

## **Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

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

June 18, 2025

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:01 a.m., via teleconference.

Those in attendance were:

Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Ms. Carla Stephen	Southern California Edison
Ms. Shelby Mulvehill	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Micheal Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Samuel Picazo	Southern California Edison
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Aaron Cochran	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Casanova	AT&T California
Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
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. Michael Truong	City of Burbank
Mr. Salvador Zambrano	City of Burbank
Mr. Joe Armstrong	City of Pasadena
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Ms. Dianell Caamano	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Hien Vuong	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. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Tamara Zaki	Boldyn Networks US LLC
Ms. Maggie Howell	ATC-Outdoor DAS, 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 9:01 a.m. Mr. Bacon then proceeded with roll call. When the roll call was completed Verizon Wireless (ATC), City of Colton (F), and Sonic Telecomm, LLC (STL) were not in attendance.

There were no 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 May 21, 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. Bacon motioned to accept the May 21, 2025, minutes as written. Mr. Treepasian seconded the motion, which after the vote tally was completed, passed unanimously.

There were no questions or comments.

### **MANAGER'S REPORT**

Ms. Pranata reported that the May 2025 Gross Expenses/Capital Investments were \$152,887.46. The members were assessed the same amount. The amount was higher than usual due to three paydays in the month of May.

There were no questions or comments.

## **COMMUNICATIONS:**

### *Gateway Cities Council of Government (COG) membership applications update*

Ms. Pranata spoke with a representative from the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, who asked a few questions and indicated they are prepared to submit the required documents. Ms. Pranata reminded them that a non-refundable application fee of \$2,200 is also required. Currently, SCJPC is still awaiting both the application fee and the necessary documentation.

There were no questions or comments.

## **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**

Mr. LaMon reported this ad hoc committee met last month. Discussions continued regarding the replacement of wood poles with steel poles. Members inquired about industry standards for assessing damaged steel poles. It was recommended that a structural engineer evaluate the damage and provide a professional assessment. Additionally, members were asked to internally discuss the development of a maintenance program or standards for such a program.

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

### **Computer Communications ad hoc Committee**

Ms. DeBarge reported this ad hoc committee met last month. 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. The ad hoc reviewed the example on how a base owner can relinquish ownership of a pole, which is included in the Discussion Calendar. Also briefly discussed the approved maintenance program,

and that conversation will continue during the next Routine Revision Committee meeting.

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

### **Basic JPA Training ad hoc Committee**

Ms. LaMon reported this ad hoc committee met last month. Ms. Allen is continuing to develop additional training materials for billing out of sequence and plans to increase the number of hours dedicated to this effort.

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

### **Operating Committee**

Mr. Treepaisan reported this ad hoc committee met last month. Discussed were the usual agenda items, with the main highlight being a discussion on potential new billing software or the standardization of submission processes, which ties into *Item 1806: Standardized Excel Form*.

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

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

There was no Consent Calendar.

### **DISCUSSION CALENDAR:**

*Interpretation of Routine Handbook: EXAMPLE: B14 – Relinquishment by base owner*

(in packet and emailed 6/4/2025)

Ms. Pranata displayed *Relinquishment by Base Owner Example B14* on the screen. Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion by explaining that this case involves the base owner relinquishing their interest in the pole. Typically, the first joint owner assumes the base owner's position. A new pole number is then required in order to finalize the billing for this JPA.

Mr. Bacon stated that the item looks good, and Ms. Ortiz noted that, with no objections, it can be moved to the consent calendar for next month.

Mr. Armstrong inquired whether a base owner could relinquish ownership of a pole if there is a tenant on it.

Ms. Ortiz responded that, to her understanding, relinquishment is only possible if one of the other joint owners agrees to assume responsibility for the tenant.

Ms. DeBarge and Mr. Treepaisan both agreed with this interpretation. Mr. Treepaisan added that a base owner cannot relinquish ownership if they still have tenants on the pole.

Mr. Armstrong then asked whether this still applies if the tenant is occupying someone else's space on the pole.

Mr. Treepaisan followed up by asking whether the tenant in question is Mr. Armstrong's, whether they are renting space from him, or if it might be an unauthorized

attachment.

Mr. Armstrong replied that he was unsure, unfortunately, Mr. Armstrong does not know. It could be one or the other. City of Pasadena's tenant records are in poor condition. City of Pasadena has several poles with numerous fiber lines, shared arms, and reconfigurations. Mr. Armstrong stated that he has no idea whose space is whose or whether the City of Pasadena is receiving payment from any of these parties. Mr. Armstrong knows that the City of Pasadena does not have power on the pole and doesn't want anything to do with it.

Mr. Treepaisan stated that if one is the base owner and have tenants on the pole, one cannot relinquish ownership. He clarified that the main issue being addressed is the relinquishment process, whereas the situation described by Mr. Armstrong appears to be more of a records issue related to tenancy and whether those attachments are there or not.

Ms. Ortiz added that if the tenant is also a member, since some members hold both ownership and tenancy, it is possible to ask them to purchase the space.

Mr. Bacon asked how the first joint owner is determined. He inquired whether this is based on the majority of space owned or if there is another method used to identify the first joint owner.

Ms. Smith stated that the first joint owner is determined by senior equity owner, specifically, the party that acquired ownership interest first. She explained that, for example, if E purchased interest in the pole before FTR, and the base owner (M) later decided to relinquish ownership, then E would become the new base owner due to their earlier acquisition.

Mr. Armstrong raised a concern about the accuracy of record corrections, noting that in some cases, records may be updated incorrectly. He referenced a separate line of poles where City of Pasadena does not have power, yet a communication wire appears to have been assigned to them. He suggested that this may have originally been an unauthorized attachment, but it now seems to have been reassigned to City of Pasadena possibly because the responsible party did not want to assume tenancy.

Ms. Black stated that Mr. Armstrong simply needs to relinquish interest and indicate that the City of Pasadena is not present on the pole. She added that, hopefully, someone may be able to identify the other cable through its tag.

Mr. Armstrong responded that he had inspected the line but was unable to locate any cable tags. He expressed uncertainty about whether the cable is even in use. He added that City of Pasadena continues to be listed as an owner on several poles, despite his belief that they were never actually an owner on those poles.

Mr. Treepaisan asked for clarification, noting that the poles in question are not city-owned. He inquired whether they were communication poles or power poles.

Mr. Armstrong responded that they are Edison sub-transmission line poles. He explained that City of Pasadena may be on the first ten poles, but the line continues for another 30 poles. Despite this, City of Pasadena continues to be listed as either an owner or a tenant on many of these poles. He expressed confusion, stating that the line doesn't even enter the city, and he doesn't understand why the City of Pasadena would have ever been assigned ownership or tenancy.

Mr. Armstrong clarified that the pole in question is an Edison communication pole and that the City of Pasadena has never had any attachments on it. However, the communication line was assigned to the City of Pasadena and Mr. Armstrong is unsure who assigned it to the City of Pasadena since the record is old.

Ms. DeBarge asked Mr. Armstrong whether he is receiving unauthorized attachment JPAs or if he is simply seeing this information on a pole card via the SCJPC website.

Mr. Armstrong responded that he receives JPAs when changes are made, and he is subsequently being billed for them.

Ms. DeBarge replied that if he has specific examples, he should reach out to her directly. She added that if the JPAs are coming from SCE and appear to be incorrect, she would be happy to review them with him.

Mr. Armstrong acknowledged the offer and thanked Ms. DeBarge for her assistance.

Ms. Ortiz asked whether the item was acceptable as is, or if a note should be added specifically referencing the point made by Ms. Smith regarding identifying the next base owner on senior equity.

Ms. Black responded that adding a note would likely help prevent future questions.

Ms. Ortiz replied, okay, and then asked whether adding the note would require the item to return to the Discussion Calendar or if it could proceed to the Consent Calendar next month.

Ms. Black confirmed she was comfortable with placing it on the Consent Calendar and asked if any members had objections.

There were no objections. This item will be moved to the Consent Calendar for the July 2025 Administrative Board meeting.

## **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)**
- Item 1804: Replacement of Joint Pole with Solely Owned Pole– ROUTINE REVISION (4/16/2025) **(STILL OPEN)**
- Item 1805: Disaster Pole Replacement ROUTINE REVISION (4/16/2025) **(STILL OPEN)**

All items remain open at this time.

### Closed Items

There were no closed items.

### **New Business**

#### ***Known Items:***

*There were no Know Items.*

There were no further questions or comments.

#### ***Unknown Items:***

*Priority Billing (Fire) K. Black (AT&T California)*

Ms. Black stated that there was unfinished business regarding the Cal Fire email sent out a few weeks ago. She hoped members had shared it with their legal teams and opened the floor for any questions or discussion. She mentioned receiving a couple of questions from one member, which she would address shortly, and asked if anyone else had comments.

Ms. DeBarge asked if the discussion was related to Section 7.6.

Ms. Black clarified that one of the questions she received was whether Cal Fire is the only organization authorized to determine the cause of a fire. She noted that this is a good question and likely depends on geography. In non-municipal (rural) areas, Cal Fire would be the authority, whereas within municipal boundaries, the local fire department would typically have jurisdiction. She emphasized that this was her understanding and invited others to share their expertise.

Mr. Treepaisan explained that Frontier Communications uses its own arson investigator to either refute or collaborate with Cal Fire's findings. He acknowledged that while Cal Fire may be the authority, their conclusions can be disputed, especially in legal proceedings. He emphasized that companies have the option to hire independent investigators.

Ms. Black then asked whether the incident in question occurred within a municipality or in what she referred to as a “Cal Fire district” a rural area. She questioned whether Cal Fire would have jurisdiction in an urban setting like downtown Los Angeles.

Mr. Armstrong stated he does not think so and that the City of Pasadena has its own fire inspector who is responsible for making causational determinations. He explained that, for example, in the case of a structural fire affecting a few properties, Cal Fire would typically not be involved.

Mr. Vuong stated that, as municipalities and utilities, there is a requirement to prepare a Wildfire Mitigation Plan (WMP). Some utilities choose to work with their local fire departments to evaluate these plans. He clarified that while the discussion may not be strictly limited to power lines or overhead facilities, any utility infrastructure located within a High Fire-Threat District (HFTD) as designated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) must be addressed in the plan. He noted that the CPUC provides a map identifying all high fire-threat areas, and utilities are required to submit their WMPs annually to both the CPUC and the Wildfire Safety Advisory Board for evaluation. Utilities may choose to have their plans reviewed by an independent evaluator or by a local fire department, which can help identify risks and recommend mitigation strategies. Mr. Vuong concluded by saying he wasn’t sure if this directly answered the question but wanted to share the information as relevant context.

Mr. Treepaisan mentioned that, based on a quick online search, Cal Fire appears to have contracts with counties. However, there are indications that some areas particularly wildland and forested regions, not under the direct control of federal or local governments may fall outside of Cal Fire’s jurisdiction. These areas are typically rural and may not be governed by cities or municipalities.

Ms. Black suggested revisiting the language used in the current draft. Specifically, she proposed replacing references to "Cal Fire" with broader terms such as "legal authority" or "authorizing agency for the geographic area." This change would ensure the language is inclusive of other entities that may have jurisdiction, especially in areas where Cal Fire is not the responsible agency. She emphasized the importance of confirming whether Cal Fire has full statewide coverage. During the Routine Revision ad hoc, Ms. Black plans to request an item number to formally present these proposed edits. Alternatively, she may revise the language and bring the updated version to the next meeting for further discussion.

Ms. Black stated the second question regarding whether "cause" and "fault" are the same in the context of incident reporting. Mr. Van Stryk asked Ms. Pranata to display Ms. Black’s email for reference.

Mr. Van Stryk noted that this may be more of a legal question. He asked whether, if a local jurisdiction identifies the cause of a fire, it automatically implies that the identified party is at fault.

Mr. Treepaisan responded that this is indeed a legal matter. Based on his experience working with attorneys, including those from Frontier Communications, he explained that while cause and effect can be established, fault typically requires proof of negligence. In other words, to assign blame, there must be evidence that a party failed to act appropriately or responsibly.

Mr. Van Stryk then asked whether fault is determined solely through legal proceedings or if agencies like Cal Fire can make that determination. He used the

example of a car crash involving a drunk driver hitting a pole asking whether fault is immediately assigned or if further investigation is needed.

Mr. Treepaisan clarified that while the cause (e.g., the car hitting the pole) may be clear, determining the fault often involves legal processes. He also noted that settlements or non-disclosure agreements may influence how faults are officially recorded. Ultimately, in such cases, responsibility for damages typically falls on the driver or their insurance provider.

Ms. Black noted that Cal Fire previously listed fire causes on its website, sometimes down to specific sources such as a lawn mower spark. However, this information is no longer publicly posted. Now, formal requests must be submitted to obtain Cal Fire's ruling on cause determination.

Ms. DeBarge expressed concerns from SCE's perspective, emphasizing that the claims process is already established and should remain separate from the JPA process. She highlighted that the current JPA system is significantly backlogged, with over 6,500 "bill after" tasks pending and more than 60,000 poles in the SCJPC backlog. She cautioned that introducing claims into the JPA process would further complicate and delay an already strained system. She also pointed out that many JPAs are already on hold due to recent fires, with joint owners submitting requests to purchase into newly installed poles. These installations often occur as part of emergency response efforts, replacing infrastructure on a like-for-like basis. Delays in billing and record updates are already impacting ongoing and future work.

Ms. Black acknowledged the concerns raised but indicated that AT&T California is being directed to continue moving forward. She explained that while these situations are rare, they tend to be significant when they do occur. From AT&T California's experience, paying upfront and pursuing reimbursement through legal channels often results in multi-year delays in cost recovery.

Ms. Black committed to taking the feedback back to AT&T California's legal team for further discussion. She acknowledged the challenges and emphasized that she does not intend to dismiss Ms. DeBarge's concerns. However, she will proceed with submitting proposed edits to the Routine Handbook during the next Routine Revision Ad Hoc meeting. She also expressed appreciation for the professionalism shown during a difficult conversation and acknowledged the difficulty of representing AT&T California in this context. The members thanked Ms. Black as well.

There were no further questions or comments.

### RF Signage

Ms. LaMon stated that this issue had been raised previously but was never resolved. It has resurfaced in connection with recent Crown Castle projects, where wireless facilities are being installed adjacent to utility poles. In some cases, the electromagnetic energy (EME) levels exceed public exposure limits, requiring the installation of RF exposure signage. Because the EME levels extend to nearby utility poles, signage would need to be placed on those poles. However, if the company (e.g., Crown Castle) does not own the pole, there appears to be no established process for obtaining permission to install signage. Ms. LaMon asked whether any members had concerns with placing RF signage on poles not owned by the installing entity.

Mr. Van Stryk asked whether relocating the poles was an option. Ms. LaMon responded that she was unsure, noting that many of the poles carry power lines and are located on private property. In one specific case, the wireless facility is being installed on a rooftop.

Ms. Black shared that she had encountered a similar situation with AT&T Mobility, where they were not the pole owner. In that case, she had to contact all pole owners to obtain permission for signage placement.

Ms. LaMon added that Crown Castle has initiated a similar outreach process. However, in some instances, the pole owner does not have an established approval process, which has stalled progress. She also raised a related question regarding LADWP's signage rules. While RF signage is typically allowed when small cells are installed on utility poles, it is unclear whether the same rules apply when no small cell is present, but RF exposure still exceeds limits.

Mr. Van Stryk asked whether the RF signage requirement is mandated by the FCC or other regulatory bodies. Ms. LaMon confirmed that it is.

Mr. Van Stryk expressed his personal view that placing warning signage should not be controversial, suggesting that it may be better to install the signs and address any objections later. He noted that warning signs are a basic safety measure.

Ms. LaMon agreed, explaining that the signage is based on the EME report and must be installed at a specific height to remain below the exposure threshold. The signs also include contact information for coordination before work is performed on the affected pole.

Mr. Bacon stated that at LADWP, meters will not be energized unless RF signage is visible during inspection.

Ms. LaMon clarified that in the current case, there is no meter involved because the wireless facility is located elsewhere, and the pole in question is only within the exposure zone.

Mr. Bacon asked whether Crown Castle is required to install the signage.

Ms. LaMon confirmed that, to her understanding, it is a regulatory requirement tied to the facility's approval. Her concern is about the process for obtaining permission to place signage on poles not owned by the installer.

Mr. Bacon explained that LADWP's primary concern is maintaining climbing space. Signage must not obstruct access, particularly below 18 feet or where communication lines are located. LADWP typically advises placing signage within the installer's equipment space, possibly using a guard arm, and not attaching it directly to the pole if avoidable.

Ms. LaMon noted that in some cases, the installer has no equipment or fiber on the pole, which complicates signage placement.

Ms. DeBarge asked if the conversation was related to the recent SCE email regarding RF signage.

Ms. LaMon confirmed and explained that Crown Castle has two sites: one affecting an SCE pole and another involving a pole not owned by SCE. She requested input from all parties on their respective processes for approving signage placement.

Ms. DeBarge responded that Mr. Flores is currently reviewing the matter for SCE and noted that Edison supports Mr. Van Stryk's earlier suggestion regarding signage placement.

Mr. Bacon asked for details about the signage, including type, size, and current usage.

Ms. LaMon replied that she would follow up with specifics but believes the signage is similar to what is used for small cell sites, small placards indicating a safe distance from the antenna and a contact number to request a temporary shutdown for safe access.

Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP will need to review the request internally. He suggested that a placard placed around 8.5 to 9 feet could be a simple and cost-effective solution but emphasized the need to confirm the appropriate height and placement with LADWP management.

Ms. LaMon noted that based on EME reports, signage is typically recommended at approximately 15 feet, which remains below the usable space on the pole.

Mr. Van Stryk supported the 15-foot placement, citing concerns about lower signage being obscured by unauthorized postings.

Mr. Bacon agreed, adding that 15 feet aligns with LADWP's meter placement and is within the line of sight for workers approaching the pole. He reiterated that LADWP would likely support placard use but would confirm internally.

Ms. LaMon offered to send a follow-up email to Mr. Bacon to help move the process forward, noting that project teams are awaiting guidance. Mr. Bacon commented great.

Ms. DeBarge asked whether the RF placard would typically be placed on the equipment itself.

Ms. LaMon clarified that while signage is usually placed where the equipment is located, in this case, the equipment is on a rooftop. Because the RF exposure extends to a nearby utility pole, signage would need to be placed on the pole even though there is no equipment on it.

Mr. Bacon explained that in such scenarios, rooftop antennas often create high RF fields near poles. For example, when climbing a pole adjacent to a rooftop installation, a worker may find themselves just a few feet from an active antenna. He emphasized that placing signage at the antenna height is ineffective, as it may not be visible from all sides or could be obscured. He recommended placing signage at the base of the pole for better visibility and safety.

Ms. LaMon added that the EME report typically specifies how far below the exposure threshold the signage should be placed to ensure it is seen before entering the exposure zone.

Mr. Bacon agreed, stating his thoughts exactly.

Ms. LaMon offered to provide the EME report and its recommended signage height to assist with determining appropriate placement.

Mr. Bacon confirmed that it would be helpful, noting that each utility may have its own standards for signage placement.

Ms. LaMon thanked the members for their input.

There were no further questions or comments.

### *Crown Castle Transition Announcement*

Ms. LaMon announced that she has accepted a new position within the Crown Castle team, which will take her out of the Los Angeles market. As a result, she will be transitioning out of her current role. Ms. Dizon will be stepping in to take her place for the time being.

Ms. LaMon expressed her excitement about the new opportunity and appreciation for the collaboration with the group.

The members congratulated Ms. LaMon on her new role. Mr. Bacon added, good luck and thanked her for being a contributing member. Ms. LaMon has provided fantastic input.

There were no further questions or comments.

Policy Changes (standing agenda item)

There were no Policy Changes.

**SCHEDULE OF FUTURE MEETINGS:**

Future meetings that will be remote were scheduled as follows:

Administrative Board	<b>7/16/2025</b>	<b>9:00 a.m.</b>	Teleconference (MS TEAMS)
Operating Committee	7/16/2025	Following	Administrative Board
Authorized Costs Committee	7/16/2025	Following	Operating Committee
Routine Revision Committee	7/16/2025	Following	Authorized Costs Committee
Compliance Committee	7/16/2025	Following	Routine Revision Committee
Computer Committee	7/16/2025	Following	Compliance Committee
Basic JPA Training	7/16/2025	Following	Computer Committee
Billing Process Simplification	7/16/2025	Following	Basic JPA Training

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Bacon adjourned the meeting at 9:57 a.m. until July 16, 2025.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Bacon, President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ms. Angela Pranata, Manager of Operations

\_\_\_\_\_  
Transcribed by Ms. Kathleen Allen - Committee Staff

# RELINQUISHMENT BY BASE OWNER EXAMPLE B14

(1) This transaction shows the base owner, U1, relinquishing interest on a pole. Typically, the 1<sup>st</sup> joint owner would become the new base owner.

(2) Indicate proper section of Routine to reflect the intention of the JPA.

(3) Show existing pole number in parenthesis. Add a space for the new pole number which is to be provided by U2.

(4) Show the existing pole height in parenthesis. Add the new proposed height below.

(5) U1 to indicate how much of the pole will be cut.

(6) Add the proposed grade and space for U2.

Note: New pole number is required for final billing.

J.P. FORM 2-1 Rev 07/20

### Preliminary

### AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT POLE TRANSACTION

This authorization is in accordance with Joint Pole Agreement and Routine. The undersigned have agreed on Joint work as specified heron.

SCJPC USE ONLY

PAGE NO. 1 OF 1

Date Prepared 5/7/2025 By In Field  By Phone  By Email   
 Date Sent 5/7/2025 Confirming Agreement  Date Completed

Estimated Construction Start Date \_\_\_\_\_ JPA Auth. No. U1-124578

UTILITY	REPRESENTATIVE	PHONE NUMBER/EMAIL	DISTRICT-DIVISION-EXCHANGE	APPROVED	ACCOUNTING DATA
U1	U1REP	888-888-8888	SANTA ANA	U1REP	124578-002
U2	U2REP				
U3	U3REP				

POLE NO.	Pole Length Anchor Size	Year Set	Pole Treat Class Anchor Direct	Record						Proposed						Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons.	
				12KV	C	C				U1	C	C						
				U1	U2	U3				U1	U2	U3						
<u>(3)</u> (123456U1)	<u>(4)</u> (45) 35	1986	FT CL2	39-9	23-5	24-1				<u>(5)</u> C-10	<u>(6)</u> 30-6	24-1			<u>(2)</u> →	U1 TO RELINQUISH INTEREST SEC 5.1-A, U2 TO RENUMBER SEC 5.1-B	1	
____U2											23-5					WARNER AV N/S 55' W/O STANDARD AV	2	
																		3
																		4
																		5
																		6
																		7
																		8
																		9
																		10
																		11
																		12
																		13

**POLE LEGEND:**  
 L = LOWER TOP (Item 5E)  
 P = PULL (Item 5A)  
 P(x) = FOOTAGE CUT  
 PB = PULL BUTT  
 T = TRANSPORT (Item 5E)  
 S = SALVAGE  
 D = DISPOSE (Item 5E)  
 TR = TENANT  
 SCZ = SAFETY CLEARANCE ZONE  
 SCIP = SECTION OF POLE  
 ANCHOR ARM LEGEND:  
 AR = ANCHOR ARM REMOVED  
 AT = ANCHOR ARM TRANSFERRED

Show Quantity of Items to be billed in the Column of Party to be Paid.

↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑  
 GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION  
 SANTA ANA  
 COMMUNITY

FORM 48 SENT \_\_\_\_\_



ITEM 1807 - ROUTINE REVISION COMMITTEE

**CalFire to determine cause of fire prior to any JPA billing - Email from AT&T CA****From** Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>**Date** Fri 5/30/2025 5:54 PM

**To** aaska@anaheim.net <aaska@anaheim.net>; Alex Parra <AParra@riversideca.gov>; April.Debarge@sce.com <April.Debarge@sce.com>; ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com <ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com>; Ben Coffey <bcoffey@banningca.gov>; DAILEY (AT&T CA), TODD M DAILEY <td3494@att.com>; Daniel Lippert <DLippert@burbankca.gov>; David Campo <D\_Campo@ci.lompoc.ca.us>; Heidi Seropian <hseropian@extenetsystems.com>; Hien Vuong (Azusa) <hvuong@azusaca.gov>; John Vu <JVu@anaheim.net>; Bacon John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>; Joint Pole BURBANK <JointPole@burbankca.gov>; BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>; Linda McLean <lmclean@extenetsystems.com>; Marco Murillo <marco.murillo@verizonwireless.com>; Megan Stewart <Megan.Stewart@ftr.com>; Nick Van Stryk (Vernon) <nick@petrellielectric.com>; pb4420@att.com <pb4420@att.com>; Torbati, Iman <ITorbati@ci.vernon.ca.us>

**Cc** ar3752@att.com <ar3752@att.com>; RUIZ, JULIAN <jr4859@att.com>; CONSULTER, BARRY J <bc7572@att.com>; COCHRAN, AARON M <ac1262@att.com>; BARBOSA, MATT <mb8923@att.com>; Troy Stanard <rs2517@att.com>; JOY YOUNG <jv2453@att.com>; Veronica C Romero (vr2931@att.com) <vr2931@att.com>

1 attachment (617 KB)

SCJPC Agreement 1998\_Confidential.pdf;

Good afternoon to SCJPC Members,

I am forwarding this message at the request of Kay Black - AT&amp;T California (member code HLA, HSO, T).

=====

Hello SCJPC Members,

At the May Administrative Board meeting, ATT was asked to point out where in the SCJPC Agreement ATT feels there is justification to ask for CalFire to determine the cause of a fire, prior to Fire Final Bills being processed.

In instances of past fires believed to have been ignited by an SCJPC Member's equipment, ATT has been obligated to pay or incur joint pole costs to replace fire-damaged poles, and then bring suit against that Member and await several years for resolution of the litigation before recouping the joint pole costs it had expended to replace the poles damaged by the SCJPC Member's actions or omissions. ATT does not believe any Member should be obliged to advance joint pole costs to another Member in which that SCJPC Member is suspected or has suggested that it may have had a role in starting the fire. ATT thus believes that waiting for CalFire to determine the fire cause before billing is a fair and practical approach.

Under section 9 of the SCJPC Agreement (attached) it states –

**9. HOLD HARMLESS:**

*Each Member agrees to indemnify, to defend, and to save harmless each other Member, the Committee, the Office, and its and their Directors, Officers, agents, employees, successors and*

*assigns from any and all claims or demands arising out of injuries or death to persons, or damage to property, sustained by any person, either corporate or real, to the extent related to or arising from the negligent act or omission of each such Member or its officers, agents, employees, contractors, tenants, or licensees while exercising the privileges of or performing the duties required by this Agreement, the by-laws, the Routine Handbook, or other governing documents. Each Member shall be proportionately responsible for its own negligent acts and omissions and pay proportionately any judgment for damages awarded to any person, either corporate or real, as a result of such acts or omissions. Each such Member also agrees to pay any and all reasonable costs incurred by any non-culpable Member to defend itself against claims or lawsuits filed as a result of such acts or omissions including reasonable attorney's fees as the court may award for such defense.*

ATT would like to propose the following Routine Handbook edits for section 7.6B at the next meeting. The edits or changes we request are in red:

#### **7.6 B. Replacement of Pole Due to**

#### **Natural Causes Disaster (Storm, Fire, Wind Event, etc. Catastrophe)**

The Member replacing the pole(s) may proceed with replacements prior to issuing Form 2. The Member shall sell interest to each Member concerned. Each Member shall receive salvage on maximum value recoverable and shall pay pulling and transportation. Each Member shall transfer its facilities.

Setting Member must issue Form 2 Preliminary with date and identification of natural cause (Form 48 may be attached). Setting Member must issue Form 2 Preliminary within 180 calendar days from date of pole replacement. After 180 calendar days, section 7.13 will apply unless mutually agreed by all parties to extend.

In cases where the urgency for new pole installation is not immediate, notification rules of this section will still apply, however the rules of 7.11 will be followed to determine “**proposed**” purchase in new pole (Added January 2012).

Section 7.13 does not apply if JPA issued within 180 days of construction (Effective January 2016)

**In areas damaged by a fire, the JPA Form 2 Final is not to be processed until CalFire makes a final decision regarding the cause of the fire. If a Member is found to have caused the fire, they shall submit the Final Bill with zero costs to the other Owners, per the SCJPC Agreement under Section 9 - Hold Harmless.**

Let me know if you have any questions.

Kay Black

AT&T West ACE Joint Pole Staff

2125 Occidental Road

Santa Rosa CA 95401



=====

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