

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

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

April 16, 2025

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:02 a.m., via teleconference.

Those in attendance were:

Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Silvana Ray	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Ms. Carla Stephen	Southern California Edison
Ms. Shelby Mulvehill	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kristoffer Scheetz	Southern California Edison
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Aaron Cochran	AT&T California
Mr. Robert Stanard	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Aaron Covhran	AT&T California
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Jacqueline Costa	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Effinger	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. John Vu	City of Anaheim
Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Ms. Maribel Sanchez	Teleport Communications America
Mr. Irvin Orzuna	City of Glendale
Mr. Aproorv Verma	City of Glendale
Mr. Salvador Zambrano	City of Burbank
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Mr. Phillip Hinojos	City of Colton
Mr. Hien Vuong	City of Azusa
Mr. Joseph DeLaTorre	City of Azusa
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Mr. David Campo	City of Lompoc
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)

Mr. Claudia Arellano	City of Vernon
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Johnny Villalobos	M-Power Communications
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Tamara Zaki	Boldyn Networks US LLC
Ms. Maggie Howell	ATC-Outdoor DAS, LLC
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Bacon, President of SCJPC, called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m. Mr. Bacon then proceeded with roll call. When the roll call was completed Frontier Communications (FTR), Verizon Wireless (ATC), City of Pasadena (MP), and AT&T Mobility (LAC) were not in attendance.

Mr. Bacon proposed waiving the attendance penalty fee for members who missed the Administrative Board meeting due to attending the GO 95 Rules Committee Meeting. Mr. Vuong supported this suggestion, explaining his recent absences were due to other commitments and his backup, Mr. Silva, is on sick leave. Mr. Vuong requested Ms. Pranata to change the City of Azusa's contact from Mr. Silva to Mr. DeLaTorre. Ms. Pranata advised Mr. Vuong to email her so she could update the member contact information on the website. She also inquired if an excused absence had been granted for those who missed the Administrative Board meeting. Mr. Van Stryk opposed Mr. Bacon's suggestion, stating that the absent members belong to large companies capable of sending representatives to both meetings.

After further discussion, it was decided not to grant excused absences for those who missed the Administrative Board meeting.

Mr. Vuong inquired about penalties for the City of Azusa missing meetings. Ms. Pranata stated that penalties depend on the City's attendance percentage, which is available on the website. She explained that members falling below 50% attendance will be penalized.

There were no further questions or comments.

HOUSEKEEPING:

Mr. Bacon requested that members who are teleconferencing mute their phones so that no interference is picked up. He added that if the teleconferencing members must step away from the meeting to please inform the chair when they leave and return to the meeting, in the event that a vote call transpired in their absence. Additionally, he asked members, before speaking, to please state their name and company first, then proceed with comments or questions. If someone else is talking, please do not talk over them because it is hard to hear and incoherent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Bacon inquired whether the members had reviewed the minutes of March 19, 2025, Administrative Board meeting and if there were any comments, additions, deletions, or revisions. In that there were no corrections, Mr. Bacon then solicited a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Van Stryk motioned to accept the March 19, 2025, minutes as written. Mr. Dailey seconded the motion, which after the vote tally was completed, passed. However, Mr. Vuong abstained.

There were no questions or comments.

MANAGER'S REPORT

Ms. Pranata reported that the March 2025 Gross Expenses/Capital Investments were \$117,699.06. The members were assessed the same amount. The amount was higher than usual due to the recent office staff hires.

There were no questions or comments.

COMMUNICATIONS:

There were no Communications.

SPECIAL REPORTS:

There were no Special Reports.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Authorized Cost ad hoc Committee

Mr. Van Stryk reported this ad hoc committee met last month. Discussed were *Item 1801: Review of Pole Price Calculations*, *Item 1802: Review of Authorized Cost Calculations*, and *Item 1803: Review of Authorized Tree Trimming Costs for Jointly Owned Space*.

He directed the members to the minutes for all the details.

Compliance ad hoc Committee

Ms. Dizon reported this ad hoc committee met last month. Discussed was grounding on steel poles. Ms. LaMon and Mr. Harmon are collaborating to develop appropriate documentation language for grounding on steel poles. However, due to conflicting schedules and pending meetings with their internal teams, they have not yet had the opportunity to convene.

For additional information, she referred the members to the meeting minutes.

Computer Communications ad hoc Committee

Ms. Ray reported this ad hoc committee met last month. Ms. Pranata was to inquire with the web developer whether additional member requests will incur a fee or be provided at no charge, given that all requests were due by November 2024.

She directed the members to the minutes for all the details.

Routine Revision ad hoc Committee

Ms. Ortiz reported this ad hoc committee met last month. Discussed was the necessity of creating an example for the base owner to relinquish from a pole, which is currently in progress. Additionally, the ad hoc committee reviewed the proposed edits to the approved maintenance program, which will continue at the next Routine Revision meeting.

For additional information, she referred the members to the meeting minutes.

Basic JPA Training ad hoc Committee

Ms. Dizon reported this ad hoc committee met last month. Ms. Allen dedicated additional hours to billing training and presenting her PowerPoint slides on billing out of sequence to the members, which received positive feedback. She will continue creating videos on this topic. Ms. Allen cannot proceed to other training topics until the billing out of sequence series is completed.

For additional information, she referred the members to the meeting minutes.

Operating Committee

Mr. Treepaisan's absence resulted in no report being provided.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

There was no Consent Calendar.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

Future in-person meetings: May 21, 2025 and October 2025

Ms. Pranata announced that members plan to meet in person on May 21, 2025. She inquired whether the office should provide coffee, water, and morning refreshments, such as muffins or croissants. Mr. Bacon confirmed this.

Ms. Pranata will send a survey to all members to determine the number of attendees from each company, their lunch requirements, and any dietary restrictions.

Please note that companies attending the in-person meeting will be responsible for the cost of food and drinks for their attendees. This amount will be added to the monthly membership invoice.

There were no further questions or comments.

OTHER ITEMS:

Unfinished Business

- Item 1581: Pole Record Redesign – OPERATING (10/16/2013) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1597: Review of Routine Handbook examples – ROUTINE REVISION (5/19/2015) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1630: CPUC Updates – COMPLIANCE (2/14/2018) – **ON HOLD**
- Item 1658: Environmental Issues – COMPLIANCE (1/16/2019, moved from Admin Board 1/15/2020) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1776: Establishing a Timeline and Codified Process for Mutual benefit of Pole Replacements - ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD (3/17/2021, Moved from COMPLIANCE 6/18/2021) – **ON HOLD**
- Item 1789: Intrusive Inspection for Communication Only Poles in Fire Tier 3 – COMPLIANCE (1/18/2023) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1793: Section 4.0 with Form 48 – ROUTINE REVISION (10/18/2023) - **ON HOLD**
- Item 1798: Strand Mounted Antennas – ROUTINE REVISION (11/20/2024) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Routine Handbook Review – ROUTINE REVISION (2/19/2025) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1800: Approved Maintenance Program Review – COMPLIANCE (2/19/2025) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1801: Review of Pole Price Calculations – AUTHORIZED COSTS (2/29/2025) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1802: Review of Authorized Cost Calculations – AUTHORIZED COSTS (2/29/2025) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1803: Review of Authorized Tree Trimming Costs for Jointly Owned Space – AUTHORIZED COSTS (2/29/2025) **(STILL OPEN)**

All items remain open at this time.

Closed Items

There were no closed items.

Mr. Bacon remarked that reading these items aloud at every meeting is mundane and repetitive. He suggested noting their status as posted in the agenda and asking members to review the open items. This would save time and avoid unnecessary repetition. He invited comments on this approach, and Ms. Black agreed.

New Business

Known Items:

There were no Know Items.

There were no further questions or comments.

Unknown Items:

New Billing Accounts for Emergency Work (Section 7.6)

Ms. Black asked if members could establish a billing account for emergency work, distinct from the BAU (business as usual) work. Ms. Black clarified that each member has billing accounts, such as AT&T California (HLA) and Edison, account number 601. Ms. Black proposed appending additional digits to the account number for emergency work. Ms. Black explained that account 601 is designated for BAU work, while account numbered 601## (601 followed by two digits) is used for emergency work. When the JPA indicates Section 7.6, it signifies emergency work, allowing all teams to quickly identify the costs associated with it. Mr. Bacon asked if Ms. Black is seeking storm work trackers for JPAs that specify the storm. Ms. Black confirmed, stating it would be Section 7.6B, and members agreed to include the storm name and date on their Form 2. Ms. Black noted that Ms. Pranata agreed it would be feasible for billers to create a spreadsheet for the emergency billing account(s), identifying whether the JPA pertains to damage, a 7.6B storm, fire, or disaster. This spreadsheet would accompany the billing account, allowing members to quickly itemize emergency expenditures. Mr. Van Stryk requested an example from Ms. Black, as he is unfamiliar with the billing accounts. Ms. Black asked Ms. Pranata to display Section 20, *SCJPC Bill Number Codes*, from the Routine Handbook on the screen. Ms. Pranata shared the sheet, and Mr. Bacon noted that members previously included the specific storm name on the JPA. Mr. Van Stryk asked if Ms. Black is suggesting adding these numbers to Form 2 or if SCJPC will create new numbers for emergency work, noting he has never entered these numbers before. Ms. Black clarified that Mr. Van Stryk would not enter these numbers; the SCJPC office uses them when creating Form 44s. For example, Edison and City of Vernon use account 622, and the SCJPC office labels Form 44 with the month, year, and account number. Ms. Black proposed using account 622 for BAU work, and an account like 62276 (as an example) for damage or emergency work under Section 7.6. Ms. Black noted that while smaller utilities may have fewer instances, AT&T California's volume is substantial, making it cumbersome to identify emergency work within BAU work. Mr. Van Stryk asked if this responsibility would fall to the billers. Ms. Pranata confirmed that the SCJPC would add the bill numbers for those sections. Mr. Van Stryk asked if this approach would help differentiate between disasters. Ms. Black confirmed, noting that Ms. Pranata agreed SCJPC would create a spreadsheet specifying the Section and the disaster. Ms. Black clarified that Section 7.6A incidents, like car hit pole, would not be named as they are simply damages. However, for Section 7.6B, Edison will list the disaster name and date on the JPA, such as "windstorm" or "Eaton fire." Billers will then record this information in a spreadsheet associated with the specific billing account. Mr. Van Stryk questioned the necessity for billers to perform these tasks, suggesting that AT&T California should be responsible for verifying the information on Form 2, ensuring the numbers are accurate, identifying

emergency work, and addressing it accordingly. Mr. Van Stryk asserted that Ms. Black is essentially requesting billers to manage AT&T California's tasks, which could be handled internally by AT&T California. Mr. Van Stryk stated that is a lot of work for billers to do if only a couple members benefit. Ms. Ray added that she would need to consult with finance to assess the impact on Edison. Ms. Black asked whether Ms. Ray would investigate the impact of an additional billing account on Edison. Ms. Ray confirmed she would inquire about the potential effects. Ms. Black explained that the impact on AT&T California would be the addition of a Form 44, which they would need to pay. The benefit would be having the data readily available for their risk management team, consolidated into one billing account for emergency identification. Mr. Van Stryk expressed that while he is not against an additional billing account, he opposes having billers categorize each incident, such as disasters or car hit pole, as it is driven by AT&T California's internal billing structure. Mr. Van Stryk inquired who determines the specific tasks billers must perform and what information is required on Form 2 for them to complete these tasks. He emphasized that this responsibility should lie with the utility. Mr. Van Stryk believes that billers should not be responsible for this work. Ms. Black asked if Mr. Van Stryk is opposed to the new spreadsheet that billers would maintain, rather than the new billing account itself. She assured the committee that AT&T California could handle this internally and forgo the spreadsheet. Ms. Black asked Ms. Pranata to correct her if needed and clarified that using the emergency bill number code for Section 7.6B would not create additional work for billers. Ms. Pranata confirmed this, noting that billers would only require training. Ms. Pranata asked if this applies to both Section 7.6A and Section 7.6B. Ms. Black confirmed that it does. Ms. Black concluded the discussion, asking if there were any further questions. She noted that Edison will review the impact on their financial team and requested other members to do the same. The discussion will continue next month.

Priority Billing (Fire)

Ms. Black stated that AT&T California wants to define priority billing for fires, requiring Cal Fire to determine the cause first. This is because Cal Fire can quickly identify causes like lightning or a lawn mower. However, if an SCJPC member could be responsible, AT&T California prefers not to prioritize those JPAs until Cal Fire confirms the cause is unrelated to a non SCJPC member. Ms. Black added that they are requesting those JPAs to hold off on billing until all members have agreed on the process. Mr. Van Stryk inquired if Ms. Black is suggesting that, in the event of a building fire that damages lines or causes them to fall onto another building, members should wait for a report on the fire's cause before proceeding with the work. Ms. Black replied no, and only in fires when Cal Fire would be involved. Mr. Bacon inquired if AT&T California will refrain from conducting business with the members until Cal Fire issues an official statement regarding the cause of the fire. Ms. Black clarified that AT&T California does not want to make any payments at this time. Ms. Black explained that AT&T California does not want to pay the final bill of the work that was stored on the joint pole until Cal Fire determines that it was a non SCJPC member. Mr. Van Stryk inquired if AT&T California does not want to put lines up. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California will be restoring service, however, does not want to pay for the work stored on the joint pole until Cal Fire confirms that the cause was unrelated to an SCJPC member. Mr. Van Stryk stated he does not see how Cal Fires designation

changes ownership on a pole. Mr. Bacon stated that it is illegal and asked Ms. Black to confirm if it is a legal stipulation or warning that one cannot indemnify themselves in cases involving financial transactions and other activities related to the pole. Mr. Bacon then stated it should be business as usual because AT&T California is a member, and the membership doesn't end because there's a question mark on liability. Mr. Bacon added that LA DWP will continue sending JPAs to AT&T California because he needs to install the pole and must follow the established rules and notification procedures for other members.

After some further discussion Ms. Black expressed her appreciation for the members' feedback and assured them that she would relay it to AT&T California's legal team. Ms. Black clarified that members should continue processing Form 2 preliminaries, with the roadblock placed only at the payment stage, final bill part, as requested by AT&T California. Ms. Black concurred that members should continue with the Form 2 preliminary to ensure service restoration. Ms. Black concluded by requesting members to relay this information to their respective companies and suggested continuing the discussion next month when the other utilities from the Rules Committee return.

There were no further questions or comments.

Policy Changes (standing agenda item)

There were no Policy Changes.

SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:

Ms. Pranata reiterated that the May 21, 2025, meeting at the San Dimas office is optional. She confirmed that an online meeting will be available for members who cannot attend in person.

Future meetings that will be remote were scheduled as follows:

Administrative Board	5/21/2025	9:00 a.m.	Teleconference (MS TEAMS)
Operating Committee	5/21/2025	Following	Administrative Board
Authorized Costs Committee	5/21/2025	Following	Operating Committee
Routine Revision Committee	5/21/2025	Following	Authorized Costs Committee
Compliance Committee	5/21/2025	Following	Routine Revision Committee
Computer Committee	5/21/2025	Following	Compliance Committee
Basic JPA Training	5/21/2025	Following	Computer Committee

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Bacon adjourned the meeting at 9:46 a.m. until May 21, 2025.

Mr. Bacon, President

Ms. Angela Pranata, Manager of Operations

Transcribed by Ms. Kathleen Allen - Committee Staff