

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

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

October 15, 2025

A regular meeting of the **Basic JPA Training ad hoc Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:20 a.m., via teleconference.

Those in attendance were:

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
Ms. April DeBarge	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. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Aaron Cochran	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Mr. Robert Stanard	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Casanova	AT&T California
Mr. James Todaro	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. Edward Khashadourian	City of Glendale
Mr. Salvador Zambrano	City of Burbank
Ms. Katia Muradian	City of Pasadena
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Mr. David Navar	City of Colton
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Tamara Zaki	Boldyn Networks US LLC

Ms. Angela Pranata
Ms. Kathleen Allen

Committee Staff
Committee Staff

Chairperson, Ms. Dizon called the meeting to order at 11:20 a.m. by addressing the first item on the agenda, the review of **September 2025 meeting minutes**.

There were no questions or comments.

The second item on the agenda is the **Final Billing Information – Training Video**.

- Training Videos
 - Completed videos can be found under:
<https://scjpc.net/members/basic-jpa-training/>
- Explaining Final memos/errors through videos
 - Next recorded videos by SCJPC for review
 - Action Items from last month
 - Members to send examples to Ms. Allen two Fridays before the monthly meeting.
 - Ms. Allen is still waiting on SCE to send information on the anchors in order to record the anchor video.
 - Ms. Allen to record videos on arms, billing out of sequence, PTX, and possibly a video on anchors.
 - Ms. Allen to record videos on memo reasons.
 - Ms. Allen to record separate videos on invalid grade and space scenarios.
 - Mr. Bacon or any other member to send Ms. Allen an example of a PTX JPA if they could find one.
 - Ms. Allen to work on creating Billing out of Sequence video(s).
 - Members to write a note of explaining the history under the “Location and Nature or Work” for BOS JPAs.
 - AT&T to respond to Ms. Allen’s inquiry for their JPA for Ms. Allen’s PowerPoint.

Ms. Dizon asked Ms. Allen if she had received the necessary information to create a new BOS video. Ms. Allen confirmed she had, noting that AT&T California had responded. She mentioned there had been several emails regarding preliminary topics, which she typically does not handle. However, she was asked to include information about "date sent" in the videos or PowerPoints and sought clarification on that point. Ms. Allen referenced an email indicating multiple JPAs were sent and that members should determine billing order based on the "date sent." She asked whether all members are aware of pending JPAs and how companies know which JPA should bill first. She cited an example involving three JPAs: H JPA (sent 8/29/16), NG JPA (sent 8/16/17), and TWN JPA (sent 4/29/22), which should be processed in that order. Ms. Black confirmed she sent the email and explained that when preliminaries are sent to other members, planners from other utilities may annotate them to indicate billing order. For example, if AT&T California sends a purchase of interest to Edison, the Edison planner may note that an NG’s JPA should bill first based on its earlier sent date.

This redlining helps ensure billing follows the correct sequence. Ms. Black added that there was some confusion in the email thread, with one participant believing billing order only applied to pole replacements. She suggested that limiting billing order enforcement to pole replacements could simplify the process and reduce the burden on billers, though it would alter how purchases of interest are billed. Ms. DeBarge asked whether it is financially beneficial for AT&T California to be billed first in a purchase scenario. She questioned the value of reversing billing if another company, such as Verizon Wireless (ATC), billed first. Ms. Black responded that the financial impact is likely minimal for purchases of interest but emphasized that billing in sequence ensures accurate revenue allocation. Ms. Allen noted that billing out of sequence could result in missed charges, especially if AT&T California should have billed first. She stressed the importance of billing order to ensure proper compensation. Ms. DeBarge asked if there were examples of significant financial impact. Ms. Black acknowledged that the amounts may be small and pointed out that many companies have not been following the correct process, contributing to the backlog. She suggested that accepting some revenue loss might be reasonable given the circumstances. Ms. Black also mentioned a specific case where Edison final billed a JPA as 18.1F, which now requires reversal and rebilling due to incorrect sequence. Mr. Coffey clarified that the City of Banning was unaware of the billing order requirement. He explained that, as a small utility without a dedicated joint pole team, these procedural details are new to them. He appreciated the clarification and emphasized their intent to learn and improve. Ms. Black thanked participants for their engagement and reiterated that billing should follow the "prepared" and "sent" dates listed on the preliminary JPA. These dates should remain consistent on the final bill. She encouraged members to review pole data to identify other transactions and ensure proper billing order is noted in the "Location and Nature of Work" section of the JPA. Ms. Black clarified that billing order is critical, especially in pole replacement scenarios. For example, if AT&T California intends to purchase interest in a pole originally set in 1967, that transaction must occur before the new pole is installed. Billing should follow the chronological order of set dates to ensure proper cost recovery. Ms. DeBarge raised a concern. What happens if the new pole is already set and attachments haven't occurred. She noted that in some cases, the original pole has been replaced before a purchase of interest is finalized, and without a Form 48 from the joint owner, the process becomes complicated. In such cases, the purchase of interest applies to the new pole, not the old one. Ms. Black emphasized that this is why billing order matters if companies don't follow it, they risk losing reimbursement from other owners for pole replacements. She reiterated that billing in order should absolutely apply to pole replacements to ensure proper financial reconciliation. Ms. DeBarge questioned whether it's worth pursuing billing corrections when final bills are often not issued. She suggested the group stay focused on BOS related issues. Ms. Dizon referenced Section 4.X regarding billing out of sequence. She provided an example where Crown Castle sends a JPA involving joint ownership with SCE and HLA. If MCI had a prior JPA that should have billed first but was overlooked, Crown Castle wouldn't know. Once MCI's JPA bills, the pole card updates to reflect MCI's ownership. During finalization, this discrepancy may trigger an R01 due to the missed billing sequence. Ms. Black responded that BOS can still be applied to H JPAs, even if it doesn't impact billing directly. For example, MCI's JPA could be noted in the header as 18.1G to indicate it billed out of sequence. Billers would recognize it as a purchase of interest

and proceed without reversing billing. SCJPC's record would reflect NG's transaction, allowing billing to move forward efficiently. She agreed that avoiding R01s is preferable. Ms. Black asked Ms. Allen whether limiting billing reversals to pole replacements would be helpful. Ms. Allen stated yes and noted it would simplify operations. She referenced a previous NG JPA where she would have had to back out three or four other JPAs to finalize the correct one first. That JPA was a purchase of interest and never finalized due to unresolved issues. Ms. Allen recommended conducting a time study to assess how long it takes to bill a purchase of interest BOS. She recalled a previous study on multi-party billing where one biller became overwhelmed. Despite the findings, members insisted on maintaining the billing process, stating "a dollar is a dollar." Ms. Allen concluded that it's up to the members to decide whether they're comfortable not recovering the full amount. Ms. Black proposed treating non-compliance with billing order as a penalty, especially for path joint clean-up efforts. She volunteered to collaborate with Ms. Allen to develop a new process and present it to the committee. She also committed to addressing Ms. Dizon's concerns about R01s. Mr. Van Stryk emphasized the importance of R01s for pole loading, particularly when members are not already on the pole.

Ms. Black thanked the committee for their engagement and stated she would collaborate with Ms. Allen to prepare and share an example with the group for review.

There were no further questions or comments.

The third item on the agenda is the **Interpretation of Billing (standing agenda item – 11/16/2022)**

There were none.

Priority definition of Billing Out of Sequence (K. Black, AT&T California)

Ms. Black expressed interest in revisiting the definition of "priority" as it relates to billing out of sequence. However, she noted that if the committee agrees to limit BOS to pole replacements only, her concern would be resolved. In that case, the 400 priority JPAs currently flagged would no longer be applicable. Ms. Black stated she will table the discussion for now pending the committee's decision.

There were no questions or comments.

Review of Action Items:

- Ms. Black will collaborate with Ms. Allen to develop a potential new process aimed at streamlining and resolving the complexities surrounding BOS JPAs.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m. until November 19, 2025.

Transcribed by Ms. Kathleen Allen – Committee Staff