

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

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

August 20, 2025

A meeting of the **ad hoc Compliance Committee** took place on the above date, **at 11:38 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Ms. Aarize Dizon | Crown Castle NG West Inc. |
| Mr. Jeremy Effinger | Crown Castle NG West Inc. |
| Ms. Jacqueline Costa | Crown Castle NG West Inc. |
| Ms. April DeBarge | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Carla Stephen | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Marisol Bailey | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Michael Pearson | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Samuel Picazo | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Shelby Mulvehill | Southern California Edison |
| Ms. Silvana Ray | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Kevin Flores | Southern California Edison |
| Mr. Lex Treepaisan | Frontier Communications |
| Ms. Kay Black | AT&T California |
| Mr. Todd Dailey | AT&T California |
| Mr. Alvin Robielos | AT&T California |
| Mr. Aaron Cochran | AT&T California |
| Ms. Joy Young | AT&T California |
| Mr. Julian Ruiz | AT&T California |
| Ms. Veronica Casanova-Romero | AT&T California |
| Mr. John Bacon | City of Los Angeles |
| Mr. Gabriel Pech | City of Los Angeles |
| Ms. Lynne LaFrenais | Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc. |
| Mr. Alex Parra | City of Riverside |
| Mr. Ben Coffey | City of Banning |
| Ms. Katia Muradian | City of Pasadena |
| Mr. Dave Campo | City of Lompoc |
| Mr. Nick Van Stryk | City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric) |
| Ms. Maria Ortiz | MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications |
| Ms. Alicia Smith | Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications |
| Mr. Irvin Orzuna | City of Glendale |
| Mr. Edward Khashadourian | City of Glendale |
| Ms. Shawn Henderson | T-Mobile USA |

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Ms. Linda McLean | Extenet Systems |
| Ms. Heidi Seropian | Extenet Systems |
| Ms. Angela Pranata | Committee Staff |
| Ms. Kathleen Allen | Committee Staff |
| Ms. Anali Spencer | Committee Staff |

Ms. Dizon called the meeting to order at 11:38 a.m.

Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s meeting minutes

Ms. Dizon inquired if the members had any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the prior meeting minutes.

There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 2 – Item 1630: CPUC Updates (2/14/17– title changed 04/17/2019) – The Admin Board decided this topic requires greater discussion and is to remain open (8/14/2018).

Ms. Dizon opened the discussion to CPUC updates and stated that this item is on hold for now.

There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 3 – Item 1658: Environmental Issues (1/16/2019, moved from Admin Board on 1/15/2020)

Ms. Dizon opened the discussion on Environmental Issues. She asked the members if they had anything to bring up at this time.

There were no comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 4 – Item 1800: Approved Maintenance Program Review (K. Black – AT&T CA – 2/19/2025)

Ms. Dizon opened the discussion to the Approved Maintenance Program Review. Ms. Black was to send out additional edits. Ms. Black stated that they were in the packet, and they discussed them briefly during Routine Revision Committee meeting. Ms. Dizon asked if there were any additional comments or questions.

There were no further comments or concerns from any members.

Agenda Item 5 Miscellaneous -

Grounding on Steel Poles

Ms. Dizon asked if the members had the chance to look at the specifications on Grounding on Steel Poles sent out. Mr. Bacon stated he had a question for the members about C Trusses (see Other Miscellaneous Items for discussion)

Ms. Dizon asked if there were any questions or concerns on Grounding on Steel poles. Mr. Dailey asked the power companies if there was preference with them grounding to the pole or adding a ground bed like they normally do. He stated that they just recently had some pushback from some power companies that do not want them to run a vertical on the steel poles and put a ground bed, that it is preferred that they ground directly to the pole. Mr. Bacon stated that there are two trends of thought on that, he stated LADWP's steel poles hole design is all predrilled-on steel poles and from the factory there are certain standards of construction, one for a transformer pole, one for a bank pole, and one for a steel pole. He stated they leave little pads which is basically a tap threaded insert for a pole and they can take a threaded ground and screw it into a steel pole and put their grounds right up there. Mr. Bacon stated that it is difficult to put a ground down the length of a steel pole because the staples do not work and they really do not want to do machine screws dealing with a difference of potential. He stated when they put the self-tapping screw and it screws right into the bulk of the steel, that seems to be a solid ground. When they run a ground down the pole with the different shades of galvanization into the two ground rods on the side of the steel pole. Mr. Bacon stated they typically ground it up in the air on one of the pads with a two-bolt clamp which is what LADWP does. Mr. Dailey asked for the ground pads Mr. Bacon described if there was specific hardware that they need to be aware of in order to utilize it. Mr. Bacon stated it is a simple item, a pressed sleeve that goes on it that has a little pad with two holes or one hole that they can screw in with the self-tapping on the steel pole. Mr. Bacon stated that the self-tapping is a drill that threads it as it goes through the steel. Mr. Dailey asked if the location of the pads are throughout various heights of the pole. Mr. Bacon stated that wherever their work is they can, with a six-inch jumper attach it to the steel pole any way they want. Ms. Dizon asked if there were any other comments or concerns. There were no further comments or concerns from any members. Ms. Dizon asked Ms. Pranata since there were no other questions, if this item could be closed. Ms. Pranata stated that if it is not going to be discussed anymore it can be closed. Ms. Dizon asked the members if it was ok to close this topic and there were no objections.

Other Miscellaneous Items

C Trusses

Mr. Bacon stated he had a scenario on steel trusses. He stated a member wants to place C trusses on the pole. That member does not want to charge the other members and would only like to be able to put the C trusses on the pole, not billing anyone. Mr. Bacon stated that if the pole is not passing loading and they can put a C truss on it adding another ten or fifteen years onto the pole. He

stated if they go by that route, where they will just pay for it, he noticed they do not put C trusses on the SCJPC record. Mr. Bacon asked if there is anything wrong with that or if it should be allowed with no record. He wanted to know if that has to be addressed. Mr. Dailey asked if this would require a JPA with zero billing just for records. Mr. Bacon replied yes and explained that typically for a C truss they are going to share it with the other members because for the cost of a C truss they all benefit because the pole gets strengthened. Mr. Bacon stated that if they do not share in the cost if there was anything that the other members would want in regards of records or if when they go out and are fielding the pole they see it has a C truss, take the information, and continue on updating their tests and analysis reports with the added C truss on. Mr. Bacon stated that he was not sure if this has to be reported. Mr. Bacon stated that it is not the base owner adding the C truss but anyone as a member can put a C truss on a pole anytime to strengthen the pole when they are putting it in the non-usable space. Mr. Bacon stated that if the company is putting C trusses, so the pole does pass the loading they want to put on the pole he stated he is for it if they need to get that done and not put it on the share cost of the members. He stated he wanted to know if the other members were ok with this. Ms. Black stated it should have a JPA so it does go on record. Mr. Bacon stated that he does not see any pole records that indicate a C truss was on it and they do bill for it. Mr. Dailey stated that he was going to ask if they normally issue a JPA when they are installed and if not, he does not think it is necessary if it is not issued for records. Mr. Ruiz asked how would the base owner who keeps records of the pole be able to update their records if they are not getting this information. Mr. Ruiz asked if all the members were in agreement that no additional agreement or approval is needed by the base owner or owners of the pole as long as the member is a member so they can place a C truss. Mr. Bacon stated that all the base owner means is that they set it and that they have an obligation for the inspections. He stated that anybody can do an inspection and a core test or through board test when they need to. Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP does not keep records of C trusses and the only way LADWP gets notified is because some companies are both sides, they are a tenant and a member. He stated when they are running a make ready and dark fiber LADWP is getting poles and wind loading reports where it is showing up as overloaded and the economical solution to extend the time period to get it to pass the loading correctly is by putting a C truss on it. This way they can string their dark fiber without having to wait for the utility to change out the pole. The C truss is the solution, but Mr. Bacon was unsure if all the other members would be ok without a record. Mr. Ruiz stated that there has to be a record and the pole owners in general need to be able to record that change in the life expectancy of the pole. Mr. Bacon stated for a communication company they have an engineering firm go out and take a look at the pole, take pictures, and look at the loading. When they see the C truss, they add that to

the stats and now their ground line is much stronger and will pass wind loading. Mr. Bacon stated that he does not think the system needs more JPAs coming into the SCJPC, indicating that and it should be by a case by case basis. Mr. Ruiz stated that from AT&T California's perspective it was not and that there needs to be notification when it happens, and what the C truss is and its sizing. Mr. Bacon asked where they are going to update it. Mr. Dailey asked if it is indicated in the pole loading analysis. Mr. Bacon stated that it is when they receive the pole loading analysis once they have installed the C truss. Mr. Treepaisan stated that if they are not tracking C trusses on the pole record, he is leaning to Mr. Bacon's comment that maybe they do not need a JPA but to address Mr. Ruiz's concern a simple email or notification that a C truss was put up could be sent. Mr. Treepaisan stated that it will also be captured on the pole loading calculation and his thought is that a JPA is strictly for billing. Since no one is being billed on the C truss then they do not need to track it on the pole card. Ms. DeBarge stated that she is with Mr. Treepaisan on that there is no billing and it is not going on the pole card reminding her of the Form 9 where they are getting out of a riser with no billing or no SCJPC tracking. Mr. Bacon stated that since they do a Form 9 for risers would they add it to the Form 9 so it has another option besides a riser and combine it if the other members would like to know there is a C truss on the pole. Mr. Bacon stated it benefits any member for a pole that may be 25 years old and eligible to be change out as a deteriorated pole as well as any company that wants to go out there after said company has installed a C truss it is nice that the pole has it and it will benefit the members and the overall strength of the pole. Mr. Bacon stated he is on the same page as Mr. Treepaisan on why create another document if no one is keeping track of it. Mr. Ruiz asked if Mr. Bacon or Mr. Treepaisan knew if with the CPUC and the pole database and phase two data points if any of that requires the members to capture the record of C trusses. Mr. Treepaisan stated that there is a field for supports of some sort and his view is if they have the information then they put it in and if they do not then they do not add it. Mr. Treepaisan asked Mr. Ruiz if they keep track of C trusses today. Mr. Ruiz stated that he has to go back and look because AT&T California started C trussing poles actively about two years ago as part of their intrusive inspection program, that they keep data, but he is unsure where it is being held or how its being held. He stated this is why he did not affirmatively confirm that they need the data because he does not disagree with the billing part in order to not create more paperwork at the SCJPC that they do not need to do. Mr. Ruiz stated that he feels they need some sort of notification at the time that it happens with some sort of the C truss specifications but does not know what exact data AT&T California is keeping and where they are holding it. He would like to go back internally to get that information before pushing for anything. Mr. Treepaisan stated that the only element he places for support structure is messenger strands.

There were no further questions or comments.

Ms. Dizon asked if there were any other miscellaneous items.
There were no questions or comments.

Agenda Item 6 - Review of Action Items/JPA Alerts

- Members are to discuss internally if a notification for a C truss should be required for record purposes.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m. until September 17, 2025.

Transcribed by Anali Spencer - Committee Staff

Item 1800: Approved Maintenance Program Review

Item 1800 - Maintenance Authorized Cost Items

Edits are red –

12. Pole **Intrusive** Inspections and Treatment (Only one item number per test.)

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| (a) Reserved for future use | |
| (b) Partial Dig | 261 |
| (c) Sound and Bore | 261 |
| (d) Full Treatment | 261 |
| (e) Reject | 261 |

Note: May only be billed once every 5 years (Effective May 2014).

- a. Poles Excavated – Treated Reject, Full Excavation or Dug Reject – poles over 15 yrs
- b. Poles Not Excavated – Sound & Bore, Visual – poles over 15 yrs
- c. Poles Partially Excavated – Partial Excavate – poles over 15 yrs
- d. Poles Excavated – Treated Reject, Full Excavation or Dug Reject – poles w/pass 20 yrs ago
- e. Poles Not Excavated – Sound & Bore, Visual – poles w/pass 20 yrs ago
- f. Poles Partially Excavated – Partial Excavate – poles w/pass 20 yrs ago

(f,g) Re-inspection of reinforced poles (may only be billed once every 10 years, effective 06/01/2011)417

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

| | |
|---|-----|
| (a) Re-Tagging....only once per pole per 12 mos, unless special agreement..... | 161 |
| (b) Replacing Visibility Strips only once per year, unless special agreement..... | 163 |