-323-2354

14005 S. Benson Ave, Chino, CA 91710

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>

Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 10:21 AM

To: Serrato, Joe <joe.serrato@crowncastle.com>; Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>;
Dizon, Aarize <Aarize.Dizon@crowncastle.com>; Wayne Brown <Gerald.Brown@sce.com>; Camile Bowie
<Camile.Bowie@sce.com>; Valerie Mitwasi <Valerie.Mitwasi@sce.com>; John Bacon <john.bacon@ladwp.com>;
lex.treepaisan@ftr.com <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>; Lynn Prescott <Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com>;
JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Maria Ortiz
(mortiz@motive-energy.com) <mortiz@motive-energy.com>; ASmith@motive-energy.com <asmith@motive-energy.com>; Kay Black <kb6314@att.com>; Cory R. Crawford <ck1358@att.com>; Shawn Henderson
<shenderson@synergy.cc>; jtodaro@motive-energy.com <jtodaro@motive-energy.com>; Nicholas Van Stryk
(nick@petrellielectric.com) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; Pedro Garganera <pedro.garganera@verizon.com>;
carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us <carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us>

Cc: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>

Subject: February 17, 2021 - Compliance Committee Meeting Minutes

Good morning,

Attached are the February 17, 2021– Compliance Committee Meeting minutes for your review. If a response is not received prior to March 9, 2021 these minutes will be uploaded to the SCJPC website. After March 9th Members can suggest changes to minutes at the next meeting.

Thank you,

Anali Spencer
Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
Phone: (909) 599-3801 Ext. 204
Fax: (909) 599-3825
anali.spencer@scjpc.net

7.0 Replacement

Replacement may be made at the request of any Member, and adjustment as to sales, salvage, pulling, transportation, and transfer costs shall be at current prices as per date of replacement. Salvage shall be prorated in accordance with recorded ownership. Pulling and transportation charges shall be prorated in accordance with Section 2.1C. Any Member, by agreement, may be designated as the replacing Member under the Routine regardless of original ownership. ~~Any pole shown as replaced on a JPA which refers to Section 18.1 Automatic Approval must show space and grade allocated in accordance with Section 2.7E.~~ The Member maintaining Class H Circuits on a jointly owned pole should preferably make the replacement. **If the Member maintaining Supply Circuits is unable to schedule and perform the replacement within 120 days of the submitted JPA, the Member proposing the replacement may schedule the replacement with a Qualified Electrical Worker to conduct the work, in accordance with any shared and/or non-shared costs where applicable.**

COI SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS

JANUARY 2021 REQUEST

Member Code	Company Name	ON FILE?	Expiration Date	NOTES
A	City of Glendale	Y	2/1/2022	
AMT	ATC-Outdoor DAS, LLC	Y	12/1/2021	AMERICAN TOWER
ATC	Verizon Wireless	Y	6/30/2021	
ATS	MCI Metro/ATS	Y	6/30/2021	
B	City of Burbank	Y	7/1/2021	
BVE	Bear Valley Electric, Inc	Y	2/1/2022	
COB	City of Banning	Y	7/1/2021	
D	City of Anaheim	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
E	So. Calif. Edison Co.	Y	No expiration date	SELF INSURED
EXT	ExteNet Systems, Inc.	Y	1/2/2022	
F	City of Colton	Y	7/1/2021	
FON	Sprint Comm, L.P.	Y	5/1/2021	
FTR	Frontier Communications	Y	6/1/2021	
H / T	AT&T California	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
ICG	Mpower Communications	Y	7/1/2021	US TELEPACIFIC HOLDINGS CORP DBA MPOWER
J	City of Riverside	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
LAC	AT&T Mobility	Y	6/1/2021	NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS LLC
LLW	City of Lompoc	Y	7/1/2021	SELF INSURED
M	City of Los Angeles	Y	4/14/2021	SELF INSURED
MA	City of Azusa	Y	7/1/2021	SELF INSURED
MCI	MCI Telecommunications	Y	6/30/2021	
MOB	Mobilitie, LLC	Y	11/11/2021	
MP	City of Pasadena	Y	NONE	SELF INSURED
NG	Crown Castle NG West Inc.	Y	4/1/2021	
NXT	XO Communications	Y	3/18/2021	
PBM	T-Mobile USA, Inc.	Y	5/1/2021	
SPR	Sprint Nextel Corporation			Sent 4th notice
TCA	Teleport Communications America, LLC	Y	6/1/2021	SUBSIDIARIES OF AT&T
TWC	Time Warner Cable	Y	1/1/2022	CHARTER COMMUNICATIONS INC
V	City of Vernon	Y	6/30/2021	SELF INSURED
		29		

EMAIL YOUR COI to this inbox: coi@scjpc.net

Table updated 5/18/2021

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC), _____ maintains attachment rights, if approved, ~~and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction~~, on distribution/communication poles ~~to with an~~ established joint-ownership record, between _____ and other members of the SCJPC.

For distribution/communication poles in which ~~a~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s), which must be approved by the pole owner(s).

The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates. As per SCJPA guidelines, a JPA becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed (unless there is a denial or hold), from the date in which the JPA was submitted.

Please note that tThe SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of **Crown Castle NG West** with the SCJPC.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The pole(s) listed on the attached permit have the following Companies listed as established Joint-Owners of record at the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC).

Joint Owners include:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed Owners grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) listed on the permit. This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

As a ~~standing M~~member of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee ("SCJPC"), _____ maintains attachment rights, ~~if approved, to and the authorization to attach equipment engage in construction, attach equipment, and engage in construction,~~ on distribution/communication poles ("poles") ~~with an to with an~~ established ~~ed~~ joint-ownership record, between _____ and other ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC.

For ~~distribution/communication~~ poles in which ~~a-~~ _____ is not an established joint-owner, _____ obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization ("JPA Form 2"), to the appropriate pole owners(s). ~~which must be approved by the pole owner(s).~~

~~The attached list of sites includes JPA submittal dates.~~ As per SCJPC ~~CA~~ guidelines, a JPA ~~Form 2~~ becomes valid after 45-days (calendar) have elapsed ~~(unless there is a denial or hold)~~, from the date in which the JPA ~~Form 2~~ was submitted.

~~Please note that t~~The SCJPC Routine Handbook is confidential, and accessible only to those ~~members~~ Members of the SCJPC. A letter from the SCJPC Manager of Operations is attached confirming the membership status of ~~Crown Castle NG West~~ with the SCJPC.

Commented [CE1]: Open to misinterpretation from non-SCJPC parties that an approval request is repeatedly required, and that *explicit* approval is mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [EC2]: "to" implies that the action of attachment establishes joint-ownership, rather than the issuance of a JPA.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE3]: Open to misinterpretation that *explicit* approval is always mandatory.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Commented [CE4]: Understood amongst Members, not pertinent to non-SCJPC parties.

Formatted: Strikethrough

Authorization Letter Terms of Use

THIS AUTHORIZATION LETTER TERMS OF USE (the “Terms”) is made on this ____ day of ____, 2020, by and between the **Members (“Members”) of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (“SCJPC”)**.

1. **Terms of Access.** Access to the Authorization Letter (hereinafter the “Letter”), and any iterations thereof, is granted exclusively to the Members of the SCJPC, their representatives and known associates.
2. **Description of Use.** The Letter is to be used for the purpose of demonstrating a Member’s basic attachment rights, as secured through membership with the SCJPC, to parties unassociated with the SCJPC.
3. **Limitations.** The Letter does not in any way supersede established processes, nor grant additional rights to any Member, beyond what is outlined within the SCJPC Routine Handbook (the “Routine”). The Letter may not be cited in a manner as to provide an alternate interpretation of the procedures of the Routine and does not imply that all necessary actions to obtain attachment rights have been met.
4. **Confidentiality.** Members acknowledge that the Terms herein are confidential to Members of the SCJPC and its operating staff.

Southern California Joint Pole Committee
279 E. Arrow Hwy, Suite 104
San Dimas, CA 91773
www.scjpc.net

To Whom it May Concern,

The Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) is made up of a group of Utility Companies, Communications Companies, and Municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles.

As per SCJPA guidelines, all listed SCJPC Members grant the other Owners permission to perform work on the pole(s) they own. The SCJPC Membership includes the following Companies:

ATC Outdoor Das, LLC	Frontier Communications
AT&T California	Golden State Water Company
AT&T Mobility	Mobilitie, LLC
CA-CLEC LLC	MCI Metro/ATS
City of Anaheim	MCI Telecommunications
City of Azusa	M-Power Communications
City of Banning	NewPath Networks
City of Burbank	Southern California Edison Company
City of Colton	Sprint Communications
City of Glendale	Sprint Nextel
City of Lompoc	T Mobile USA
City of Los Angeles	Teleport Communications America, LLC
City of Pasadena	Time Warner Cable (Spectrum)
City of Riverside	Verizon California
City of Vernon	Verizon Wireless
Crown Castle NG West., INC	XO Communications
ExTeNet Systems	

This authorization is in accordance of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) agreement.

Sincerely,

John Bacon
SCJPC President

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 2:01 PM
To: Serrato, Joe; Carrion, Earle; Wayne Brown; Camile Bowie; Valerie Mitwasi; April Debarge; Bacon, John R.; lex.treepaisan@ftr.com; CRAWFORD, CORY R; BLACK, KAY R; Nicholas Van Stryk (nick@petrellielectric.com); Maria Ortiz; Alicia Smith; Yvonne Johnson; Jim Todaro; JHarmon@motiveis.com; Yesenia Delgado; Shawn Henderson
Cc: Kathleen Allen; Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, April 5, 2021 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Good afternoon to Compliance committee members,

I'm forwarding the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page from Joe Serrato. See below email.

Thank you,

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Serrato, Joe <Joe.Serrato@crowncastle.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 17, 2021 9:02 AM
To: Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; Carrion, Earle <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>
Subject: SCJPC Website statement on landing page

Hi Angela – this was one of Crown's action items. Here is the proposed statement for the scjpc.net landing page:

Members of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) maintain attachment rights, and the authorization to engage in construction, on distribution/communication poles with an established joint-ownership record, between other Members of the SCJPC. For distribution/communication poles in which a member is not an established joint-owner, the member obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s).

Thank you,

JOE SERRATO
Supervisor, Utility Relations
T: (408) 468-5564 | M: (408) 785-0411

CROWN CASTLE FIBER
1 Park Place, 3rd Floor, Dublin, CA 94568

This email may contain confidential or privileged material. Use or disclosure of it by anyone other than the recipient is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this email.

SCJPC WEBSITE LANDING PAGE 5/19/2021 PROPOSED ADDITION:

Members of the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC) maintain attachment rights, and the authorization to engage in construction, on distribution/communication poles with an established joint-ownership record, between other Members of the SCJPC. For distribution/communication poles in which a member is not an established joint-owner, the member obtains joint-ownership attachment rights, with authorization for construction upon approval within the 45 day time limit period, through the submittal of an intent notice Form 2 Preliminary Joint Pole Authorization (JPA Form 2), to the appropriate pole owners(s).

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Item 1776

April
2021

The pathway to possible.

Item 1776

Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements

- Outside dependency of a pole replacement
- Inconsistent/unreliable timelines
- Missed customer commitments
- *NG142830-LAD051-10m1*

Item 1776

Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements

- Members should have the right to replace poles, given that Member has the necessary capacity to do so, effectively and safely.
- Institute a reasonable timeline for the completion of a pole replacement.
- Introduce an agreeable path for the proposing Member to conduct a replacement, if the reasonable timeframe cannot be met, maintaining appropriate shared/non-shared costs.

Item 1776

Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual Benefit of Pole Replacements

Next Steps

- Revise/update Section 7.0 Replacement
- Review updates to Section 7.0 for discussion in May Committee Meeting
- Questions for consideration

Utility Code	Utility Name	Phone Number	Email Address	Contact Name or Dept.	Street Address
A	City of Glendale	(818) 550-4583	cbabakhanlou@glendaleca.gov	Catherine Babakhanlou; City of Glendale	141 North Glendale Av.4th Floor
AMT	ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC	(781) 926-4672	ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com	Kelley Langdon	10 Presidential Way
ATC	Verizon Wireless	(818) 898-2352	ATC-Inspections@motive-energy.com	Verizon Wireless c/o CES	9275 Corbin Ave
ATS	MCI Metro/ATS	(909) 264-0657	Pedro.garganera@verizon.com	Pedro Garganera	18850 Orange St., Bldg. A
B	City of Burbank	(818) 238-3575	JointPole@burbankca.gov	Joint Pole Desk	164 W. Magnolia Bl
BVE	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc	909-866-4678	Isaiah.zamorano@bvesinc.com	Isaiah Zamarano	P.O. Box 1547
COB	City of Banning	(951) 392-7143	jsmith@banningca.gov	Jason Smith, City of Banning Electric	PO BOX 998
D	City of Anaheim	(714) 765-4216	mli@anaheim.net	Mary Li; City of Anaheim	201 S. Anaheim Blvd., Suite 701
E	Southern California Edison	(909) 274-3569	TPNO_DIMP@sce.com	John Z. Deng; SCE	3 Innovation Way
E-TR	Edison (Transmission)	(909) 274-3569	TPNO_DIMP@sce.com	John Z. Deng; SCE	3 Innovation Way
EXT	ExteNet Systems (California) LLC	(925) 659-7435	lpadesk@extenetsystems.com	Linda McLean	4000 Executive Parkway, Suite 325
F	City of Colton	(909) 370-5088	adunning@coltonca.gov	Ariel Dunning	150 S. 10th Street
FON	Sprint Communications L.P.	(818) 898-2352	inspections@cableeng.com	c/o Cable Engineering Services on behalf of FON	9275 Corbin Ave
FTR	Frontier Communications	(951) 723-0736	bin.liang@ftr.com	Bin Liang	32477 Haun Rd
H	AT&T California	email only pls	GO95-Notifications@att.com	Michelle Pierce	3707 Kings Way #C33A
HLA	AT&T California (Los Angeles)	email only pls	GO95-Notifications@att.com	Michelle Pierce	3707 Kings Way #C33A
HSO	AT&T California (Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino)	email only pls	GO95-Notifications@att.com	Michelle Pierce	3707 Kings Way #C33A
ICG	M-Power Communications	(949) 864-0296	mdenning@tpx.com	Mark Denning;Telepacific Communications	2698 White Road
J	City of Riverside	(951) 826-5830	sjohal@riversideca.gov cc.ruijpadesk@riversideca.gov	Steve Johal	2911 Adams St
LAC	AT&T Mobility (AT&T Wireless)	(818) 898-2352	lac-inspections@motive-energy.com	AT&T Mobility c/o Motive Energy	9275 Corbin Avenue
LLW	City of Lompoc	(805) 875-8223	D_Campo@ci.lompoc.ca.us	David Campo; City of Lompoc	100 Civic Center Plaza
M	Los Angeles DWP	(818) 775-5407	ladwpss.regcomp@ladwp.com	Ron Monahan LADWP	18718 Rayen St. Bldg. 10
MA	City of Azusa	(626) 812-5216	dpatterson@azusaca.gov	David Patterson; City of Azusa	729 N. Azusa Av.
MCI	MCI Telecommunications	(909) 264-0657	Pedro.garganera@verizon.com	Pedro Garganera	18850 Orange St., Bldg. A
MOB	Mobilite, LLC	(949) 933-1406	tpendleton@mobilite.com	Tanner Pendleton	660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 200
MP	City of Pasadena	(626) 744-3705	jarmstrong@cityofpasadena.net	Joe Armstrong	100 N. Garfield
NG	CROWN CASTLE NG WEST LLC	(888) 632-0931	AssetManagement.Inspection@crowncastle.com	SCN Inspection Administration	1 Park Place Suite 300
NXT	XO Communications	(909) 264-0657	matt.bergine@one.verizon.com	Matthew Bergine	18850 Orange St., Bldg. A
PBM	T-Mobile USA Inc.	(805) 279-3513	SHenderson@synergvy.cc	Shawn Henderson on behalf of T-Mobile	7543 Woodley Ave, SUITE 201
SPR	Sprint Nextel Corporation	(818) 898-2352	SPR-Inspections@motive-energy.com	c/o Cable Engineering Services on behalf of Sprint	9275 Corbin Ave
T	AT&T California (Kern, Tulare, Kings)	email only pls	GO95-Notifications@att.com	Michelle Pierce	3707 Kings Way #C33A
TCA	Teleport Communications America, LLC	(213) 787-0112	TRARule18Nortifications@motive-energy.com	Tibor Kucharik; Teleport Communications America, LLC	420 S. Grand Ave., 6th floor
TWN	Time Warner Cable (North)		west.go95compliance@charter.com		
TWS	Time Warner Cable (South)		west.go95compliance@charter.com		
V	City of Vernon	(323) 583-8811 Ext. 167 (Iman Yossi Torbati) (323) 589-9498 (Nick Van Stryk)	JPA@ci.vernon.ca.us	Iman Yossi Torbati / Nick Van Stryk (Petrelli Electric)	4305 Santa Fe Ave (City of Vernon) 2323 E Vernon Ave (Petrelli Electric)

Utility Code	City	State	Zip	County	Contact Name	Comments	Last Update Date
A	Glendale	CA	91206	Los Angeles	Catherine Babakhanlou		10/4/2016
AMT	Woburn	MA	01801		Kelley Langdon		1/28/2016
ATC	Northridge	CA	91324		Lynn Prescott		8/28/2020
ATS	Bloomington	CA	92316		Pedro Garganera		6/28/2019
B	Burbank	CA	91502-1772	Los Angeles	Joint Pole Desk	Email preferred. Fax: (818) 238-3594	10/18/2017
BVE	Big Bear Lake	CA	92315	San Bernardino	Isaiah Zamarano		7/7/2020
COB	Banning	CA	92220	Riverside	Jason Smith	Fax (951) 849-1550	9/2/2020
D	Anaheim	CA	92805	Orange	Mary Li		5/29/2020
E	Pomona	CA	91768		John Z. Deng	Cell Phone (310) 367-8382; Inspection & Maintenance Dept, For Emergency/Priority 1 poles, use "PRIORITY" in the subject line of the email	
E-TR	Pomona	CA	91768		John Z. Deng	Cell Phone (310) 367-8382; Inspection & Maintenance Dept For Emergency/Priority 1 poles, use "PRIORITY" in the subject line of the email	
EXT	San Ramon	CA	94583		Linda McLean		10/7/2020
F	Colton	CA	92324	San Bernardino	Ed Ficara/Ruben Briones	Fax (909) 370-5132	5/29/2020
FON	Northridge	CA	91324	Southern California Counties	Tibor Laky	CES will cc Tibor Laky on all pole inspections received from 3rd parties	5/27/2020
FTR	Menifee	CA	92584		Bin Liang		2/6/2019
H	Sacramento	CA	95821		Michelle Pierce	Emergency Notifications 24/7, 800-515-7272-Select Option 5, then Option 0	5/29/2020
HLA	Sacramento	CA	95821	Los Angeles	Michelle Pierce	Emergency Notifications 24/7, 800-515-7272-Select Option 5, then Option 0	5/29/2020
HSO	Sacramento	CA	95821	Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino	Michelle Pierce	Emergency Notifications 24/7, 800-515-7272-Select Option 5, then Option 0	5/29/2020
ICG	Irvine	CA	92614	Orange	Mark Denning	Cell phone: (949) 547-6455	5/29/2020
J	Riverside	CA	92504	Riverside	Steve Johal	(951) 826-5830	2/7/2019
LAC	Northridge	CA	91324	Los Angeles	Luciano Ongkingco		9/29/2020
LLW	Lompoc	CA	93436	Santa Barbara	David Campo		5/27/2020
M	Northridge	CA	91324	Los Angeles	Ron Monahan	Please use LADWP forms (link) and send pictures if possible	6/9/2020
MA	Azusa	CA	91702	Los Angeles	David Patterson		7/19/2019
MCI	Bloomington	CA	92316		Pedro Garganera		6/28/2019
MOB	Newport Beach	CA	92660	Los Angeles	Tanner Pendleton		10/6/2020
MP	Pasadena	CA	91101	Los Angeles	Joe Armstrong		3/4/2020
NG	Dublin	CA	95134	All California Counties	Joe Serrato (<i>Southern California</i>) Doris Cartagena (<i>Northern California</i>)		6/28/2019
NXT	Bloomington	CA	92316		Pedro Garganera		5/27/2020
PBM	Van Nuys	CA	91406	Southern California Counties	Hollie Maldonado		5/29/2020
SPR	Northridge	CA	91324	Southern California Counties	Kevin Klein	CES will cc Kevin Klein on all pole inspections received from 3rd parties	8/28/2020
T	Sacramento	CA	95821	Kern, Tulare, Kings	Michelle Pierce	Emergency Notifications 24/7, 800-515-7272-Select Option 5, then Option 0	5/29/2020
TCA	Los Angeles	CA	90071		Tibor Kucharik		8/28/2020
TWN							7/27/2019
TWS							7/27/2019
V	Vernon	CA	90058	Los Angeles	Iman Yossi Torbati (City of Vernon) Nick Van Stryk (Petrelli Electric)		2/6/2020

Member Code	A	AMT	ATC	ATS	B	BVE	COB	D
Company	CITY OF GLENDALE	ATC OUTDOOR DAS, LLC	VERIZON WIRELESS (AIRC	MCI/METRO ATS	CITY OF BURBANK	BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC SER	CITY OF BANNING	CITY OF ANAHEIM
Last Updated Representative (Primary)	Catherine Babakhanlou City of Glendale 141 N. Glendale Ave., Level 4 Glendale, CA 91206 T: (818) 550-4583 FAX: (818) 240-4754 CBabakhanlou@Glendaleca.gov	Jay Hanenkraatt ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC C/O American Tower 10 Presidential Way Woburn, MA 01801 ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com	Marco Murillo Verizon Wireless 15505 Sand Canyon Ave., Bldg D104 Irvine, CA 92618 T: (949) 286-8776 marco.murillo@verizonwireless.com Send all correspondence to: Lynn.Prescott@cableeng.com	Perdo Garganera Verizon 18850 Orange St., Bldg. A Bloomington, CA 92316 T: (909) 879-2650 M: (909) 264-0657 pedro.garganera@one.verizon.com	Bobola Akerson City of Burbank 164 W Magnolia Blvd Burbank, CA 91502 T: (818) 238-3570 FAX: (818) 238-3594 VAkerson@burbankca.gov	Lynne LaFrenais PO Box 1547 Big Bear Lake, CA 92315 T: (909) 866-4678 FAX: (909) 866-5056 Lynne.LaFrenais@bvesinc.com	Ben Coffey City of Banning Electric PO Box 998 Banning, CA 92220 (951) 922-3267 FAX: (951) 849-1550 bcoffey@banningca.gov	Mary Li T: (714) 765-4216 MLi@anaheim.net
Last Updated Representative (Alternate)	Amanda Lindgren City of Glendale 141 N. Glendale Ave., Level 4 Glendale, CA 91206 T: (818) 550-4583 FAX: (818) 240-4754 ALindgren@Glendaleca.gov	Carol Maxime ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com T: (781) 926-4731 Lauren M. Ramirez Lauren.Ramirez@AmericanTower.com American Tower Corporation 10 Presidential Way Woburn, MA 01810 T: (781) 428.7377 M: (850) 867-8345	Jim Perry Jim.Perry@verizonwireless.com Lynn Prescott (CES) Lynn.prescott@cableeng.com T: (818) 898-2352 FAX: (818) 898-9186	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 658-3407 MOrtiz@motive-energy.com	Calvin Clark or Daniel Lippert 164 W Magnolia Blvd Burbank, CA 91502 Calvin: (818) 238-3583 Daniel: (818) 238-3656 T: (818) 238-3594 CClark@burbankca.gov DLippert@burbankca.gov	Isaiah Zamorano PO Box 1547 Big Bear Lake, CA 92135 T: 909-866-4678 FAX: 909-866-5056 Isaiah.Zamorano@bvesinc.com	Brandon Robinson City of Banning Electric PO Box 998 Banning, CA 92220 (951) 922-3263 FAX: (951) 849-1550 brobinson@banningca.gov Veronica Craghead City of Banning Electric PO Box 998 Banning, CA 92220 T: (951) 922-3262 vcraghead@banningca.gov	Vinh Tran Principal Electrical Engineer vtran@anaheim.net T: (714) 765-4273 Alvin M. Aska T: (714) 765-4147 aaska@anaheim.net
Last Updated Authorized Signature Bill of Sale (Form 44)	Catherine Babakhanlou City of Glendale 141 N. Glendale Ave., Level 4 Glendale, CA 91206	Gerard Aineztein 3500 Regency Parkway, Ste. 100 Cary, NC 27518 T: (919) 466-5563 gerard.aineztein@americantower.com	Jim Perry 15505 Sand Canyon Ave. Building D-104 Irvine, CA 92618 Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 658-3407 MOrtiz@motive-energy.com	Bobola Akerson or Daniel Lippert 164 W Magnolia Blvd Burbank, CA 91502 Bobola: (818) 238-3570 Daniel: (818) 238-3656 T: (818) 238-3594 VAkerson@burbankca.gov DLippert@burbankca.gov	Sedrick James PO Box 1547 Big Bear Lake, CA 92315 T: (909) 866-4678 FAX: (909) 866-5056 Sedrick.james@bvesinc.com	Brandon Robinson City of Banning Electric PO Box 998 Banning, CA 92220 (951) 922-3263 FAX: (951) 349-1550	Mary Li T: (714) 765-4216 MLi@anaheim.net
Last Updated Billing Address	Catherine Babakhanlou City of Glendale 141 N. Glendale Ave., Level 4 Glendale, CA 91206	Juan Tan, Paralegal ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC C/O American Tower 10 Presidential Way Woburn, MA 01801 T: (781) 926-4586 Juan.Tan@americantower.com ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 658-3407 MOrtiz@motive-energy.com	Email preferred: JointPole@burbankca.gov Joint Pole Desk Burbank Water and Power 164 W Magnolia Blvd Burbank, CA 91502 T: (818) 238-3575 FAX: (818) 238-3594	Michelle Sayegh PO Box 1547 Big Bear Lake, CA 92315 T: (909) 866-4678 FAX: (909) 866-5056 Michelle.Sayegh@bvesinc.com	Veronica Craghead City of Banning Electric PO Box 998 Banning, CA 92220 (951) 922-3262 FAX: (951) 849-1550 vcraghead@banningca.gov	Mary Li City of Anaheim Public Utilities 201 S. Anaheim Blvd. Suite 701 Anaheim, CA 92805 Mary Li T: (714) 765-4216 MLi@anaheim.net
Last Updated Form Submission (Electronic)	JPA@Glendaleca.gov	Jay.hanenkraatt@americantower.com Lauren.Ramirez@AmericanTower.com	ATCJPA@motive-energy.com	MCI_ATS_JPA@motive-energy.com	JointPole@burbankca.gov	Lynne.LaFrenais@bvesinc.com	bcoffey@banningca.gov	JPADesk@anaheim.net
Last Updated Form Submission (Mailing)	Catherine Babakhanlou City of Glendale 141 N. Glendale Ave., 4th Floor Glendale, CA 91206 T: (818) 550-4583 FAX: (818) 240-4754	Juan Tan, Paralegal ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC C/O American Tower 10 Presidential Way Woburn, MA 01801 T: (781) 926-4586	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 898-2352 FAX: (818) 898-9186	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 658-3407	Joint Pole Desk Burbank Water and Power 164 W Magnolia Blvd Burbank, CA 91502 T: (818) 238-3575 FAX: (818) 238-3594	Lynne LaFrenais PO Box 1547 Big Bear Lake, CA 92315 T: (909) 866-4678 FAX: (909) 866-5056	Ben Coffey City of Banning Electric PO Box 998 Banning, CA 92220 T: (951) 922-3267 FAX: (951) 849-1550	Joe Orona City of Anaheim 201 S. Anaheim Bl., Suite 701 Anaheim, CA 92805 FAX: (714) 765-5221
Last Updated Request to Expedite JPA	Catherine Babakhanlou City of Glendale 141 N. Glendale Ave., Level 4 Glendale, CA 91206 Ph (818) 550-4583 Fax (818) 240-4754	Juan Tan, Paralegal ATC Outdoor DAS, LLC C/O American Tower 10 Presidential Way Woburn, MA 01801 Ph: (781) 926-4586 Email: Juan.Tan@americantower.com ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com	Cable Engineering Services (818) 898-2352	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 (818) 658-3407 MOrtiz@motive-energy.com	Mina Shehata 164 W Magnolia Blvd Burbank, CA 91502 (818) 238-3719 (818) 238-3594 MShehata@burbankca.gov [Email Preferred]	Lynne LaFrenais PO Box 1547 Big Bear Lake, CA 92315 909-866-4678 FAX: 909-866-5056 Lynne.LaFrenais@bvesinc.com	Ben Coffey City of Banning Electric PO Box 998 Banning, CA 92220 bcoffey@banningca.gov (951) 922-3267 Fax (951) 849-1550	(714) 765-4221 (714) 765-4243
Last Updated Additional Form Mailing Address								
Notes								

Member Code	ICG	J	LAC	LLW	M	MA	MCI	MOB
Company	M-POWER/TELEPACIFIC COMMUNICATIONS	CITY OF RIVERSIDE	AT&T MOBILITY	CITY OF LOMPOC	CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER	CITY OF AZUSA	MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS	MOBILITIE, LLC
Last Updated Representative (Primary)	Mark Denning Telepacific Communications 2698 White Road Irvine, CA 92614 T: (949) 864-0296 FAX: (949) 864-0286 mdenning@telepacific.com	Alejandro "Alex" Parra City of Riverside 3750 University Ave 4th Floor Riverside, CA, 92501 T: (951) 826-5411 FAX: (951) 826-2492 aparra@riversideca.gov	Philip Brown AT&T Mobility 3939 E. Coronado St. Anaheim, CA 92807 T: (714) 237-6256 FAX: (949) 271-5007 pb4420 @att.com	David Campo Electrical Estimator City of Lompoc 100 Civic Center Plaza Lompoc, CA 93438-8001 T: (805) 875-8223 D_Campo@ci.lompoc.ca.us	Ronald Schram Los Angeles Department of Water and Power 111 N. Hope St. Room 863 Los Angeles, CA 90012 T: (213) 367-2745 FAX: (213) 367-3680 ronald.schram@ladwp.com	David Patterson City of Azusa 729 N. Azusa Ave Azusa, CA 91702 T: (626) 812-5216 dpatterson@azusaca.gov	Perdo Garganera Verizon 18850 Orange St., Bldg. A Bloomington, CA 92316 T: (909) 879-2650 M: (909) 264-0657 pedro.garganera@one.verizon.com	Tanner Pendleton Mobilitie, LLC 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92660 T: (949) 933-1406 tpendleton@mobilitie.com
Last Updated Representative (Alternate)		Robyn Brace City of Riverside 3750 University Ave 4th Floor Riverside, CA, 92501 T: (951) 826-5394 FAX: (951) 826-2492 rbrace@riversideca.gov	Yvonne Johnson YJohnson@motive-energy.com	David Campo D_Campo@ci.lompoc.ca.us	Jeffery Williams Los Angeles Department of Water and Power 111 N. Hope St Room 866 Los Angeles, CA 90012 T: (213) 367-2212 FAX: (213) 367-3680	Hien Vuong 729 N. Azusa Ave Azusa, CA 91702 T: (626) 812-5172 hvuong@azusaca.gov	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 658-3407 MOrtiz@motive-energy.com	Minh Luong Mobilitie, LLC 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92660 T: (657) 261-3807 mluong@mobilitie.com
Last Updated Authorized Signature Bill of Sale (Form 44)	Mark Denning Telepacific Communications 2698 White Road Irvine, CA 92614	Alejandro "Alex" Parra City of Riverside 3750 University Ave 4th Floor Riverside, CA, 92501 T: (951) 826-5411 FAX: (951) 826-2492 aparra@riversideca.gov	Yvonne Johnson Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	David Campo Electrical Estimator City of Lompoc 100 Civic Center Plaza Lompoc, CA 93438-8001	Bill Herriott Los Angeles Department of Water and Power 111 N. Hope St Room 863 Los Angeles, CA 90012 T: (213) 367-2520 FAX: (213) 367-3680	David Patterson Operations Manager 729 N. Azusa Ave Azusa, CA 91702	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 658-3407 MOrtiz@motive-energy.com	Christopher Glass Paul Gerst Racheal Torres Mobilitie, LLC 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92660 RTorres@mobilitie.com
Last Updated Billing Address	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 898-2352 FAX: (818) 898-9186	Alejandro "Alex" Parra City of Riverside 3750 University Ave 4th Floor Riverside, CA, 92501	Yvonne Johnson Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	David Campo Electrical Estimator City of Lompoc 100 Civic Center Plaza Lompoc, CA 93438-8001	Joint Pole Office Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Pole Records. 111 N. Hope St. Room 863 Los Angeles, CA 90012	David Patterson City of Azusa 729 N. Azusa Ave Azusa, CA 91702	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 658-3407 MOrtiz@motive-energy.com	Attn: Asset Mgmt Mobilitie 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92660 AssetMgmt@mobilitie.com (877) 999-7070
Last Updated Form Submission (Electronic)	ICGJPA@motive-energy.com	rpuijadesk@riversideca.gov	LACJPA@motive-energy.com	D_Campo@ci.lompoc.ca.us	JPA@ladwp.com	dpatterson@azusaca.gov	MCI_ATS_JPA@motive-energy.com	tpendleton@mobilitie.com
Last Updated Form Submission (Mailing)	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 898-2352 FAX: (818) 898-9186	Alejandro "Alex" Parra City of Riverside 3750 University Ave 4th Floor Riverside, CA, 92501	Yvonne Johnson Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	David Campo Electrical Estimator City of Lompoc 100 Civic Center Plaza Lompoc, CA 93438-8001	Joint Pole Office Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. Pole Records. 111 N. Hope St. Room 863 Los Angeles, CA 90012	David Patterson Light & Power City of Azusa 729 N. Azusa Ave Azusa, CA 91702 T: (626) 812-5216 FAX: (626) 812-5122	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 658-3407 MOrtiz@motive-energy.com	Tanner Pendleton Mobilitie, LLC 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92660 T: (949) 933-1406
Last Updated Request to Expedite JPA	Curt Heley: Manager OSP (408) 308-0925	Alejandro "Alex" Parra City of Riverside 3750 University Ave 4th Floor Riverside, CA, 92501	Jim Todaro Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 JTodaro@motiveis.com	David Campo Electrical Estimator City of Lompoc 100 Civic Center Plaza Lompoc, CA 93438-8001	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power 111 N. Hope St Room 863 Los Angeles, CA 90012 (213) 367-2520	Electric Operations Manager (626) 812-5218	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Ave. Northridge, CA 91324 MOrtiz@motiveis.com	Tanner Pendleton Mobilitie, LLC 660 Newport Center Drive, Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92660 Email: tpendleton@mobilitie.com Phone: (949) 933-1406
Last Updated Additional Form Mailing Address								
Notes								

Member Code	MP	NG	NXT	PBM	SPR	TCA	TWN
Company	CITY OF PASADENA	CROWN CASTLE NG W	XO COMMUNICATIONS (N	T-MOBILE, USA	SPRINT NEXTEL CORPORA	TELEPORT COMMUNICATIONS AM	TIME WARNER NORTH (ZONES 1 - 7)
Last Updated Representative (Primary)	Joe Armstrong City Of Pasadena 100 N. Garfield Pasadena, CA 91101 T: (626) 744-3705 FAX: (626) 744-4670 jamstrong@cityofpasadena.net	Joe Serrato Crown Castle 1 Park Place, Suite 300 Dublin, CA 94568 T: (408) 468-5564 joe.serrato@crowncastle.com	Perdo Garganera Verizon (XO) 18850 Orange St., Bldg. A Bloomington, CA 92316 T: 909) 879-2650 C: (909) 264-0657 pedro.garganera@one.verizon.com	KIMBERLY BALDWIN T-MOBILE 4100 GUARDIAN ST. SUITE 101 SIMI VALLEY, CA 93063 T: (858) 526-7504 kimberly.2.baldwin@t-mobile.com	Kevin Klein 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 T: (424) 270-1081 M: (760) 402-6000 kevin.klein@sprint.com	Joel McKinney Teleport Communications America, LLC Principal-Tech Project Mgmt AT&T Metro OSP Construction & Engineering 300 North Point Pkwy Alpharetta, GA 30005 T: (770) 335-9816 jcmckinney@att.com	Rey Lopez Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 T: (626) 201-8381 Rey.Lopez@Charter.com
Last Updated Representative (Alternate)		Earle Carrion T: (408) 468-5538 earle.carrion@crowncastle.com	Maria Ortiz MOrtiz@motive-energy.com	Shawn Henderson SYNERGY ENGINEERING 7543 WOODLEY AVE SUITE 201 VAN NUYS, CA 91406 T: (805) 279-3513 shenderson@synergy.cc	Alicia Smith ASmith@motive-energy.com	Lupe Hernandez LHernandez@motive-energy.com	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695 Yesenia.Delgado@Charter.com
Last Updated Authorized Signature Bill of Sale (Form 44)	Joe Armstrong & Jeff Barber City Of Pasadena 100 N. Garfield Pasadena, CA 91101 Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Joe Serrato Crown Castle 1 Park Place, Suite 300 Dublin, CA 94568	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 898-2352	Shawn Henderson SYNERGY ENGINEERING 7543 WOODLEY AVE SUITE 201 VAN NUYS, CA 91406 T: (805) 279-3513 shenderson@synergy.cc	Kevin Klein 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 T: (424) 270-1081 M: (760) 402-6000 kevin.klein@sprint.com	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695 Yesenia.Delgado@Charter.com
Last Updated Billing Address	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Email accepted: JPA@crowncastle.com Attn: JPA Accounting Crown Castle 1 Park Place, Suite 300 Dublin, CA 94568	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Shawn Henderson SYNERGY ENGINEERING 7543 WOODLEY AVE SUITE 201 VAN NUYS, CA 91406 T: (805) 279-3513 shenderson@synergy.cc	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695 Yesenia.Delgado@Charter.com
Last Updated Form Submission (Electronic)	MPJPA@motive-energy.com	Non-NG/NPN/CCI JPA submittals: ForeignJPA@crowncastle.com NG/NPN/CCI JPA responses: JPA@crowncastle.com	NXTJPA@motive-energy.com	TMOBILE.JPA@SYNERGY.CC	SPRJPA@motive-energy.com	TCAJPA@motive-energy.com	TWCJPA@charter.com
Last Updated Form Submission (Mailing)	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 898-2352 FAX: (818) 898-9186	Attn: JPA Accounting Crown Castle 1 Park Place, Suite 300 Dublin, CA 94568	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Shawn Henderson SYNERGY ENGINEERING 7543 WOODLEY AVE SUITE 201 VAN NUYS, CA 91406	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Lynn Prescott Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 T: (818) 898-2352 FAX: (818) 898-9186	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695
Last Updated Request to Expedite JPA	Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	(888) 632-0931	Maria Ortiz Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324 MOrtiz@motiveis.com	Shawn Henderson SYNERGY ENGINEERING 7543 WOODLEY AVE SUITE 201 VAN NUYS, CA 91406 (805) 279-3513 shenderson@synergy.cc	Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Cable Engineering Services 9275 Corbin Avenue Northridge, CA 91324	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695 Yesenia.Delgado@Charter.com
Last Updated Additional Form Mailing Address							
Notes							

Member Code	TWS	V
Company	TIME WARNER SOUTH (ZONES 8 - 12)	CITY OF VERNON
Last Updated		
Representative (Primary)	Rey Lopez Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 T: (626) 201-8381 Rey.Lopez@Charter.com	Iman Yossi Torbati City of Vernon 4305 Santa Fe Ave. Vernon, CA 90058 T: (323) 583-8811 Ext. 167 FAX: (323) 826-1458 itorbati@ci.vernon.ca.us
Last Updated		
Representative (Alternate)	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695 Yesenia.Delgado@Charter.com	Nick Van Stryk Petrelli Electric 2323 E. Vernon Ave Vernon, CA 90058 T: (323) 589-9498 nick@petrellelectric.com
Last Updated		
Authorized Signature Bill of Sale (Form 44)	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695 Yesenia.Delgado@Charter.com	Timothy Bass Vernon Public Utilities 4305 Santa Fe Avenue Vernon, CA 90058 T: 323-583-8811 x851 M: 714-273-7327 FAX: 323-826-1425 tbass@ci.vernon.ca.us
Last Updated		
Billing Address	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695 Yesenia.Delgado@Charter.com	Iman Yossi Torbati City of Vernon 4305 Santa Fe Ave. Vernon, CA 90058 T: (323) 583-8811 Ext. 167 FAX: (323) 826-1458 itorbati@ci.vernon.ca.us
Last Updated		
Form Submission (Electronic)	TWCJPA@charter.com	JPA@ci.vernon.ca.us
Last Updated		
Form Submission (Mailing)	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner North 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695	Iman Yossi Torbati City of Vernon 4305 Santa Fe Ave Vernon, CA 90058 T: (323) 583-8811 Ext. 167 FAX: (323) 826-1458 Nick Van Stryk Petrelli Electric 2323 E. Vernon Ave Vernon, CA 90058 T: (323) 589-9498
Last Updated		
Request to Expedite JPA	Yesenia Delgado Time Warner South 7337 Central Ave Riverside, CA 92504 (951) 406-1695 Yesenia.Delgado@Charter.com	Iman Yossi Torbati City of Vernon 4305 Santa Fe Ave. Vernon, CA 90058 (323) 583-8811 Ext. 167 (323) 826-1458 itorbati@ci.vernon.ca.us
Last Updated		
Additional Form Mailing Address		
Notes		

SCJPC Contacts Revision

June 2021

SCJPC Compliance Meeting

QUICK LINKS[Home](#)[Officers](#)[Calendar](#)[Criteria for Membership](#)[Member Application Process](#)[FAQ](#)**CONTACT**[Emergency](#) [Emergency and Claims](#)[Staff](#)[Dual/Buddy Poles](#)[Graffiti Removal](#)[JPA](#)[Inspections](#)[Field Assistance and Joint Meet](#)**MEMBERS**[JPA Search](#)[Quick Pole Search](#)[Advanced Pole Search](#)[Multiple Pole Search](#)[Website/Doc Search](#)[Forms and Routine Handbook](#)[Pole Prices and Authorized Costs](#)[Member Contact Information](#)[Pole Inspection Resources](#)[Agenda](#)[Priority Poles Definitions](#)[Meeting Minutes](#)[Meeting Attendance Policy](#)[Board Attendance](#)[JPA Alert](#)[Basic JPA Training](#)[Agreement and By-Laws](#)[Technical Resources](#)[Cable and Pole Tags](#)[Dispute Resolution](#)[Approved Contractors List](#)[Standards for Contractors Qualifications](#)

QUICK LINKS[Home](#)[Officers](#)[Calendar](#)[Criteria for Membership](#)[Member Application Process](#)[FAQ](#)**CONTACT**[JPA](#)
[Field Assistance and Joint Meet](#)
[Inspections](#)
[Emergency and Claims](#)
[Dual Poles](#)
[Graffiti Removal](#)
[Staff](#)**MEMBERS**[JPA Search](#)[Quick Pole Search](#)[Advanced Pole Search](#)[Multiple Pole Search](#)[Website/Doc Search](#)[Forms and Routine Handbook](#)[Pole Prices and Authorized Costs](#)~~[Member Contact Information](#)~~[Pole Inspection Resources](#)[Agenda](#)[Priority Poles Definitions](#)[Meeting Minutes](#)[Meeting Attendance Policy](#)[Board Attendance](#)[JPA Alert](#)[Basic JPA Training](#)[Agreement and By-Laws](#)[Technical Resources](#)[Cable and Pole Tags](#)[Dispute Resolution](#)[Approved Contractors List](#)[Standards for Contractors Qualifications](#)

Southern California Joint Pole

[EMERGENCY](#)[STAFF](#)[SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT - DUAL POLES IN FIELD/BUDDY POLES](#)[SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT - GRAFFITI REMOVAL](#)[Emergency and Claims](#)[Dual Poles](#)[Graffiti Removal](#)[Staff](#)

The Joint Pole Committee is made up of a group of member representatives of utilities, communications, and municipalities in Southern California who hold joint equity interest in utility poles. Established by telephone, electricity and railroad companies, the Committee has existed since October 10, 1906. It was formed as a result of the need to limit the number of poles in the field and to create a uniform procedure for recording ownership of poles. Each member has a vote and shares in the expenses of the Committee according to their joint pole interests. The Committee meetings are held in accordance to the SCJPC By-Laws.

The Committee employs an administrative staff whose purpose is to keep accurate records of ownership for each jointly-owned pole and keep on file a master record of each jointly-owned pole. The principal function is to calculate the established value of each transaction, involving the sale or purchase of joint pole equity interests or maintenance of those interests. The Joint Pole Committee staff prepares monthly Bills of Sale which are sent to the members to enable them to make monetary settlement of their joint enterprises.

Current members of Southern California Joint Pole Committee are:

Southern California Edison (E)	City of Los Angeles (M)
Frontier Communications (FTR)	City of Riverside (J)
City of Anaheim (D)	City of Pasadena (MP)
City of Glendale (A)	Bear Valley Electric Service Inc (BVE)