

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

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

July 16, 2025

A meeting of the **ad hoc Computer Communications Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:12 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

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
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. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Todd Dailey	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
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Mr. Michael Truong	City of Burbank
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

Ms. Ray called the meeting to order at 11:12 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s minutes

Ms. Ray opened the meeting by asking if there were any questions or concerns regarding last month’s meeting minutes. No members commented or expressed concerns.

Agenda Item 2 – Item 1806: Standardized Excel Form (6/18/2025 – moved from Operating Committee)

Ms. Ray inquired whether Mr. Treepaisan and Ms. Pranata had been able to meet to review the examples of various versions of the Final Form 2. Ms. Pranata confirmed that she had met with Mr. Treepaisan. Mr. Treepaisan reported that not all members were utilizing the most current version of the Final Form 2. He recounted that the original intent behind standardizing the forms was to address the backlog and facilitate programming to assist the SCJPC office with billing. Mr. Treepaisan emphasized that consistent use of standardized forms would enable more effective data manipulation and calculation. He suggested that, despite the variations in form submissions, there were identifiable common patterns such as pole numbers and section references that could be programmed to automate calculations. Mr. Treepaisan proposed that a programmer could be engaged to develop logic for processing these forms, thereby reducing manual effort.

Ms. Pranata agreed with Mr. Treepaisan's assessment and proposed reaching out to members who were using outdated versions of the form. She intended to request that they switch to the latest version available on the SCJPC website. The members agreed with Ms. Pranata's proposal to contact those using outdated versions of the Final Form 2 and request that they adopt the most current version.

Ms. Black inquired about the two versions of the Final Form 2 available on the website. Ms. Pranata clarified that the two versions differed only in the presence of a macro. One version included a macro while the other did not. However, both were identical in terms of cell names, column names, and overall formatting. She emphasized that the structural consistency between the two versions ensured compatibility regardless of which version was used.

Ms. Ray asked which version the SCJPC office preferred the committee to adopt. Ms. Pranata responded that it did not matter because once the version with the macro, which is the .xlsm file, was executed and the form converted from preliminary to final, the form would align in terms of cell references and formatting with the other version, which is the .xlsx file. She reiterated that either version was acceptable provided it was downloaded directly from the SCJPC website.

Ms. Pranata then addressed the issue of outdated forms still being used by some members. She reported encountering versions from as early as 2013 and 2019, as well as forms dated March and April 2020, which were no longer hosted on the website. Mr. Treepaisan added that he believed some companies may have downloaded these older forms in 2019 and continued to distribute and use them, contributing to the inconsistency in submissions.

Ms. Ray asked Ms. Pranata whether she would be contacting the programmers currently working with the committee to explore the possibility of automating the Final Form calculation to address the backlog. Ms. Pranata responded that she had not yet done so but would proceed if the committee approved. She offered to share the Final Form 2 with the programmers to determine whether billing could be automated using the Excel format. Ms. Ray then asked the committee whether this was an initiative they would like to pursue at this time. Mr. Treepaisan and Ms. Black supported the proposal, noting that automation would be beneficial not only for addressing the backlog but also for future submissions. Ms. Pranata agreed and stated that she would move forward with obtaining quotes.

Agenda Item 3 - Miscellaneous items/New item numbers

Ms. Ray asked if there were any other miscellaneous items.

Centralized Access to Intrusive Pole Test and Treatment Results (K.Black, AT&T CA)

Ms. Black inquired about capturing and publishing the intrusive pole test and treatment results. She suggested that these results should be made available to all members because they fall under shared costs. She proposed either integrating the data into the existing SCJPC database or hosting it on a SharePoint site. She expressed interest in opening the discussion with committee members regarding this item.

Ms. Ray asked whether there was an existing mechanism for members to access such data. She explained that Southern California Edison's data is located in their SPIDAstudio system. She then inquired whether other members had similar systems that would allow access to this information. Ms. McLean responded that she would check for Extenet systems in Southern California but confirmed that she had access to the data for Northern California.

Ms. Black clarified that her organization does not currently provide intrusive testing for other owners, does not have a maintenance program, and lacks an internal mechanism for sharing such data. She suggested that the SCJPC could serve as a central repository for these results.

Mr. Van Stryk expressed concern about storing intrusive inspection results at the SCJPC. He proposed that the results be stored outside of the SCJPC because centralizing them might lead to future complications. He explained that in the event of a failure, such as a pole collapse resulting in injury, which he noted has never occurred, legal parties might seek access to all available inspection data. If SCJPC were known to store such information, it could become a target for legal inquiries. Several members agreed with Mr. Van Stryk's assessment, and the original proposal to centralize the data at SCJPC was withdrawn.

There were no additional miscellaneous items.

Agenda Item 4 - Review of Action Items

- Ms. Pranata to contact members to ensure they are using the latest version of Final Form 2 available on the SCJPC website.
- Ms. Pranata to obtain quotes for programming services to automate Final Form processing and billing calculations.

The meeting adjourned at 11:24 a.m. until August 20, 2025.

Transcribed by Angela Pranata - Committee Staff