

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

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

February 19, 2025

A meeting of the **ad hoc Compliance Committee** took place on the above date,
at 12:15 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Effinger	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Ms. Carla Stephen	Southern California Edison
Ms. Shelby Mulvehill	Southern California Edison
Mr. Cesar G. Rodriguez	Southern California Edison
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI/Metro ATS, XO Communications, MCI Telecommunications
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Mr. John Vu	City of Anaheim
Mr. Salvador Zambrano	City of Burbank
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Robert Stanard	AT&T California
Mr. Julian Ruiz	AT&T California
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Mr. Irvin Orzuna	City of Glendale
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Services Inc.
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Tamara Zaki	Boldyn Networks US LLC
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC

Ms. Angela Pranata
Ms. Kathleen Allen
Ms. Anali Spencer

Committee Staff
Committee Staff
Committee Staff

Ms. LaMon called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s meeting minutes – Ms. LaMon inquired if the members had any questions, 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) – The Admin Board decided this topic requires greater discussion and is to remain open (8/14/2018). - Ms. LaMon opened the discussion to CPUC updates and stated that this item is on hold for now.

There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1658: Environmental Issues (1/16/2019, moved from Admin Board on 1/15/2020) – Ms. LaMon opened the discussion to Environmental Issues. She asked the members if they had anything to discuss at this time.

There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 4 – Miscellaneous -

Grounding on Steel Poles – Ms. LaMon stated that they are waiting back to hear back from SCE regarding grounding on steel poles. Ms. Bailey stated there are no updates as of now but that they did take it back to the appropriate party and are waiting to get an answer. When SCE gets the answer, they will update the members at the SCJPC. Ms. LaMon stated this item has been on hold for the past two meetings and asked if SCE had an estimate for the members. Ms. Bailey stated SCE will try to get something back by the next meeting but could not promise. She stated they will work on not keeping it on hold for much longer. During the action item discussion, Mr. Bacon asked about for the Steel Pole Grounding what it was they were looking for. Ms. LaMon stated that the question came from AT&T California and that the question was if there was the ability to tie into those groundings. Ms. Black stated she does not need an answer for that because she is 99% sure they will say no they cannot tie into their ground. Mr. Bacon stated that no one will let them tie into the ground because of their fault current

and other issues that go with it. He stated that anytime on a steel pole they can wire brush and self-tap a ground to the steel pole itself. That is the own level of the steel pole is decent. Mr. Bacon stated that he knows that they are not looking for a neutral and is unsure if they are doing a typical communication ground where they have to ground every 1500 feet. He stated that they do have the option of running their own ground the side of the steel pole for LADWP. He stated he does not know for SCE. Ms. Black stated that if the question is being left open AT&T California that it can be closed because they had already been informed that they are not tying into anybody's ground. Mr. Harmon stated that he would like to expand to this stating that the Rules Committee and SCG&E are helping them lead and trying to get a little bit ahead for the replacement of a wood pole for a steel pole. He stated when they are attached to that steel pole, they have a common bond no matter what happens. Mr. Harmon stated that he would not recommend to anyone to utilize that steel pole to meet the requirements of the messenger grounding and bonding quarter mile or dead ends. He stated he would suggest they do a redundant type of a ground. Mr. Harmon stated that until they can get grounding language in GO 95 specifically for steel poles, they are subject to figuring out what they do. Mr. Harmon stated that they need to be well aware that when they have a wood pole that is replaced with a steel pole that their messengers are held away from the steel pole on a wood arm. He stated his description is accurate in so much as that steel messenger is very exposed and at any point in time secondary can fall on that messenger and light it up. If a person is climbing and touches the steel pole and the messenger, they then have a problem. Mr. Harmon stated that he has instructed everyone that he can to identify this because this is an issue, and they need to be bonded to that steel pole to prevent that. He stated these are the things they are trying to discuss in the Rules Committee. Mr. Harmon stated that at this point he would like it to be a company policy that they just bond back to the pole where they run a jumper wire so that all the messengers are on the arm and everyone is happy. He stated that if they see a steel pole, they either need to be on the pole or bonded to it. Mr. Treepaisan stated that Frontier would be bonded to the pole. Ms. LaMon asked if this is something that will need to be discussed further in Routine. Mr. Harmon stated as a general guideline if they are disconnecting a members ground and walking away they are creating a GO 95 violation. He stated it needs to be clear when a structure is being replaced, all the grounding gets reconnected, or they do not

disconnect it. Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP has to lay two ground rods for every pole a foot apart way from the pole and they typically do not let anybody attach to their ground. Ms. LaMon stated that they can take the example of a lot of the buddy poles being out there for year that it can take a lot of the communication companies some time to get out there to replace the wood arms.

After further discussion and Ms. LaMon will get together to present something to the members that is amicable to all communications that have exposed messengers and do not want to create a situation where there is a difference of potential and the members can agree or disagree. Ms. LaMon agreed.

There were no comments or concerns from any members.

- **Approved Maintenance Program** – Ms. Black stated that AT&T California would like to propose for mutual benefit that they have standard that all the utilities utilize regardless of the maintenance program they have within the company, since everyone's is going to be different. She stated it is hard to understand what is being billed if there is not any criteria around the programs. Ms. Black stated AT&T California would like to use GO 165 table one as the criteria and anything else that is done above that would not be agreed upon as mutual benefit. Ms. Pranata displayed the *Table 1: Distribution Inspection Cycles (Maximum Intervals in Years)* on the meeting screen. She stated that this is where AT&T California would like to start the conversation at. Ms. LaMon asked if any members had anything to add to this. Ms. Black stated how she was explained that poles younger than 15 years do not need to be intrusive inspected. She stated that after 15 years passes the intrusive test they are not required to re intrusive test it for 20 more years. Ms. Black asked if Mr. Treepaisan or Mr. Harmon could to jump in if her information was incorrect that when they bill it is agreed that they can intrusive test after 15 years and then be informed if it passes or fails and if it does pass they should not expect to be billed for another intrusive test for 20 more years. Mr. Harmon & Mr. Treepaisan agreed. Mr. Treepaisan stated that the only thing that applies for communications on the table are the last two columns for intrusive testing and the last three rows for wood poles. Mr. Harmon stated that these are the maximum/minimum set out by the law to try and prevent or limit the civil liability, companies usually tailor their programs to be just slightly less than the maximums. He stated that there could be areas with woodpeckers or other issues that would promote more recurrent or a frequent inspection, which in that situation it would be acceptable

to maybe a less time period. Mr. Van Stryk stated that there seems to be two things happening here. Companies doing inspections at intervals that do not sound normal and billing for it, and two members are not getting the report or whatever they are supposed to be partially paying for. He stated he would refrain personally from trying to place limits or timelines in the Routine Handbook. Or even try and say they cannot do an inspection on the pole because there was one done 14 years prior. Mr. Van Stryk stated he does not know about the administrative timeframes either, so it could be the inspection actually happened in 2014 and then was billed for in 2015 so it is over 10 years. He stated that he also thinks another part of this as well is the way it is being billed in the spreadsheet style format. He stated it appears they are talking about SCE and other companies doing a mass billing cycle where members are not getting to review what they are doing before it is done. Ms. Black stated that that was not the case because AT&T California loves the spreadsheet and would like to make a template that all the utilities could use because they can track it easier that way. She stated that AT&T California would like some consistent criteria included in the spreadsheet and this could be something else to look at and have all who have an approved program and see if they can agree to meet all the criteria and hand in the information in the style. Ms. Black stated she was not sure if this was happening already but that for any utility who would want to be added in, they should try and memorialize it saying going forward this would be part of the criteria to get them approved. Mr. Van Stryk asked in order to add it would they want to change it to a rereview period like every ten to fifteen years for companies that have an approved maintenance program have to get it approved again in Administrative Board. Mr. Harmon stated it is just the ones that they are intending to share the cost for portions of the intrusive inspection, which is the portion they would want to see to accept those costs. Mr. Harmon stated that Ms. Black mentioned that the members would be more than happy to pay those costs but if there could be a way to get the usable data which is a percentage. He stated they would not need anything other than that percentage to put into their PLC's and adopt it. Mr. Harmon stated that however they determine that RSM can remain proprietary but the value that they would be using to reduce the strength of the pole could be common. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California's bean counters would love that because they could forecast when all is going to need to be replaced, and it was a fabulous idea. Mr. Van Stryk stated that has also always been his

biggest gripe with being billed for inspections. He stated some time back the City of Vernon was being billed by SCE and the pole was marked bad, they requested to see what was bad, but never got the information. He stated he is not a fan of the Excel format but that was just his opinion and that he does not like being billed for things before he gets to see it and going back and arguing is always harder than correcting things up front. Ms. Black stated they are given time where it is sent to AT&T California to pull out things before it gets sent to billing. Mr. Van Stryk stated that the City of Vernon only gets a spreadsheet that shows a pole is on there and it does not show what they are getting billed for before they see the Form 2. Ms. Black stated that should not be happening because it is part of the agreement of being an approved provider with the SCJPC. Ms. Black stated that SCE always captures the meeting minutes and gives AT&T California the opportunity to protest things, and they do pull it out if they are protesting it. Ms. Ortiz stated that it is a 15-day period that they have to either reject or request a correction on that list. Mr. Harmon stated that he had comments on the two things going on. They would want to make sure the frequency is not overdone and something that has value in the terms of the results that every member can utilize. He stated that it is not just GO 165, but the values could be very important if they are within five years to do their calculations. He stated that they would need to define a frequency that no one will disagree on and then how do they intrusively inspect a pole that is not based on frequency but the need of a member while also going about that without swiss cheesing the pole. Ms. Black asked if they could start with GO 165 and see if there was a member who does not agree that this would be deliverable because that would seem to be the most logical place because their entire agreement and Routine Handbook basically states they need to be compliant with GO 95. The members agreed to start there. Mr. Harmon stated that it would be wonderful to be part of the pole card stating pass/fail. Mr. Treepaisan stated that Mr. Harmon brought us the two issues because they have the compliance with GO 165 which are the minimum standards and that he had the same argument with PG&E as far as GO 165 saying 20 years but they want to do it within ten years. He explained that PG&E had their intrusive inspection costs and Frontier's portion, which he then took this as a negotiation point due to PG&E wanting to go above and beyond. Mr. Treepaisan stated that if they follow the cycle in GO 165 it does not address Mr. Harmon's point of a pole older than 15 years old needs an intrusive inspection within the last

five years. Mr. Treepaisan stated that that could not be mutually beneficial to all members and something that that particular member pays for, but that he was unsure. Mr. Harmon stated that it has to be beneficial for everyone because they are doing a calculation on the pole and if the data they find the RSM (Reduction in Section Modules) is bad and the pole failed, then it is clearly beneficial for all parties. Mr. Harmon stated the for the last eighteen audits the SED inspectors are getting out there and measuring the bottom circumference of the pole and looking at the entries of the inspections if the pole is over 15 years old. He stated he does not know how they became informed so fast, but they are clearly going to the letter of the law by asking how old the pole is, where it is at and want to be shown the information. He stated that when they have a pass/fail on their intrusive inspections Verizon Wireless has no way of incorporating the reduction in section modules without having to go with the power partners representation that it is 100%. He stated he has to do his best with the data available but that will go only so long until the SCT asks more about how it passed. Mr. Treepaisan stated that GO 165 allows for a ten-year period once they hit age 15 and that is different from requiring a five-year intrusive for attaching. Mr. Bacon stated he agreed with Mr. Treepaisan. Mr. Treepaisan stated then it leads to a rabbit hole of asking how many poles are getting inspected a year. He stated in the north there was supposed to be a list presented as part of a maintenance program and the member could decide if that was acceptable to do and pay for it, but he thinks it was geared for the smaller companies in case they were presented with a half a million pole list vs a normal 100,000 pole that they could absorb the cost, which is their contention with some of the spreadsheets, is forecasting volume. Mr. Bacon stated on the power side they are hearing the term above and beyond more for fire protection which is a CPUC directive. He stated if the rules say has to be done fifteen years or five years after then that is what they should go by, and he does not think there should be additional cost. If they are the utility going above and beyond, he does not think it is fair to share the cost. Mr. Bacon stated that if the CPUC makes them share the cost then they will have to. Ms. Black stated that what she can try to come up with what Mr. Harmon calls the “ask for the results and ask for the deliverable” possibly with help from Mr. Treepaisan and Mr. Harmon for the criteria that they could add into the Routine Handbook verbiage. Ms. LaMon agreed. Mr. Treepaisan stated that a key point is to ask for the results. Mr. Van Stryk stated to clarify what was not being

included in the Excel sheet was pole tagging, but that was still being charged on the Form 44. Ms. Black stated that was true.

Mr. Harmon stated that this seemed like a great opportunity to inform the members when talking about vis strips and ridiculously common things Mr. Harmon stated that he is of the position of if one finds it one fixes it and share, but he is also happy to send it to the base owner. He stated that they should have some sort of consistency in how they will mitigate it, so they are prepared when the inspectors. If it is mutual benefit items, maybe the first person to find it fixes it and sends it out as opposed to saying they wont touch it. Mr. Van Stryk stated the issue was not that they would not fix it, it was that they were using old pole tags, so City of Vernon replaced a Section of Poles and had to go back out there and retag. Mr. Van Stryk stated administratively it cost them the same amount of money to get the money back because of the way the authorized costs work as it does for them to just fix it and not hit them up for the money. Mr. Van Stryk stated this happened over the course of a year and a half on random poles throughout the area. Mr. Van Stryk stated because of this he asked to not be billed anymore for inspections and tags and requested that a Form 2 be sent first for him to approve and then they can go out there and do the work. He stated he is constantly searching Form 44's from SCE trying to figure out if he has to go back out and double check for tags. Mr. Harmon stated that it sounds like Mr. Van Stryk is willing to pay for mutually beneficial things as long as he is made aware of it before it happens. Mr. Van Stryk stated yes. Mr. Bacon stated that if they do put visible strips up, three, four, and five, anything else, and they tend to be liable for a suit. Ms. LaMon asked if Mr. Harmon & Mr. Treepaisan were still going to help Ms. Black was still going to write up the asks. Mr. Harmon stated they would. Ms. LaMon asked if the members had additional comments.

There were no comments or concerns from any members.

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

- Mr. Harmon & Ms. LaMon will review the issue with the cross arms and wood poles replaced with steel for Grounding on Steel poles.
- Ms. Black, with the help of Mr. Treepaisan and Mr. Harmon will write up the asks for results and deliverables.

The meeting adjourned at 12:52 a.m. until March 19, 2025.

Transcribed by Anali Spencer - Committee Staff

**Table 1
Distribution Inspection Cycles (Maximum Intervals in Years)**

	Patrol		Detailed		Intrusive	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Transformers						
Overhead	1	2 ¹	5	5	---	---
Underground	1	2	3	3	---	---
Padmounted	1	2	5	5	---	---
Switching/Protective Devices						
Overhead	1	2 ¹	5	5	---	---
Underground	1	2	3	3	---	---
Padmounted	1	2	5	5	---	---
Regulators/Capacitors						
Overhead	1	2 ¹	5	5	---	---
Underground	1	2	3	3	---	---
Padmounted	1	2	5	5	---	---
Overhead Conductor and Cables						
Overhead Conductor and Cables	1	2 ¹	5	5	---	---
Streetlighting	1	2	x	x	---	---
Wood Poles under 15 years	1	2	x	x	---	---
Wood Poles over 15 years which have not been subject to intrusive inspection	1	2	x	x	10	10
Wood poles which passed intrusive inspection	---	---	---	---	20	20

(1) Patrol inspections in rural areas shall be increased to once per year in Extreme and Very High Fire Threat Zones in the following counties Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Santa Barbara, San Bernardino, San Diego, and Ventura. Extreme and Very High Fire Threat Zones are designated on the Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) Map prepared by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection or the modified FRAP Map prepared by San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) and adopted by Decision 12-01-032 in Phase 2 of Rulemaking 08-11-005. The fire-threat map is to be used to establish approximate boundaries and Utilities should use their own expertise and judgment to determine if local conditions require them to adjust the boundaries of the map.