

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

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

**March 19, 2025**

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:**

Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Jacqueline Costa	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Effinger	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Samuel Picazo	Southern California Edison
Ms. Carla Stephen	Southern California Edison
Mr. Cesar Rodriguez	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kristoffer Scheetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Mr. Aaron Cochran	AT&T California
Mr. Robert Stanard	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. Vinh Tran	City of Anaheim
Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Irvin Orzuna	City of Glendale
Mr. Salvador Zambrano	City of Burbank
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Mr. Elias Avila	City of Colton
Ms. Nicole Munoz	City of Colton
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA

Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Tamara Zaki	Boldyn Networks US LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

Ms. LaMon called the meeting to order at 12:30 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

- *Action Item from the last meeting: Mr. Harmon & Ms. LaMon will review the issue with the cross arms and wood poles replaced with steel for Grounding on Steel poles.*

Ms. LaMon reminded the committee that during the last meeting, Mr. Harmon and she were tasked with reviewing the issue and formulating proper language for documentation. Ms. LaMon admitted that due to conflicting schedules and waiting to meet with her internal teams, she and Mr. Harmon had not yet had an opportunity to meet. Ms. LaMon asked if Mr. Harmon had any updates.

Mr. Harmon responded by confirming that he had not scheduled any upcoming meetings with the SCD but remained available to collaborate on the matter. He reiterated his willingness to contribute whenever Ms. LaMon was

ready to move forward with internal discussions. Ms. LaMon acknowledged his readiness and said she would continue to push for internal meetings and connect with Mr. Harmon as soon as possible.

There were no additional comments or concerns from any members.

### Other Miscellaneous Items

Ms. LaMon asked if there were any other miscellaneous items. There were no questions or comments.

### **Agenda Item 5 – Item 1800: Approved Maintenance Program Review (K.Black – AT&T CA – 2/19/2025)**

- *Action item from the last meeting: Ms. Black, with the help of Mr. Treepaisan and Mr. Harmon will write up the asks for results and deliverables.*

Ms. LaMon transitioned the discussion to the approved maintenance program. She noted that in the previous meeting, Ms. Black, Mr. Treepaisan, and Mr. Harmon had been assigned the responsibility of drafting a document detailing the requested results and deliverables for the program. Ms. Black provided an update, stating that she had not yet reached out to Mr. Treepaisan or Mr. Harmon for collaboration.

Mr. Treepaisan commented that he had reviewed Ms. Black's document. He was in agreement with the document and that it was consistent with GO 165 requirements. Additionally, he confirmed that the document adequately addressed Mr. Harmon's previous concerns regarding intrusive testing requirements for pit poles that had reached 15 years of service.

Mr. Harmon commented that his primary concern was ensuring accessibility to test results and understanding the definition of the program.

Ms. Black reported that she had made some minor edits to the document but had not yet circulated them. She asked whether the committee could commit to using the *GO 165 Table 1, "Distribution Inspection Cycles (Maximum Intervals in Years)," (attached in the packet)* as the primary standard for the maintenance program process. If so, the committee could then fine-tune the verbiage. She asked the committee attendees if there were any objections or if any members did not follow the GO 165 table.

Mr. Picazo informed the committee that his leadership team was still in the process of reviewing the proposed changes. He asked Ms. Black if she had made additional changes to the document he had received or the one in the packet.

Ms. Black responded that she had not sent out her latest edits and wanted to have the dialogue during the meeting. She added that the changes

were focused more on what the GO 165 table entailed. She then requested that all committee members consult with their respective leadership teams to confirm whether they supported the mutual benefit portion of the program and whether it should be based on the GO 165 table. Ms. Black added that some members had their own maintenance programs; however, the committee needed a standard, and the table was the CPUC requirement.

Ms. LaMon asked Ms. Black if she planned to distribute an updated version of the draft for review. Ms. Black responded that she would wait for the Routine Revision committee meeting. Ms. LaMon asked if Ms. Black would like to move this discussion to the Routine Revision committee. Ms. Black responded no, confirming that while compliance discussions would focus on defining the maintenance plan and its foundation, the Routine Revision committee would handle any necessary adjustments to the Routine Handbook.

Ms. Black reiterated her request that committee members engage with their leadership teams prior to the next meeting to verify their agreement on the use of the GO 165 table as the standard for the shared cost portion of the maintenance program.

Ms. Pranata asked whether she should email Ms. Black's question to all committee members or just the Compliance committee attendees. Ms. Black responded that the question should be sent out to all members since it would affect those who had an approved maintenance program.

Ms. McLean requested that Ms. Black restate her question. Ms. Black stated that she had a homework assignment for all members. The homework assignment was for each committee member should meet with their leadership to confirm whether they agreed to define a maintenance program based on the *GO 165 Table 1, "Distribution Inspection Cycles (Maximum Intervals in Years),"* as included in the packet, and to determine when the shared cost was appropriate.

Mr. Harmon commented that the mutual benefit of maintenance sharing should apply only to intrusive inspections and not to other activities. He added that members performing the intrusive inspections should follow the maximum frequency outlined in GO 165. If a member operated a more frequent program, they should notify the group for discussion. Mr. Treepaisan concurred. Ms. Black agreed with Mr. Harmon and Mr. Treepaisan, emphasizing the maximum frequency.

Mr. Harmon commented that there could be a potential mutual benefit if an intrusive inspection was performed earlier than the maximum frequency for calculation purposes. This could allow the restart of the 10-, 15-, or 20-year schedule per GO 165.

Ms. Black asked Ms. Pranata to extract key discussion points from the meeting recording and compile them into an email. She proposed that she first send the draft to Mr. Harmon, Mr. Treepaisan, and her for review before

distributing it to all committee members. Ms. Pranata confirmed that she would send the homework assignment draft to the three individuals mentioned above before distributing it to all members.

**Agenda Item 6 - Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts**

- Item 1800: Ms. Pranata to capture the homework assignment from the recording and, after review by Ms. Black, Mr. Treepaisan, and Mr. Harmon, send it along with the GO 165 table to all members.
- Mr. Harmon & Ms. LaMon will work on the verbiage for the *Grounding on Steel Poles* subject.

The meeting adjourned at 12:42 p.m. until April 16, 2025.

Transcribed by Angela Pranata - Committee Staff

Item 1800: Approved Maintenance Program Review

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

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