

## **Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

279 E. Arrow Hwy. Suite 104  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 599-3801  
Fax (909) 599-3825

**March 15, 2023**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Engineering and Construction Field Meet Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:23 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Romero	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Ms. Valerie Mitwasi	Southern California Edison
Mr. Sam Picazo	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles – DWP
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Katy White	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time Warner Cable
Ms. Maria Ortiz	XO Communications
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel Corporation/Sprint Communications CO.L. P
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Mr. Richard Soriano	City of Banning
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	AT&T Mobility
Mr. Nicholas Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. David Campo	City of Lompoc
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Mr. Joe Armstrong	City of Pasadena
Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Mr. Arturo Garcia	City of Glendale
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Services Inc.
Mr. Renzo Garzon	Mobilitie, LLC
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

Ms. Black called the meeting to order at 11:23 a.m.

**Agenda Item 1 – Definition for Planning/Design meet** – Ms. Black opened up and stated that she wanted to start with the definition. Ms. Black commented that she liked the term “Design meet” better than “Planning meet” and asked for feedback from everyone. She added that she found an old file from Josh Mathisen; however, she was not ready to share it with everyone that day. She asked if other members would like to collaborate on the definition with her and present it to the committee next month. Mr. Treepaisan, Ms. Mitwasi, and Mr. Van Stryk responded that they would like to collaborate. Ms. Black commented that other members could email her if they would like to collaborate.

**Agenda Item 2 – Definition and Requirements for Construction Field Meet.**

Ms. Black opened up and inquired about how the committee defines when it is required and what are the field conditions. Mr. Bacon responded that a riser on the pole was required. He added that GO95 spacing would be required as well. Members need to ensure there is enough room for the spacing with different voltages. Mr. Van Stryk added that if a member wanted approval less than 45 days, then signing in the field during a construction field meet would be a reason to do it. Ms. Black inquired if that would be an emergency call. Mr. Van Stryk responded that if a customer’s timeline is quick, joint pole approval is needed, and they are willing to pay for the timeline to be sped up, then members can sign in the field. Ms. LaFrenais commented that BVE starts construction 45 days after Form 2 has been sent out. The design meet should happen before the 45 days. Mr. Van Stryk clarified that he was talking about a construction field meet. Ms. LaFrenais commented that BVE would have the design by the time they sent out Form 2. Ms. Black commented that Ms. LaFrenais opened up a discussion for Agenda Item 3, which is the next subject. Ms. Black stated that there should be discussion and rules on the requirements for a construction field meet, the specific types of conditions that would warrant the members losing the 45 days, and when to compromise the 45 days. Mr. Van Stryk commented that 45 days exist for the no-response. If the form is signed, then the member could continue the day after that. Ms. Black commented that while it was correct, the receiving members (AT&T CA) need 45 days due to workload and lack of manpower. Mr. Bacon and Ms. Mitwasi agreed with Ms. Black. Mr. Bacon commented that there are emergency levels, and members can request a meeting. Mr. Bacon would reach out to a utility and ask them to expedite the work whenever LADWP had an emergency. Mr. Bacon suggested adding “emergency” for this section. Ms. Mitwasi stated that in those circumstances, members would need a design meet when they need to plan, have a discussion outside the plan, or if they need to go on a different path than the regular 45 days. During the design meet and discussion, members could agree with the involved and impacted members if it can be processed in a different timeline. Ms. Black stated that she noted the requirements for both the design and construction field meet. She wrote down risers, GO95 spacing, emergencies/what type, and antenna. Ms. Black commented that a safety emergency is different than a customer emergency. Ms. Black reiterated that she is trying to define what field conditions would drive a design or a construction field meet. Ms. Black stated she would send the list to Ms. Pranata for the meeting next month.

### **Agenda Item 3- Requirements for the Form 2 package**

- **Proposed conference call date (must be 45 days after F2 sent) for Design Meet and proposed date for Construction meet.**
- **Initiating Member Contact Name, email and phone number.**
- **Pictures**
- **Single pole JPA**

Ms. Black inquired what the receiving members would like the requirements to be for the Form 2 package. Ms. Black commented that AT&T CA would like 45 days to approve and have a proposed conference call date and information listed on Form 2 so their team could be ready to attend the design meet on the proposed date. Ms. Black asked for feedback from Ms. LaFrenais. Mr. Van Stryk asked for clarification that this is to extend the 45-day timeline and propose a phone call after the 45 days. Ms. Mitwasi responded that the design meet should happen before Form 2 is created. It will mitigate the number of revisions, red lines, and Form 7s if the agreement is set before the JPA is created. Mr. Van Stryk agreed with Ms. Mitwasi; however, he is not responsible for the required attendees of the design meet. Ms. Mitwasi responded that SCE is in the same happenstance and trying to drive this change internally to get the planners to start having these discussions upfront. Ms. Black stated that they could possibly be proposing a new form for planning meet that is going to drive its own timeline. Ms. Mitwasi commented that she was not thinking of using another form. Ms. Black asked Ms. Mitwasi how SCE would communicate to AT&T CA that SCE needs a design meet. Mr. Van Stryk commented that the local coordinator would make a phone call. Ms. Mitwasi responded that SCE would reach out to AT&T CA with a notification that a project is coming and if AT&T CA has any concerns. She added that SCE would add the design meet date as the confirming date on the header of one of the Joint Pole forms. The date indicated that the members had the design meet and had a discussion on what is on Form 2. Ms. Black commented that some members who do not use the contacts posted on the SCJPC website would contact the wrong person, such as the representative, which would not be the right person for the design meet. Mr. Treepaisan commented that the committee should decide the informal versus formal communication to set the design meet. Mr. Van Stryk stated that the City of Vernon has a bridge project that the federal government is funding and had numerous design meets with joint members and other parties. He added that the committee could add another criteria of a design meet that anything over \$200,000-\$1,000,000 project should have a design meet because the members would not want to go back and do it twice. Ms. Black commented that the City of Anaheim reached out to AT&T CA, and some meetings were missed because it was not formal enough. Ms. Black stated that AT&T CA would like to take this internally on how they could propose something that is more formal. She added that there are way too many opportunities for it to break down on AT&T CA's side if there is not enough process around it. Ms. Black asked SCE that when SCE sends an email to AT&T CA, what items would SCE be providing in the email? Ms. Mitwasi responded that SCE could standardize and formalize further. She added that SCE would reach out and share their plan for the replacement and the setting. Mr. Van Stryk commented that in the past, he would show up with a preliminary design and pole loads. If there were any issues, he would go back and redo it. Ms. Black asked if Mr. Van Stryk included pictures. Mr. Van Stryk responded that

he would include pictures or Google Earth images/street view since some companies do not use O'Calc. Ms. Black asked Mr. Van Stryk, Ms. Mitwasi, and Ms. LaFrenais to send some examples to her.

**Agenda Item 4 - Review of Action Items**

- Ms. Black to send out her preliminary definitions of a design and construction field meet to Ms. Mitwasi, Mr. Treepaisan, Mr. Van Stryk, and other members who would want to be involved in that collaboration.
- Ms. Mitwasi, Ms. LaFrenais, and Mr. Van Stryk to send examples of their preliminary packages that require a design meet to Ms. Black.

The meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m. until April 19, 2023.

Angela Pranata - Committee Staff

## **Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

279 E. Arrow Hwy. Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

Fax (909) 599-3825

**April 19, 2023**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Engineering and Construction Field Meet Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:43 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Romero	AT&T California
Ms. Megan LaMon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Earle Carrion	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Alicia Walsh	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Mr. Sam Picazo	Southern California Edison
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Glenn Leckie	Frontier Communications
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Ms. Yvonne Johnson	Teleport Communications America
Mr. Arturo Garcia	City of Glendale
Mr. Joe Armstrong	City of Pasadena
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Ms. Erica Cassadas	City of Banning
Mr. Richard Soriano	City of Banning
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. Reed Mokler	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. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

Chairperson, Ms. Black called the meeting to order at 12:43 p.m. by addressing the review of the **prior month's meeting minutes**. There were no questions or comments.

**Agenda Item 1 – Definition for Planning/Design meet** – Ms. Black opened up and stated that she was slightly behind on the definition. She thanked Ms. LaFrenais and Mr. Van Stryk for the feedback. She added that Ms. Black and Ms. Mitwasi are still internally working on the definition. Ms. Black also stated that she would send a draft to interested members before the next meeting. Ms. Black reported that, in summary, the Bear Valley Electric team does not see value in the field meet, and they thought it would be a waste of time. Ms. LaFrenais responded that BVE's design or construction team is annoyed because some of the poles that should have been replaced or removed are still standing and not being pulled based on JPAs from 20 years ago. Money was paid to the company that was supposed to pull the poles. Ms. LaFrenais added that the meet would possibly be worth it on large projects where BVE needs to remove sections of poles or place brand new sections of poles. However, BVE does not see the value in having a field meet to remove or replace one to five poles. In addition, BVE does not usually receive large changes to the designs that they send out for approval within 45 days. Ms. Black responded that she would add "large projects" to her list. She commented that she also added "dollar amount of a project" to her list based on Mr. Van Stryk's feedback. Ms. Black commented that she is unsure if AT&T CA has the resources that would be able to fulfill that, and she was looking for technical reasons on the pole as being criteria. Ms. Walsh commented that from SCE's perspective, a few examples that came to mind were if the pole has antennas or risers or if a helicopter set is needed. SCE would like the communication companies to provide opinions, especially for a helicopter set; there is something on the structure that requires the communication company's expertise to transfer or change the design, so they only send out the helicopter once since sending it out multiple times would not be feasible. Ms. Black commented that she received a request from SCE for a design meet and will use it as a beta (test). Ms. Walsh commented that SCE has been pushing a field meet for the last year or year and a half. SCE requested field meets for everything. However, Ms. Walsh understands it is not feasible for other members since SCE is replacing between 17,000 to 24,000 poles yearly. Pushing it to design allows the other member to provide an opinion on the design and determine whether or not the design will impact the member's facilities. Ms. Walsh stated that she wanted to add to the discussion the definition of why the members need a design meet and if it could be done virtually as opposed to in person since they have the tools. Ms. Black commented that she wrote down the action items, antenna, risers, helicopter set, pedestals, weird stuff mounted on the pole, and definition between in-person versus virtual design meet. Ms. Black added that from Mr. Van Stryk's comments, she summarized that for a project that somebody is paying for and still in the planning stage, feedback is required for something like underground work. She added that Atlantic Bridge would be one of the examples that would need a design meet. Ms. Black then asked Mr. Van Stryk to define a risen stake – railroad, CalTrans, LA River, bond, and fire threat. Mr. Van Stryk explained that in that instance, there are different companies responsible for maintaining the federal contract for the river and two railroads right next to it, which need permits. Any kind of work that might disturb the river must be relayed to the federal government. The members need to be on the same

Engineering and Construction Field Meet Committee – April 19, 2023 Page 2 of 3

page regarding the design because there is no going back and doing it twice. Mr. Harmon stated that incorporating local jurisdiction, state, railroad, coastal, environmental, whatever it may be, predicates the need for the design meet. Mr. Van Stryk commented that he would like a meet for an underground work where a customer wanted to have everything underground in front of a brand new building. He said the City of Vernon would cover all the costs and build them together. He added that he would like the design meet so the city does not mess up anyone's facilities in the process. Ms. Black commented that she thought the committee decided that the design meet was supposed to happen before the initiating member wrote Form 2. Mr. Van Stryk agreed. Ms. Black commented that she does not think that scenario qualifies for a design meet because she wants to see the paperwork and the Form 2 prior. Mr. Van Stryk stated that it had happened twice already. The communication bills the city, and the city will bill the responsible parties.

### **Agenda Item 2 – Definition and Requirements for Construction Field Meet.**

Ms. Black inquired when the placing member would want the other members on the site for a construction meet and when that is required. After further discussions, Ms. Black commented that she wrote down power company and power company, multiple companies on the same arm, antenna, and sewer lines.

### **Agenda Item 3- Requirements for the Form 2 package**

- **Proposed conference call date (must be 45 days after F2 sent) for Design Meet and proposed date for Construction meet.**
- **Initiating Member Contact Name, email and phone number.**
- **Pictures**
- **Single pole JPA**

Ms. Black commented that the first bullet needed to be changed. She commented that she would review the agenda and send changes to Ms. Pranata before the next meeting.

### **Agenda Item 4 - Review of Action Items**

- Ms. Black to type and send out her notes.

The meeting adjourned at 1:06 p.m. until April 19, 2023.

Angela Pranata - Committee Staff

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

279 E. Arrow Hwy. Suite 104  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 599-3801  
Fax (909) 599-3825

**May 17, 2023**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Engineering and Construction Field Meet Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:37 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Romero	AT&T California
Mr. Troy Stanard	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Alicia Walsh	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Sam Picazo	Southern California Edison
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. Arturo Garcia	City of Glendale
Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Mr. Richard Soriano	City of Banning
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Dawn Laffoon	Mobilitie, LLC
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Linda McLean	Exenet Systems
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Exenet Systems
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

Chairperson, Ms. Black called the meeting to order at 12:37 p.m. by addressing the review of the **prior month's meeting minutes**. There were no questions or comments.

**Agenda Item 2 – Definition for Planning/Design meet** – Ms. Black stated that she completed her action item late and asked Ms. Allen to display the document she sent out on Webex. Ms. Black stated that the document was an attempt to capture everyone's requests. She added that the committee could review the document with Engineering and Construction Field Meet Committee – May 17, 2023

their team and send edits instead of reading it during the meeting. Mr. Treepaisan commented that emailing the edits might be the most efficient path. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he has one thing to add from Frontier's JPA engineers under the field conditions requiring a design meet. The engineers wanted to add a billing relocation or billing work order to one of them so that they could bill the customers when there is a billing work order involving a JPA. Ms. Black responded that she would add it to the list. Ms. Black commented that she added a few things to her internal copy, not on display. She added underground projects, environmental concerns, and basic GO95 expansions. Ms. Black stated that she would add "Jeremy" next to the last subject so Mr. Harmon could clarify next month. Ms. Black also stated that she just added a Section 1.2 clarification discussion based on Ms. Walsh's request during the Authorized Costs ad hoc committee. Ms. Black inquired if she should add pole top expansion. Mr. Treepaisan responded that the committee should wait for Mr. Harmon. Ms. Walsh inquired if a relinquishment requires a design meet. Ms. Black responded that she thought AT&T CA would accept it. Mr. Treepaisan agreed with Ms. Black if SCE was topping the pole and leaving the comm facilities in place. Ms. Walsh confirmed that SCE would be required to relinquish many poles due to underground work for the next five years if the other owner chooses not to participate in the underground work. Ms. Black commented that she will add a relinquishment note in parentheses under the underground project section. Ms. Black added that AT&T CA would like a design meet because they would need to know as soon as possible to see if they would go in the trench with SCE for the big undergrounding project. Ms. Black mentioned that PG&E does not give AT&T CA enough advance notice to get in the trench, which is a big concern for AT&T CA. Ms. Walsh would like to discuss the SCE's large undergrounding effort, the impact, and what other members would need from SCE besides the JPA. Ms. Walsh added that the members could discuss the undergrounding program with SCE offline and bring it to the committee. SCE is undertaking a five to seven-year program and undergrounding many areas. Ms. Black commented that AT&T CA and other members would like to know about five years ahead of time if possible. Ms. Walsh commented that she is trying to give AT&T CA as much notice as possible; however, she would not know for sure until she has the JPAs or about six months out. Ms. Walsh stated that she is tossing it out there for the members' awareness. Ms. Black commented that AT&T CA would contact SCE for a side meeting. Ms. Black asked members to email her if they would like to add items to the list.

The committee then reviewed **the Initiating Member requirements to process the design meet request to all owners**. Ms. Black stated that there were many questions about this subject last month. Ms. Black asked if members could ask their team internally why a field meet is being typed on Form 2. She would like to know what drives the field meet, if it is a training issue for that particular new person, if it has a valid reason, or if it has an existing field condition according to the document. She mentioned that it is the company culture in Northern California to add it to Form 2 and hoped that this is not the case for the Southern California members. Ms. Black then asked for feedback from other members. Ms. Treepaisan commented that he does not know if everything was captured in the document; however, he would hate if the committee missed something. Ms. Black inquired if she should add "other" with an explanation.

Ms. Black stated that she could make a form for the initiating member to complete and send to other members so the recipients would know enough information

before Form 2. She would list the items based on the document she created. Ms. Black pointed out number five and asked other members how many business days would be reasonable for the design meet request. She suggested adding a specific contact name to the member contact information file. Ms. Walsh responded that she is reluctant to say that the committee needs another form. She would rather have it on Form 2. Ms. Black asked Ms. LaFrenais would be OK with a draft Form 2. Ms. LaFrenais has yet to respond. Ms. Black stated that she would not create another form and would update the document.

The members continued to review the rest of the document. Ms. Black commented that AT&T CA wants to know the initiating member's SPOC (Single Point of Contact) and the main person in charge. She added that she had never seen any contact information. She also would like to see pictures and set up a virtual meeting as the first meeting. Ms. Walsh and Ms. LaFrenais agreed to set up a virtual meeting as the first meeting.

Ms. Black stated that she did not have time to create a document for the next agenda items; however, she will create the construction field meet section before the next meeting. She added that she would make changes from today and send the revised document out to members promptly.

Ms. LaFrenais commented that she asked her team what would be considered a large project and hoped to hear back from her team soon. Ms. Black responded that she had found her notes and had an answer. Ms. Black stated that she added Caltrans, the LA River project, or other big dollar projects requiring much coordination.

**Agenda Item 3 – Definition and Requirements for Construction Field Meet.**  
This item was tabled for the next meeting.

**Agenda Item 4- Requirements for the Form 2 package**  
This item was tabled for the next meeting.

**Agenda Item 5 - MISC**  
There were no miscellaneous items.

**Agenda Item 6 - Review of Action Items**

- Ms. Black to update the MS Word document and send it out to members.
- Members to review Ms. Black's revised document and provide feedback or edits.
- Ms. Black to write the verbiage for the next items of the agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 12:59 p.m. until June 21, 2023.

Transcribed by Angela Pranata - Committee Staff

## Item 1 – Definition for Planning/Design meet

- **Planning Design Meet:**
  - **Definition:** A meeting, either in person or remote (conference call), where all Pole Owners discuss the issues impacting a non-normal pole replacement. These issues could include attached facilities, physical limitations at the pole location or a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Entity request. (Anything else?) At least one Planning Design Meeting must occur prior to a on site Design meet. (required- yes I mean MUST!)
  
- **Field conditions requiring a Design Meet:**
  - i. Multiple Companies on the same arm – (Why not just transfer the section of pole or the actual arm?) I may be missing something.
  - ii. Antenna Equipment
  - iii. Sewer lines or other immovable obstacles
  - iv. Multiple Power Companies on pole
  - v. Multiple risers – (Is it multiple risers?)
  - vi. Power Meter
  - vii. Pole mounted Communication equipment (need to define what power can not do) terminals should be ok – but B-Box no – is that correct?
  - viii. Communication facilities that need to be “floated” or “Held off”. We need to list these or define.
  - ix. Large projects (need more here – BVE and Vernon)
  - x. High dollar amount projects (Vernon)
  - xi. Helicopter set (SCE)
  - xii. Anything else?
  
- **Initiating Members reasons to request a Design meet:**
  - i. Should it be only if the Field conditions listed above are met?
  - ii. New Power Company Employee unsure of Communication equipment? (Each Member to identify their own internal person who the receiving member could forward the request too.) SME within each member to address their own internal questions.
  - iii. Initiating Members Company culture? – How to change this? How to identify?
  - iv. Anything else?
  
- **Initiating Member requirements to process the Design Meet request to all Owners:**
  - i. Fill in new Design Meet form with all required information: (WIP- KB to do)
    - 1. Pole tag
    - 2. Actual address, with City and hopefully a Lat /Long if possible
    - 3. Field Condition item from above that is the trigger
    - 4. Initiating Member reason from above as the trigger
    - 5. xx Business Day advance timeline – what is reasonable?
    - 6. Request sent to specific people each Member identifies as a new line item on Member Contact list.
    - 7. Anything else?

- ii. **Form 2:** Only the pole needing a Design and Construction meet is on the JPA. (All other poles must be removed.)
  1. Initiating Member Design Meet SPOC contact information (phone and email) listed on JPA
  2. Draft JPA with “known” items filled in.
  3. Anything else?
- - i. **Pole loading details** completed and included with request.
  - ii. **Pictures** – focusing on the Communications facilities that are an issue. But as many pictures as possible.
  - iii. **Virtual meeting should be set up before any field meeting** to see if all Owners are required at to meet in the field. (This allows for Companies to get the correct folks engaged if needed.) This will mean multiple meetings but will facilitate the correct folks at later meetings because the SOW is known. (Required)
    1. **Any requirements?**
- Do we need an **AC item** to charge the Cost Causer? When would this be a triggered or define when acceptable to use the AC item.

## **Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

279 E. Arrow Hwy. Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

Fax (909) 599-3825

**June 21, 2023**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Engineering and Construction Field Meet Committee** took place on the above date, at 12:35 p.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Romero	AT&T California
Ms. Alicia Walsh	Southern California Edison
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Michael Wilke	City of Los Angeles
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. Glenn Leckie	Frontier Communications
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. John Vu	City of Anaheim
Mr. Arturo Garcia	City of Glendale
Ms. Katy White	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

Chairperson, Ms. Black called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m. by addressing the review of the **prior month's meeting minutes**. There were no questions or comments.

### **Agenda Item 2 – Definition for Planning/Design meet**

- Action items from the previous meeting:
- Ms. Black to update the MS Word document and send it out to members.
- Members to review Ms. Black's revised document and provide feedback or edits.

- Ms. Black to write the verbiage for the next items of the agenda.

Ms. Black reported that she met with the AT&T California team, and there were conversations about the differences between the same hole set and cut and kick. Ms. Black commented that they are very different operations, and one is more work-intensive. She added that she would open up the discussion during the Authorized Costs ad hoc committee to obtain more definitions. For this ad hoc meeting, it would be critical to have more definition around what is required at the joint construction meet. Ms. Black felt that a design meet might not be necessary for the cut and kick but would be necessary for the same hole set. Ms. Black would check her notes to ensure the term 'same hole set' is correct. Ms. Walsh commented that they are complicated; however, she is more concerned with the ones that have razors. Mr. Harmon stated there is no difference between 'same hole set' and 'cut and kick.' He explained that members could set the pole in the same hole, remove all the facilities to a section of a pole, cut and kick it – meaning move the older pole adjacent to it and support it. He added that the predominant reasons a member would set in the same hole are a riser on a pole, a dead end, or an anchor to ensure the member is bisecting and an existing utility adjacent to it. The 'cut and kick' indicates that the setting member has left a portion of the pole safely and securely to a new pole in the same hole as the old one. From SCE's perspective, Ms. Walsh stated that the cut and kick is where the section of the pole is maintained at the communication level, either through ties or secured at the new pole through some anchor or something that they placed up on the pole with nothing underneath it. Mr. Harmon explained that 'cut and kick' came from 'cut and kick the pole butt,' where a member takes the bottom part of the pole (pole butt) so a new pole can be placed in the same hole. Ms. Black commented that her team was trying to explain that after the construction is different. Ms. Black inquired if only some of them would have a section of the pole or do all of them would. Mr. Harmon commented that there is a diagram in the Routine Handbook, however, it is confusing, and the committee could revise it to explain the process better. Ms. Black agreed that the diagram was confusing.

Ms. Black then commented that she would work on the revised document from last month's meeting and send it to the committee.

Ms. Black asked the members if they had any examples that she could work on together with the other members. She is trying to recreate the process in real-time. She asked if a power company has a pole candidate right now that qualifies for a valid 'joint meet' so she can document the process to get from A to B. Mr. Dailey stated that AT&T CA would like to see examples where they may not want to leave a section of a pole or just want to remove the entire pole and have both teams work together. Mr. Wilke commented that he used to send an email with a picture with a question on how to proceed. He would rarely meet out in the field. Mr. Daily responded that it was a good point. He would like to know the urgency of a meet or have a clear definition. Mr. Wilke commented that he would find out from his team at LADWP what is pending right now and will reach out to AT&T CA after. Ms. Black reiterated that she wanted to make the first design meet virtually.

### **Agenda Item 3 – Definition and Requirements for Construction Field Meet.**

This item was tabled for the next meeting.

**Agenda Item 4- Requirements for the Form 2 package**

This item was tabled for the next meeting.

**Agenda Item 5 - MISC**

There were no miscellaneous items.

**Agenda Item 6 - Review of Action Items**

- Ms. Black to update the MS Word document from the last meeting and send it out to members. Members to review Ms. Black's revised document and provide feedback or edits. Ms. Black to write the next verbiage for the next items of the agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 12:47 p.m. until July 19, 2023.

Transcribed by Angela Pranata - Committee Staff

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

279 E. Arrow Hwy. Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

Fax (909) 599-3825

**Engineering and Construction Field Meet ad hoc Committee  
did not meet in July 2023.**

**Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

279 E. Arrow Hwy. Suite 104  
San Dimas, CA 91773  
Phone (909) 599-3801  
Fax (909) 599-3825

**August 16, 2023**

A meeting of the **ad hoc Engineering and Construction Field Meet Committee** took place on the above date, at 11:40 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Todd Dailey	AT&T California
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Robert Jystad	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Araceli Lomeli	City of Los Angeles
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Sam Picazo	Southern California Edison
Mr. Jeremy Harmon	Verizon Wireless
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Ms. Katy White	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Ms. Emily McDonald	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications
Mr. Joe Armstrong	City of Pasadena
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Ms. Alyssa Aguilar	City of Colton
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Dawn Laffoon	Mobilitie, LLC
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff

Chairperson, Ms. Black called the meeting to order at 11:40 a.m. Ms. Black stated that the ad hoc committee will be closed. The committee could be opened at another time by another member when necessary.

There were no questions or comments.

The meeting adjourned at 11:41 a.m.

Transcribed by Angela Pranata - Committee Staff