

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

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

March 19, 2025

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 12:42 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI/Metro ATS, XO Communications, MCI Telecommunications
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
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
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.
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. 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
Ms. Tamara Zaki
Ms. Angela Pranata
Ms. Kathleen Allen

Extenet Systems
Boldyn Networks US LLC
Committee Staff
Committee Staff

Ms. Ortiz called the meeting to order at 12:42 p.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s meeting minutes – Ms. Ortiz opened the meeting by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes.

There were no comments or concerns from the members.

Agenda Item 2 – Interpretation of Routine Handbook – Ms. Ortiz stated Ms. LaMon sent an email with the JPA example (see attached). Ms. LaMon stated most of the examples were on page two showing Crown Castle and Verizon Wireless are still attached. Ms. Ortiz stated that they would need to issue a correction of records for those. Ms. LaMon stated the main issue she wanted to address with these was that there should be something in place to avoid the relinquishing of a joint pole without a process for those who are going to remain attached to take ownership of a pole. Ms. LaMon stated it shows Verizon Wireless is to remove the pole but does not see any correspondence of agreement that the location is no longer needed. Ms. Ortiz stated that this was an old example but that in the last couple of years they had a JPA proposing for SCE to remove the pole but they redlined it for SCE to relinquish and cut the pole so it can be renumbered, and the comms keep it. Ms. Ortiz stated that this is possibly what should have happened with the example. Ms. Black asked to view the header to see if anyone did reply within the 45 days. Mr. Harmon stated that he believes what Ms. LaMon is inferring is that for this example all SCE had to do was relinquish and has no reason to remove the whole pole when there are other members that need it. SCE can relinquish and remove their facilities. He stated here they are not relinquishing but removing the entire pole and not made any sort of representation to the other. Mr. Harmon stated that they had a similar situation in Santiago which they marked up the JPA requesting the pole not be removed and that they just relinquish. He stated as a general respect for other parties that are existing with different business plans that if the pole is going to be removed, to first make sure every party has accepted and has other plans for their attachments. Ms. Ortiz stated that on page one of the JPA example it does show a relinquish minus the renumbering. Ms. LaMon stated she could not find other examples. Mr. Van Stryk stated that if they are talking just a relinquishment, then the old pole tag should remain until it is changed because it is still the same pole. Ms. Black stated that the definition of a base owner is now tied into pole inspections and the tag is how they tell who the base owner is. Ms. Black stated that can lead to further issues where if they leave the SCE tag and if someone walks buy they will believe SCE needs to test and treat the pole because of that tag. Mr. Van Stryk stated that the tag does not always tell

them who is responsible for maintenance or inspections but that they could change the E to whoever the new base owner is and keep the same number. Mr. Harmon stated that it seems Crown Castle wants a process to do this officially. Mr. Van Stryk stated that it is not the base owners' job to see who wants to tag the pole. Mr. Harmon agreed, but that the for should state a new tag needs to be presented. Ms. LaMon stated that the issue is how the JPA's are being finalized, and the record goes dead but there are still members attached to these poles in the field and there is no longer a record when there should be. Ms. DeBarge asked if they are discussing Section 5.1B, which cannot be billed without a new pole number provided if the base owner is relinquishing. Ms. LaMon stated that they are finalizing with no pole number provided and the record goes dead. Ms. DeBarge asked if they are still joint owners or if the pole is now solely owned. Ms. LaMon stated that it is where they are still joint owners. Ms. LaMon stated that two things are happening here where there is the relinquishment where the pole is not being retagged and also the removal of pole where there are still existing owners. Ms. DeBarge stated for the first where there is a relinquishment and joint owners still there, that would be Section 5.1B and cannot bill without there being a new base owner pole number provided. For the second scenario for the examples on page two of the JPA example she stated that is not a relinquishment and there should have been some communication back stating they did not want the pole to be PTD'd. Ms. LaMon stated that this is an older JPA, and she was unsure if there was that communication. Mr. Harmon stated that in the Santiago area they had some joint JPAs that had a removal and a complete PTD but there were four other owners and a tenant on the poles. He stated they would have liked to go underground but funds did not allow so instead they marked the JPA up with a relinquishment as opposed to a removal. Mr. Harmon asked Ms. Ortiz how they would adjust the pole numbers since SCE was no longer on the poles. Ms. Ortiz stated she would have to look at the JPA and see how it was done at that time. Ms. Ortiz stated she does not believe there are examples in the Routine Handbook for this but that she will double check and if none will create an example showing the base owner relinquishing off the pole and one of the remaining owners taking over as base owner and showing the renumbering as well as include all the sections. Ms. LaMon agreed that would be helpful. Ms. LaMon stated that Ms. DeBarge had mentioned a JPA cannot bill without a new base owner and pole number but that this JPA did bill and wanted to know how this could be avoided. Ms. Ortiz stated that for this JPA example may not have been required at that time but that now if a JPA were received this way it would not get processed. Ms. Allen stated that poles on the first page there is a note at the bottom the JPA that states "E relinq, but E removed at later time, no renumbering per E. VZ new base owner of record". Ms. Allen then stated that currently a base owner cannot relinquish without a new pole number because the SCJPC database will not accept it. Ms. Allen stated that for the example on page one of the JPA it may be a special case but for the examples on page two those billed under Section 5.0 which means SCE removed all the attachments

and the record at the SCJPC office will become dead. Ms. Allen stated that a relinquishment means a member removes an attachment and other members remain on the pole and the pole remains active. Ms. Ortiz asked if the SCJPC gets a Final with SCE relinquishing and showing FTR to renumber but there is no FTR new pole number then it will not be processed. Ms. Allen stated that is correct and it would be returned via memo requesting a FTR pole number. Mr. Van Stryk asked if SCE could send a pole number on FTR's behalf without a reply. Ms. Ortiz stated they could not. Mr. Treepaisan stated that in those cases he will get an email requesting a new pole number. Mr. Picazo stated that SCE had a situation where they were relinquishing interest and AT&T California and Frontier were going to remain on the pole, so he got a new pole number from Frontier, which SCE does request a new pole number when they are relinquishing. Mr. Van Stryk stated that if no reply is received what would SCE do. Mr. Picazo stated he will continue trying to get the number so that the JPA can be submitted. Ms. LaMon stated that this just seems like it is an issue of old records that need to be cleaned up a bit and not necessarily an issue that needs to be revised in the Routine Handbook. Ms. Ortiz stated that she needs to double-check the examples, but if there is no example she wanted to know if the members would like an example to show relinquishment and renumbering. Ms. DeBarge stated that this is a good example to doctor up with red lines. Ms. Ortiz stated that it could be one showing a JPA issued with the base owner relinquishing and another existing member becoming the base owner. Ms. Allen stated that she has an example that she could share with Ms. Ortiz to work off of. Ms. Ortiz stated she would like that.

There were no comments or concerns from the members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1597: Review of Routine Handbook Examples (5/19/2015) – Ms. Ortiz stated Ms. Black was going to work on examples for the Billing out of Sequence and inquired if Ms. Black had anything to present. Ms. DeBarge stated that she thinks they are currently good with that and the PowerPoint that Ms. Allen is working on and videos as well. Ms. Ortiz asked if they were going to want to add an example to the Routine Handbook as well. Ms. Allen stated that there will be some and they can be shared when they are created.

There were no further comments or concerns from the members.

Agenda Item 4 – Item 1793: Section 4.0 with Form 48 (Y. Delgado – Time Warner Cable 10/18/2023) – Ms. Ortiz opened to Section 4.0 with Form 48. Ms. Ortiz stated this item was on hold and asked if it was still on hold. Ms. DeBarge confirmed that this item is still on hold.

There were no further comments or concerns from the members.

Agenda Item 5 – Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas (Lex Treepaisan – Frontier Communications & Jeremy Harmon – Verizon Wireless, moved

from Routine Revision – 3/15/23, moved from Compliance – 6/17/24) – 11/20/2024 – Ms. Ortiz opened to Strand Mounted Antennas. Mr. Treepaisan and Mr. Harmon were going to look at Section 3.15 to see if it could be re-worded. Mr. Treepaisan stated that they did not get the opportunity to work on the language with Mr. Harmon but that he does have some thoughts when looking at Section 3.15 and incorporating the height of attachment at the height of the antenna and a two foot clearance beyond that, but he wants to run it by Mr. Harmon before presenting anything. Mr. Treepaisan asked that this item to be tabled for next month.

There were no further questions or comments from the members.

Agenda Item 6 - Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Routine Handbook Review (Kay Black – AT&T California - 2/19/25) – Ms. Black asked for the packet to be displayed on the screen(see attached). Ms. Black stated she saw Mr. Harmon and Mr. Treepaisan read the documents in the packet and asked if any other members had time to review it or if they had any questions. Ms. Black stated she had some questions on the blue highlights. Ms. Black stated the blue under item number twelve she finds the timeline there if they go with GO 165 as standard then she does not believe it should be ten years there. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he feels the same way, but that he noticed that in SCE's approved maintenance plan it is the ten-year cycle indicated and that is what was approved back in 2010 or 2011. Ms. Black stated that the reason AT&T California is bringing this up is because the maintenance program is allowed the way their company wants and needs to do it but the shared cost portion of the maintenance program should be based upon not what each company wants to do, but on a standard for the GO 165 table. Ms. Black stated that is where the edits she is doing are coming from and using that as a standard and not the approved program for each particular company. Mr. Harmon stated that he would like to caution all that this creates a condition of reinforced poles. Mr. Harmon stated it just needs to be explained because when it is talking about inspection, is it an intrusive inspection or a visual inspection because GO 165 has both. Ms. Black stated she will work with Mr. Harmon on redefining to make it more standard based on GO 165. Mr. Treepaisan stated adding intrusive inspection would satisfy that. Ms. Black stated that she would add intrusive.

Ms. Black then moved on to retagging. She stated that they have one utility that they are sharing costs with where they could retag the same pole five times in one year and AT&T California does not understand this and want to bring up the discussion on how the retagging process works. Ms. Black wanted to know if there was a formal plan to go out and see if the tag is there. Mr. Picazo asked if there were any specific examples Ms. Black could share with SCE so they could look into and see what is going on. Ms. Black stated she sent an example over to Mr. Pearson at SCE. Mr. Picazo stated he would look into it. Mr. Picazo stated that Mr. Van Stryk had also mentioned some issues as well and asked if he could send them to him so they can go over it offline. Mr. Van Stryk stated it was more

of a when SCE was doing inspections and the old pole tags being retagged on new poles using the old pole tag. Mr. Van Stryk stated it is not a big deal, just twice the work when they have to go back out. Mr. Picazo asked Mr. Van Stryk if he does have the examples if he could send them so that SCE can address it so the same issue is not being dealt with. Mr. Van Stryk stated that it is an old EV (Edison-Vernon) tag being reused on a brand-new set pole, so someone has to go back and retag it with a V pole tag.

Ms. Black asked if the members would like to put some structure around this item for example not being billed more than X amount in a year or five years. Mr. Van Stryk stated that the amount of times trucks pull off tags and high vis signs, they could go out there every day all day in some industrial areas and just do vis signs and retags from trucks taking them when they drive through, especially when they are close to corners. He stated he does not think you could put a number on it. He stated he does not think it is a huge thing normally tagged for because he does not see it often due to being in a small city. Ms. Black asked if AT&T California was the only member that has concerns about this. Ms. Ortiz stated they probably see it more often because AT&T California has more joint poles with SCE than the rest of the membership, but that if it is concerning to AT&T California then they do need to do something about it. Ms. Ortiz stated she has noticed they will get a pole that was retagged one year then retagged the next year figuring it is just in a bad area. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California will take another look at this one and continue to move on. Mr. Van Stryk stated that what AT&T California could do is ask for the member retagging to send a Form 48 with a photo and store it away and if it happens again to compare the two photos. Ms. Black stated that she will take it offline with the utilities that they are working with. Mr. Van Stryk mentioned that the utility should be taking photos themselves before and after for inspection repairs.

Ms. Black asked for a reinforced pole where it says within five years. She stated that she has been learning about stubbing and reinforcing poles and that Osmos has done many presentations to both the SCJPC and NCJPA and that they say a stubbed pole has so many years of life left after they place trusses. Ms. Black stated she would like to know why it says five years if they are going to get more than 20 years of life out of that pole. Mr. Harmon asked if they are warranting the product. He asked if LADWP who has been using trusses for a long time has actual evidence where they have trussed a pole and 30 years later it is still performing as desired, then they could have reason to move those five years out a lot. Ms. Black stated she was unsure if Osmos warranties it. She asked members who truss a pole what their plan for pole replacement is or their criteria they are using. Ms. Black asked if the members could ask if their companies have defined the replacement plan after a pole has been reinforced and come back with information next month to discuss. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California does not want to pay for a pole to be reinforced and in the industry it is supposed to last 20 years but because it is year six now they have the pole being replaced, they cannot get their money back for the truss. She

stated over a lot of pole replacements it is a lot of money being paid out on trusses. Ms. Black reiterated that the homework assignment for members is to go back and see if your company has defined the replacement plan after the pole has been reinforced.

Ms. Black stated that she would like members to look at the edits as well. Ms. Black is going to be positive that all the members will agree GO 165 is going to be the standard and then she will send Ms. Pranata her next set of edits that have used this information as a standard and she will have more discussion items to go over with the members.

There were no further questions or comments from the members.

Agenda Item 7 – Miscellaneous Issues –

- Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any miscellaneous items.
There were no comments or concerns from the members.

Agenda Item 8 – Review of Action items/JPA Alerts –

- Ms. Ortiz will work on the example showing the base owner to relinquish and one of the remaining members to renumber.
- Mr. Treepaisan will meet up with Mr. Harmon to discuss Section 3.15 for Item 1798: Strand Mounted Antennas.
- The members are to review Mr. Black's edits and to specifically ask their companies what the replacement plan is after a pole has been reinforced.

The Meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m. until April 16, 2025.

Transcribed by Anali Spencer – Committee Staff

Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas

94.4 Clearances

- A. Antennas and supporting elements below supply lines shall maintain a vertical clearance of 6 feet from Supply Conductors operating at 0 – 50kV. (See [Figure 94-1](#))
 - B. Antennas and supporting elements below communication lines shall maintain a 2 ft. vertical separation from communication conductors and equipment. (See [Figure 94-1](#))
 - C. Antennas, associated equipment (e.g. terminations, enclosures) and support elements installed above supply lines and/or communication lines of different ownership attached to the same structure shall maintain the vertical clearances specified in [Rule 38, Table 2, Case 21, Columns A - H](#).
- Note: Other vertical clearances between communication equipment and supply lines are specified in [Rule 32.1.072](#).
- D. Antennas, associated equipment (e.g. terminations, enclosures) and support elements, installed above supply lines and/or communication lines of different ownership, shall maintain the radial clearances from unattached supply and communication lines specified in [Rule 38, Table 2, Case 3](#).
 - E. Antennas shall maintain a 2 ft. horizontal clearance from centerline of pole when affixed between supply and communication lines or below communication lines. (See [Figure 94-1](#))
 - F. Horizontal clearances from centerline of the pole for Antennas, associated equipment and support elements, affixed between supply lines or at the top of a climbable pole, are not specified, but must be arranged so that the pole may be climbed safely.
 - G. Antennas shall have a vertical clearance above ground as specified in [Rule 37, Table 1, Column 6, Cases 1 -6a](#). (See [Figure 94-1](#))

Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas

Anali Spencer

From: Angela Pranata
Sent: Tuesday, May 2, 2023 9:52 AM
To: Anali Spencer
Subject: Fw: Antennas - Types ,Clearances and the Purchasing of Space
Attachments: example pole.png; 4 cables one antenna attached to cable.png; 4 cables one antenna attached to cable - pic 2.png

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Monday, May 8, 2023 8:00 AM
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: IMPORTANT, MTG

Angela Pranata
Manager of Operations
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee
909-599-3801 x8
Cell: 909-451-3024
angela@scjpc.net

From: Nick Van Stryk <nick@petrellelectric.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 2:22 PM
To: JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; 'Earle Carrion' <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>
Cc: AT&T (Joint Pole) Kay Black <kayblack@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; 'john.bacon at ladwp.com' <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; Lex Treepaisan <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>
Subject: Antennas - Types ,Clearances and the Purchasing of Space

Good Afternoon,

I have been sent a set of plans regarding antenna attachments and I keep getting mixed answers.

I am trying to understand how an antenna attached to a pole requires one clearance but once an Antenna is attached to the messenger it no longer is required to mean as much of a separation. I have attached an image of a pole in which the member has submitted plans to install an antenna. They do not plan on attaching the antenna to the pole. I can only assume then that the antenna will be on a messenger.

There is no purchase of interest required. My concern is that they are sharing an arm and will (with the added weight) also end up sagging into the line below them. If they installed a vertical 12" stand off to maintain the separation; the equipment would still not be 12" apart.

As you can see in an example I found, in the photos "4 cables one antenna", their attachment is not radially separated. The most recent attachment on the pole is the antenna owner.

My question is how can an antenna attached to a messenger be exempt from the rules of 94.4 which apply to antennas on a pole? I don't completely understand what is exempting antennas on a messenger from the clearances in 94.4. I

Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas

don't understand why the requirements exist for when it is attached direct to an arm or pole and then no longer are required after they are installed 2ft off the pole.

Respectfully,

Nicholas Van Stryk • *P.E. Electrical* • **Direct:** 323.583.8811 Ext. 618 • **Cell:** 818.300.4682

Service Planning • Electrical Inspections • SCJPC Representative • Fiber Services • GIS Coordinator

Petrelli **ELECTRIC CO.**

SAFETY • QUALITY • SERVICE

ST. LIC. 444795

Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Handbook Review

Sec 2.7H Approved Maintenance Programs and Sec 19.5 Inspection and treatment of Poles (edits in red) Questions in purple/yellow The text in question is in blue highlight

Sec 2.7H

H. Approved Maintenance Program

Per Section 19.5, those utilities currently involved in an approved inspection/inspection & treatment program are shown below:

Member Date of Board Approval

SCE (Edison) October 1993*steel stub/fiberglass April 2007-wrap added

M (DWP) July 2000

MP (Pasadena) July 2000

J (Riverside) June 2001

MA (Azusa) August 2001

D (City of Anaheim) January 2006

BVE (Bear Valley Electric) January 2006

LLW (City of Lompoc) March 2009

B (City of Burbank) April 2016

All inspection/inspection and treatment joint pole authorizations will be final billed within three years of inspection date. ~~May only be billed once every 5 years.~~

Billing criteria and inspection intervals for shared costs must meet the intrusive inspection requirement in GO 165, Table 1.

Wood Poles under 15 years cannot be billed.

Poles over 15 years that have been inspected/treated can be billed, if inspection results are shared with the other owners.

Poles that pass Inspection can only be billed every 20 years.

Inspections completed prior to the members Board approval date, cannot be billed to other members. (Revised April 2016).

Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Handbook Review

19.5 Inspection, or Inspection and Treatment of Poles

Inspection, or inspection and treatment of joint poles subject to GO 165 or GO 95 may be made by any joint owner without expense to the other owner(s).

Billing criteria and inspection intervals for shared costs must meet the intrusive inspection requirement in GO 165, Table 1.

Wood Poles under 15 years cannot be billed.

Poles over 15 years that have been inspected/treated can be billed, if inspection results are shared with the other owners.

Poles that pass Inspection can only be billed every 20 years.

When an approved maintenance program exists (see Glossary), the expense will be shared equally by each owner of the pole (See Item 12, may include item 6, and 15. See Section 2.7H for members with approved maintenance program). ~~May only be billed once every 5 years. (January 2012).~~

Jointly Owned Communication Only Poles:

Proximity of the pole must meet GO 95 Rule 80.1-B for poles located in High Fire Threat Districts. The minimum age and inspection interval must meet the intrusive inspection requirement in GO 165, Table 1. If the above conditions are met, any member occupant of that communication only pole may perform the intrusive inspection on that pole, and equally share cost among all members owners on that pole.

Note: Any occupant can conduct Patrol or Detailed inspections of their facilities on these poles per GO 95 at any time and shall not bill other Members. The Intrusive Inspection's results shall be retained per GO 95 Rule 80.1-B results and shall be available to any other occupant on the pole if requested. (January 2025).

No change to Item 6.

6. Pole Stubbing (stub-size):

(a) 8 ft. metal truss.....	1571
(b) 10 ft. metal truss.....	1966
(c) 11 ft. metal truss.....	2097
(d) 12 ft. metal truss.....	1877
(e) 13 ft. metal truss	2357
(f) 14 ft. metal truss.....	2749
(g) 15.5 ft. metal truss	2749
(h) Additional metal trusses (all sizes).....	1571
(i) Inaccessible to stubbing equipment.....	1719

Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Handbook Review

Changes to Item 12 in red.

12. Pole Inspections and Treatment

- (a) Reserved for future use
- (b) Partial Dig..... 302
- (c) Sound and Bore..... 306
- (d) Full Treatment..... 306
- (e) Reject..... 306
- ~~Note: May only be billed once every 5 years (Effective May 2011):~~
- (f) Re-inspection of reinforced poles (may only be billed once every 10 years, effective 06/01/2011)..... 403

See question below for Item 12F.

Questions on Item 15: Is there a limit on how many times the same pole can be re-tagged? Can we agree to the amount and add it here?

15. Pole Marking – Maintenance items only (Revised 11/17/2021)

- (a) Re-Tagging..... 128
- (b) Replacing Visibility Strips 150

19.7 Reinforcement of Poles

Poles may be reinforced with steel sleeve, fiberglass wrap, stubs/trussing, mod/poles, etc. by mutual agreement with other owners of record. (See Authorized Costs Items 6, 17 or 18)

The reinforcing Member is responsible for placing the pole tag as specified by good construction standards, as well as for miscellaneous hardware, i.e., visibility strips, pole steps, etc.

Other items which may be associated with the reinforcement process, such as asphalt or concrete

repairs (see Section 19.6), shall be shared equally with all owners.

The added labor cost to the base cost of reinforcement resulting from risers or other facilities which increase the labor cost shall be borne by the owner of such facilities.

It is not the intent of this rule to prohibit reinforcing in emergencies where advance approval cannot be obtained.

If replacement of reinforced pole is desired by one joint owner within five years, following date of conflict?

if 5 years why is Item 12F 10 years does this

the reinforcement, this owner shall reimburse the other owner(s) for its proportion of the original reinforcement costs. Where joint owners agree to replace reinforced pole for mutual benefit, the reimbursement shall not apply. In all cases, pulling, transporting, and disposing shall be a joint expense and shall apply to pole only. (Refer to Section 2.7D)(Revised 3/15/2023)

Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Handbook Review

Do we need a "may only bill xxxx timeframe on these two items?"

17. Wood pole fiberglass wrap restoration:

(a) Pole set in dirt (8 ft. standard).....	1810
(b) Pole set in asphalt (includes cost of \$140 for asphalt / 8 ft. standard).....	2427
(c) Pole set in concrete (includes cost of \$245 for concrete / 8 ft. standard).....	2428
(d) Additional foot exceeding 8 ft. standard.....	116

18. Mod pole material and installation:

(a) 9'.....	4694
(b) 14'.....	1438
(c) 18'.....	1663

GO165 Table

**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	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.