

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

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

July 16, 2025

A regular meeting of the **Administrative Board** took place on the above date, at 9:11 a.m., via teleconference.

Those in attendance were:

Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Silvana Ray	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kristoffer Scheetz	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
Mr. Julian Ruiz	AT&T California
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Aaron Cochran	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	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. Maribel Sanchez	Teleport Communications America
Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Mr. Michael Truong	City of Burbank
Ms. Katia Muradian	City of Pasadena
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Mr. Brian Rehfield	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Ms. Dianell Caamano	AT&T Mobility
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. Linda McLean
Ms. Heidi Seropian
Ms. Tamara Zaki
Ms. Kristen Stathis
Ms. Angela Pranata
Ms. Kathleen Allen

Extenet Systems
Extenet Systems
Boldyn Networks US LLC
ATC-Outdoor DAS, LLC
Committee Staff
Committee Staff

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Bacon, President of SCJPC, called the meeting to order at 9:11 a.m. Mr. Bacon then proceeded with roll call. When the roll call was completed Verizon Wireless (ATC), City of Glendale (A), City of Colton (F), T-Mobile USA (PBM), M-POWER/TelePacific Communications (ICG), 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 reviewed the minutes of June 18, 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. Treepaisan motioned to accept the June 18, 2025, minutes as written. Mr. Dailey 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 June 2025 Gross Expenses/Capital Investments were \$126,356.42 The members were assessed the same amount.

There were no questions or comments.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Gateway Cities Council of Government (COG) membership applications update

- Still waiting for their response package and \$2,200 non-refundable application fee

Ms. Pranata reported that although the agenda noted SCJPC was still awaiting the response package, the package was received the day before the meeting. It includes the letter she previously sent via email, along with the non-refundable application fee.

She requested that members review the letter and provide feedback either via email or during the next Administrative Board meeting.

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

Ms. Dizon reported this ad hoc committee met last month. The committee reviewed the approved maintenance program, and members were asked to hold internal discussions to prepare for a more in-depth conversation at the next Compliance ad hoc Committee meeting. The topic of grounding on steel poles was also discussed. Mr. Bacon confirmed that specifications are ready to be distributed to members, along with a PTX example for reference.

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 and Mr. Treepaisan planned to connect and review examples of the various versions of Form 2 that have been received for final billing.

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. Briefly discussed the approved maintenance program. The ad hoc committee also reviewed the proposed edits to Section 7.6B, which will be continued at the next Routine Revision ad hoc

Committee.

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 confirmed that she had prepared two PowerPoint presentations one covering bill out of sequence replacements using the dead record, and another explaining the billing process for such replacements. She also noted that she has not yet recorded the accompanying videos due to a lack of feedback from the bill out of sequence team and ongoing uncertainty regarding the billing and crediting process.

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

Operating Committee

Mr. Treepaisan reported this ad hoc committee met last month. Ms. Allen reviewed key sections of the with the team, including Section 5.1 D reiterated the 50% penalty for unauthorized attachments, Section 13.3 updated pole height year set with correct notation, and Section 4 with an existing pole record Ms. Allen clarified that JPAs returns are not required if treatment is incorrect. Additional topics discussed included the disconnecting of a fax line, an attempt was made to schedule an off-cycle meeting to discuss evaluations, but it was unsuccessful. Evaluations will be conducted following today's ad hoc meetings.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR:

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

(in packet and emailed 6/4/2025)

Ms. Pranata opened the discussion by referencing the topic previously addressed last month and noted that it was also shared via email and included in the Administrative Board packet. Ms. Ortiz then stated, if there were no objections, Ms. Ortiz would like to make a motion to approve the proposed Example B-14. Ms. Black seconded the motion, which after the vote tally was completed, passed with 68% yes. However, Edison and City of Vernon voted no, City of Riverside, City of Burbank, Boldyn Networks US LLC, and ATC-Outdoor Das, LLC abstained

There were no questions or comments.

DISCUSSION CALENDAR:

There was no Discussion Calendar.

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 but Item 1804 remain open at this time.

Closed Items

Ms. Black stated that AT&T California would like to close one of the items, which is a positive development. Although the plan was to wait for the Routine Revision ad hoc committee, she requested to pause and proceed with closing *Item 1804: Replacement of Joint Pole with Solely Owned Pole*. She noted that, after a recent discussion with Edison, both parties agreed that the matter is progressing as expected and can now be considered resolved.

There were no questions or comments.

New Business

Known Items:

There were no Know Items.

Unknown Items:

Clarification Requested: Documentation of Topped Poles on JPAs A. Parra (City of Riverside)

Mr. Parra had a question. In situations where the City of Riverside uses a taller, higher-class pole (e.g., a 70-foot H3) and top it to achieve the desired height (e.g., 60 feet), is there a Section in the Routine Handbook on how this should be documented for records. Mr. Parra explained this practice is often necessary due to inventory limitations, as certain pole sizes may not be readily available and would require special ordering. While the physical pole may still bear a tag indicating its original height and class, the installed configuration differs. City of Riverside is seeking clarification on whether there is a standard method or notation in the Routine Handbook for accurately reflecting this modification on the JPA. Mr. Bacon acknowledged the complexity of the issue, noting that modifying a pole by topping it to a shorter height due to inventory limitations is not formally addressed in the Routine Handbook. He emphasized that responsibility falls on the utility since most utilities maintain a wide range of pole sizes, the expectation is to install the correct size. If a taller pole is topped, it becomes the utility's responsibility to ensure accurate documentation. The original pole tag (birthmark or silver tag) will still reflect the original height and class, which can lead to confusion. For example, a topped pole may be deeper in the ground than expected, potentially affecting removal, transport, or coordination with other utilities. Mr. Bacon continued utilities should consider updating the pole's identification using their own signage such as replacing or modifying the silver tag to reflect the actual installed height, class, and treatment. This helps maintain clarity and safety for future inspections or removals. Mr. Bacon concluded that, to his knowledge, there is no existing guidance in the SCJPC rulebooks that specifically covers this scenario. Mr. Van Stryk asked for clarification on whether the pole is being cut from the top or bottom. Mr. Parra responded that they would cut the pole from the top. Ms. Black suggested that instead of cutting, the utility could consider installing the full 70-foot pole and referencing Section 7.3 of the Routine Handbook. This would preserve the original specifications and simplify documentation, as all associated statistics would remain intact. Mr. Parra acknowledged the suggestion but explained that in many cases, topping is necessary for aesthetic and structural reasons. Leaving the extra height unused is often impractical, especially when the line is already built and cannot be raised more than 10 feet due to design constraints. In some cases, the excess height exceeds that limit, prompting the need to cut the pole. He noted that while removing or modifying the original tag is an option, many poles are only embedded to standard depths unless terrain requires otherwise. He shared that in certain scenarios such as long spans or leaning poles taller poles are necessary to meet loading requirements. Mr. Parra emphasized that due to increasing demands from both internal upgrades (e.g., moving from 4kV to 12kV systems) and external pressures (e.g., telecom upgrades), the City of Riverside may need to begin stocking taller, higher-class poles

(e.g., H-class) as standard inventory. He noted that Class 4 poles are becoming obsolete in many applications. Mr. Bacon expressed support for the idea of using nail markers to indicate pole height and set depth. He noted that he is familiar with the practice from earlier in his career and appreciates its durability. Nail markers are advantageous because they can be embedded deeply into the pole, making them less likely to be removed or damaged compared to modern tin or yellow tags. For example, a nail indicating “45/53” clearly communicates a 45-foot pole set at a depth of 8 feet (totaling 53 feet). He emphasized the importance of ensuring that accurate height and set date information is clearly marked on the pole, regardless of the method used. Mr. Parra shared a past experience involving a joint-use buck pole where he had to use a higher-class, taller pole and top it due to site constraints. The location lacked the space or easement to install a guy wire or anchor, and crossing the wide street was not feasible. As a result, a taller, stronger pole was necessary to maintain structural integrity. He recalled topping a 50’ or 55’ to meet the required height and believed he documented the modification in the JPA, though he wasn’t certain if he included a specific note about the topping. He emphasized that leaving the pole at its full height (e.g., 70 feet, H3) would have resulted in higher shared costs, which he felt would be unfair. By topping the pole and documenting it accordingly, the cost was aligned with the actual installed configuration. Mr. Van Stryk raised a concern about the implications of topping a 70-foot pole to 60 feet and setting it 8 feet into the ground. He noted that the ground line circumference of a taller, higher-class pole (e.g., Class 1) may still reflect its original classification. This could lead to confusion in the future if someone measures the pole and misidentifies it as a higher-class pole (e.g., H1), based solely on its circumference. He advised keeping detailed records to avoid misclassification and potential issues during inspections or replacements. Mr. Parra acknowledged the concern and explained that in the specific case he referenced, the pole was selected based on ground line circumference data maintained in an internal Excel spreadsheet. The pole was chosen because it met the structural requirements (e.g., wind loading) and could support the installation without guy wires or anchors, which were not feasible due to site constraints. He confirmed that the pole was not embedded deeper than standard, specifically to avoid misinterpretation based on ground line measurements. Mr. Parra stated that the modification was made at the top of the pole, and he likely documented the change in the JPA, though he would need to verify. He plans to revisit the site to check if the original tag is still present. If so, he intends to have it removed or replaced potentially with a nail marker to reflect the actual installed height and class. He emphasized the importance of ensuring that pole records reflect the intended configuration, not just the original specifications, especially for joint-use poles where cost sharing is involved.

There were no further questions or comments

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

Ms. Black shared her screen and navigated to the Cal Fire website (www.fire.ca.gov) to demonstrate how fire jurisdiction and investigation details are presented. She referenced a conversation with a county fire chief, who is the primary contact listed across multiple channels. She described him as knowledgeable, media-experienced, and helpful in answering questions related to fire jurisdiction. The

Authority Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) is determined by the epicenter of the fire’s origin. This information, along with a fire footprint, is available on the Cal Fire website. For the Pacific Palisades fire, there are two incidents with the same name; the committee reviewed the more recent one. Although the fire is listed on Cal Fire’s website, the Los Angeles City Fire Department is the AHJ. Cal Fire hosts the data because most agencies in California submit their fire information to Cal Fire for centralized access. Even when not the AHJ, Cal Fire is often asked to assist due to its expertise and resources. Smaller jurisdictions may lack the capacity to conduct full investigations, prompting Cal Fire’s involvement. If Cal Fire is not participating, the website will explicitly state so. In this case, Los Angeles City requested Cal Fire’s participation, as no such disclaimer is present. Ms. Black invited questions and emphasized the value of using Cal Fire’s site for comprehensive fire incident data. There were no questions.

Ms. Black then turned to the Eaton Fire, noting that it remains under investigation. She explained that while Los Angeles County Fire is the authority having jurisdiction, Cal Fire has also been asked to assist. She inquired about the typical duration of fire investigations. The county fire chief, who was articulate and knowledgeable, responded that there is no standard timeline, as each fire is unique. Ms. Black emphasized that even in seemingly straightforward cases such as lightning striking they still must still rule out all other potential causes, which can be a time-consuming process. In summary, there is no definitive answer on how long an investigation may take; it varies based on the complexity of each incident. Mr. Van Stryk asked whether the designation refers to "cause" or "fault" when assigning responsibility to parties. Ms. Black mentioned that she had previously asked the Chief and received the same response Mr. Treepaisan provided last month that this will likely fall under legal interpretation. Ms. Black believes that what is currently being referred to as "cause" pertains to the origin of the fire, not fault. For example, lightning may have caused the fire. She also noted that the Chief is open to further questions and encouraged others to reach out to him directly. His contact information is available on the website, and she described him as very approachable.

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	8/20/2025	9:00 a.m.	Teleconference (MS TEAMS)
Operating Committee	8/20/2025	Following	Administrative Board
Authorized Costs Committee	8/20/2025	Following	Operating Committee
Routine Revision Committee	8/20/2025	Following	Authorized Costs Committee
Compliance Committee	8/20/2025	Following	Routine Revision Committee

Computer Committee	8/20/2025	Following	Compliance Committee
Basic JPA Training	8/20/2025	Following	Computer Committee

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Bacon adjourned the meeting at 9:48 a.m. until August 20, 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. The senior equity owning Committee Member remaining as an owner, shall become the base owner for record purposes unless otherwise agreed by all remaining owners. (See Section 5.1-B)

(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

SCJPC USE ONLY

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

PAGE NO. 1 OF 1

Date Prepared 5/7/2025 By In Field By Phone By Email 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 Stet	Year Set	Pole Treat Class Anchor Direct	Record						Proposed						Item No.	LOCATION AND NATURE OF WORK <small>If not in accordance with Joint Pole agreement and routine-state reasons</small>
				12KV	C	C				U1	C	C					
				U1	U2	U3				U1	U2	U3					
<u>(123456U1)</u>	<u>(45)</u> <u>35</u>	1986	FT CL2	39-9	23-5	24-1										<u>2</u> → U1 TO RELINQUISH INTEREST SEC 5.1-A. U2 TO RENUMBER SEC 5.1-B	1
____U2																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)
 PB = PULL BUTT
 T = TRANSPORT (Item 5B)
 S = SALVAGE
 D = DISPOSE (Item 5C)
 TN = TENANT

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 _____