

## **Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

**February 18, 2026**

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 11:31 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
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. Kristoffer Scheetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Jeremy Effinger	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	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. Brian Rehfield	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. Damon Stuart	City of Banning
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Mr. Salvador Zambrano	City of Burbank
Ms. Katia Muradian	City of Pasadena
Mr. Dave Campo	City of Lompoc
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Ms. Tamara Zaki	Boldyn Networks US LLC
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications

Mr. James Todaro	Verizon Wireless (Airtouch)
Ms. Patti Ringo	Sonic Telecom, LLC
Mr. Edward Castro	City of Glendale
Mr. Irvin Orzuna	City of Glendale
Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Heidi Seropian	Extenet Systems
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Ms. Ortiz called the meeting to order at 11:31 a.m.

**Agenda Item 1 – Review of prior month’s meeting minutes** – In Ms. Ortiz opened the meeting by inquiring if there were any questions or concerns regarding the previous meeting minutes.

There were no comments or concerns from the members.

**Agenda Item 2 – Interpretation of Routine Handbook** – Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any items to bring up.

Ms. Black stated she would like to discuss the Form 48 for the receiving member of the JPA. Ms. Black asked if Form 48’s are required by the receiving members. Ms. Ortiz stated that if the receiving member does not have any work on the pole, then no they would not. Ms. Ortiz asked if any members had any discussion or comments on this. Ms. Black stated she is asking for two reasons. First reason is for resources and the second is if it is even useful information for the members if there is a pulling routine on a pole replacement and AT&T California is the last member to pull the pole butt, do the members need to know they are done with their work. Ms. Ortiz stated in that instance she would say yes. Ms. Black asked to hear from the base owners because they are billing it before AT&T California gets their job issued and does not believe they are holding the base owner up by not getting the Form 48. Ms. Black stated that that could be why she is inquiring. Mr. Van Stryk stated he does not believe AT&T California is holding up pole owners, but it is nice to know that their part is done, and it can be categorized as completed. Ms. Ortiz agreed with Mr. Van Stryk that receiving the Form 48 that the pole was PTD’d is like closing up the project for the last step and it is considered done. Mr. Van Stryk stated he has heard in other cities there will be mentions of buddy poles being out in the field and if the base owner has the Form 48 they could show that the other member stated the work was completed, but otherwise it would just be a nice thing to have. Ms. Black asked if the consensus was a Form 48 would be required when the field conditions show that the receiving member would have work to do. Ms. Van Stryk stated that when there is work to transfer it would be nice to know. Ms. Black stated that when AT&T California has a truck role, they will submit a Form 48, but if the power company does all the work, then AT&T California would not have

to send a Form 48 because they did not have a truck role. Mr. Van Stryk stated he would think that was right. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California would go by this unless there is a member that requires, they send a Form 48 every time.

Ms. Ortiz asked if there was anything else on this agenda item. There were no comments or concerns from the members.

**Agenda Item 3 – Item 1597: Review of Routine Handbook Examples (5/19/2015)** – Ms. Ortiz opened the discussion to if there were any examples to discuss.

There were no comments or concerns from the members.

**Agenda Item 4 – Item 1793: Section 4.0 with Form 48 (Y. Delgado – Time Warner Cable 10/18/2023)** – Ms. Ortiz opened to Section 4.0 with Form 48 and asked if it was still on hold. Ms. Ortiz asked if SCE would like to keep this on the agenda. Ms. Ray confirmed that this is still on hold and to keep it on the agenda.

There were no comments or concerns from the members.

**Agenda Item 5 – Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas (Lex Treepaisan – Frontier Communications & Jeremy Harmon – Verizon Wireless, moved from Routine Revision – 3/15/23, moved from Compliance – 6/17/24) – 11/20/2024** – Ms. Ortiz opened to Strand Mounted Antennas. Mr. Treepaisan stated he went back through verbiage and simplified it to incorporate the twelve-inch separation on strand mount antennas. Mr. Treepaisan shared his screen with the members). Mr. Bacon asked if it was Rule 94 and Mr. Treepaisan agreed. Mr. Treepaisan stated that the note at the end of Section 3.15 he added in red *clearance may be reduced to one foot for strand mounted antennas operating at 150 watts or less*, which memorialized the latest rule change in GO 95 for the strand mounted antennas. Mr. Treepaisan stated he did get to confirm with Mr. Harmon on this but that this is what he believes he wanted added. Mr. Treepaisan stated he originally was overcomplicating it and that he reviewed the examples in A2 and B7 and that this change does not affect that. Mr. Treepaisan stated that the only other thing that he thinks could help would be an illustration of the antenna versus something out on the pole to help clarify. Mr. Van Stryk stated an illustration could be nice but that they may also need to add something to Section 4.0 or 4.1 because he is not catching any purchase of interest for strand mounted antennas and asked if any other members are seeing any random purchases of interest on these. Mr. Van Stryk stated adding something to Section 4.0 or 4.1 stating if they are going to install a strand-mounted antenna they need to purchase more space. Mr. Treepaisan stated he will look into those sections and with this he was trying to memorialize that the note in Section 3.15 is saying that the space of the antenna still requires a safety clearance zone from the edges of that antenna. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he believes in the back examples they were using seven and eight foot total space for the antenna

including the safety clearance zone. He stated he will go over Sections 4.0 and 4.1 to see if he catches anything and he can also attempt to make some sort of illustration as an example as well. Mr. Bacon stated that he had a question in regard to the two-foot rule and the antenna itself, he wanted to know how far out from the pole the strand mounted antenna must be and if that language needs to be added. Mr. Treepaisan stated he believes that other things in GO 95 mention a certain number of feet so he will make note of this to add it. Mr. Van Stryk stated that in Section 4.0 there is a note three that Mr. Treepaisan could edit or add to for that same thing. Mr. Van Stryk stated that note three described about members purchasing above an existing antenna and incoming members are required to purchase two feet minimum above the antenna. Mr. Treepaisan could add a note four and keep it simple. Mr. Treepaisan stated that Mr. Van Stryk's suggestion to add a note four does seem like the least intrusive way to add something. Mr. Bacon stated that he is not familiar with certain cellular regulations and wanted to know how they would go about determining if the cell antenna was 150 watts or less. Mr. Van Stryk stated with good faith. Mr. Treepaisan stated that besides the good faith they would need to have the members send the data sheet or have the make and model of that radio system. Mr. Treepaisan stated he does not know how many of the antenna out there are operating at 150 watts or less. He stated he was making the stipulation because it puts it at a communication level circuit because communication circuits cannot operate over 150 watts. Mr. Treepaisan stated that as far as GO 95 and the clearances from Class C communication circuits he wanted to keep it as a level playing field and they should meet all the requirements of a Class C circuit. Ms. Black asked for the members placing strand mounted antennas she asked if they could chime in if their antennas are less than 150 watts. Mr. Van Stryk stated that when all this started City of Vernon put a strand mounted antenna up and he was confused because he thought he needed to go back and charge a Section 4.1 and did not know how much space was required to be charged and when the pole is rearranged there is not space for the antenna per GO 95. Mr. Van Stryk stated he started this because he did not know if City of Vernon was required to purchase additional space or not and how to establish this in the Routine Handbook so that if it ever comes up the members can easily find that they are supposed to have purchased additional space and bill for it when they rearrange and be code compliant and also documented that they purchased that space. Mr. Treepaisan stated that the note in Section 3.15 is vague and does not explicitly say additional space to the antenna size. Mr. Treepaisan stated that in the examples A2 and B7 they are purchasing seven or eight feet to accommodate for a five-foot antenna size and the two feet from there. In going through the notes, he saw the original question posed to know why the strand mount antenna is at a different height and that the language was placed there from the fire proceedings along with some others. Mr. Bacon asked on a 150-watt antenna that is classified as a low volt antenna which is fed power wise through the communication line or if it has a secondary hook up with the power box and

then going up and out on the strand mount. Mr. Treepaisan stated that his interpretation of the rule is that it would be a low voltage site and GO 95 addresses antennas and radios as one in the same. Mr. Treepaisan stated his original thought when he read through this was it was separate but reading closer to it, it is basically combining the antenna and it includes the radio part and if any of those components exceed 150 watts the two-foot rule comes back into play. Mr. Treepaisan stated he looked at the specs and the two cases he looked at the radios were well over 150 watts for modern systems and that he does not know because he does not place wireless antennas for Frontier Communications and asked if anyone from Verizon Wireless or AT&T Mobility could speak to that because he does not know what technology is being put up and how much power is being consumed by the radio or emitted from the antenna. Mr. Van Stryk stated that he believes the communication would be feeding at 150 watts almost like a PoE (Power over Ethernet). Mr. Treepaisan stated that 150 watts they are looking at network power and circuits which are 100 watts which could be fed with a twisted pair. Mr. Treepaisan stated Ms. McLean gave him an example that Extenet was doing but those radios were 500 to 1000 watts which would not apply here. Mr. Treepaisan stated that cable tv asked for this rule for a specific application in mind and he added the 150-watt language to keep it a level playing field.

There were no further questions or comments from the members.

**Agenda Item 6 - Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Routine Handbook Review (Kay Black – AT&T California - 2/19/25)** – Ms. Ortiz opened to the Approved Maintenance Program and stated that this item was discussed at the Administrative Board meeting and further discussion was required by SCE. Ms. Black asked if SCE had any edits. Mr. Ray stated SCE did not have any edits yet. Ms. Black stated that this item is still on hold pending SCE edits.

There were no further questions or comments from the members.

**Agenda Item 7 – Item 1800: Approved Maintenance Program Review (K. Black – AT&T CA – 2/19/2025, moved from Compliance on 08/20/2025)** – Ms. Ortiz opened to Approved Maintenance Program and stated that this item was discussed at the Administrative Board meeting and further discussion was required by SCE. Ms. Black confirmed this was pending SCE’s review.

There were no further questions or comments from the members.

**Agenda Item 8 – Item 1808: Time Limit for Final Form 2 Billing (H. Chadwick - NXT/MCI/ATS - 1/21/2026)** – Ms. Ortiz opened to Item 1808, Time Limit for Final Form 2 Billing brought up by Mr. Chadwick who was currently not on the call. Ms. Ortiz stated that what is intention with this was with pole replacements if they can be final billed within two years of the pole being placed. Ms. Ortiz stated that they all have a huge backlog, but this is what he wanted to bring to the table. Ms. Ortiz stated that there are pole replacements from over 4

years being final billed now. Mr. Van Stryk stated that he is guessing Mr. Chadwick does not have any problems with Section 7.13. Ms. Ortiz stated Mr. Chadwick was referencing the Section 7.11 replacements. Mr. Van Stryk stated he is ok with adding language if they add it to Section 4.0 as well. Mr. Van Stryk stated that if a purchase space fails to final bill, they need to forfeit ownership and unattach all their lines if they must do their Form 2 with a Form 7 within a year or two. Mr. Van Stryk stated that if they have a time limit then whoever is holding them up has to remove their attachment. Ms. Ortiz stated that what MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications has been seeing as well is if there is a purchase of interest holding up a replacement what they will do is remove the pole from the purchase of interest and show it as unauthorized on the pole replacement. Ms. Ortiz stated they are doing it that way as well so that they do not have to wait for that purchase of interest JPA to final bill. Mr. Van Stryk stated they can do it that way if the companies approves of it, but technically they are not supposed to because they are forcing the communication company to pay more when they did submit their Form 2, pole loading, and all that work. Mr. Van Stryk stated that if they are going to discuss time limits like putting a time limit or shot clock on the replacing member to get all their things administratively in line, then the communication member who cannot get their things in line has to remove their attachment. Mr. Van Stryk stated in his opinion this would be the only way to make it fair, not asking the setting member to now administratively jump through hurdles to accommodate that attaching member for not doing their administrative job. Mr. Van Stryk stated that is not the way it should work because Section 4.1 and Section 7.7 are a penalty and should not be the normal. Ms. Ray asked how it works when the committee has its own backlog. Ms. Ortiz stated that it is like a domino effect and stated if the members would like to brainstorm some ideas or suggestions to bring back and further discuss next month. Ms. Ray stated Mr. Chadwick may have those to share when he joins the meeting.

There were no further questions or comments from the members.

#### **Agenda Item 9 Miscellaneous Issues –**

- Ms. Ortiz asked if there were any miscellaneous items.  
There were no comments or concerns from the members.

#### **Agenda Item 10 – Review of Action items/JPA Alerts –**

- **Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas** Mr. Treepaisan is going to review to see if a note can be added to Section 4.0 and Section 4.1. He is also to make an illustration based on his red lines to Section 3.15.
- **Item 1808: Time Limit for Final Form 2 Billing** The members are to brainstorm and see how they can improve the process because of the domino effect caused due to pending JPAs that need to be final billed.

The Meeting adjourned at 11:54 a.m. until March 18, 2026.

Transcribed by Anali Spencer – Committee Staff

# Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas

## 94.4 Clearances

- A. Antennas and supporting elements below supply lines shall maintain a vertical clearance of 6 feet from Supply Conductors operating at 0 – 50kV. (See [Figure 94-1](#))
- B. Antennas and supporting elements below communication lines shall maintain a 2 ft. vertical separation from communication conductors and equipment. (See [Figure 94-1](#))
- C. Antennas, associated equipment (e.g. terminations, enclosures) and support elements installed above supply lines and/or communication lines of different ownership attached to the same structure shall maintain the vertical clearances specified in [Rule 38, Table 2, Case 21, Columns A - H](#).  
Note: Other vertical clearances between communication equipment and supply lines are specified in [Rule 32.1.072](#).
- D. Antennas, associated equipment (e.g. terminations, enclosures) and support elements, installed above supply lines and/or communication lines of different ownership, shall maintain the radial clearances from unattached supply and communication lines specified in [Rule 38, Table 2, Case 3](#).
- E. Antennas shall maintain a 2 ft. horizontal clearance from centerline of pole when affixed between supply and communication lines or below communication lines. (See [Figure 94-1](#))
- F. Horizontal clearances from centerline of the pole for Antennas, associated equipment and support elements, affixed between supply lines or at the top of a climbable pole, are not specified, but must be arranged so that the pole may be climbed safely.
- G. Antennas shall have a vertical clearance above ground as specified in [Rule 37, Table 1, Column 6, Cases 1 -6a](#). (See [Figure 94-1](#))

## Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas

### Anali Spencer

---

**From:** Angela Pranata  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 2, 2023 9:52 AM  
**To:** Anali Spencer  
**Subject:** Fw: Antennas - Types ,Clearances and the Purchasing of Space  
**Attachments:** example pole.png; 4 cables one antenna attached to cable.png; 4 cables one antenna attached to cable - pic 2.png

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Due By:** Monday, May 8, 2023 8:00 AM  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:** IMPORTANT, MTG

Angela Pranata  
Manager of Operations  
So. Ca. Joint Pole Committee  
909-599-3801 x8  
Cell: 909-451-3024  
angela@scjpc.net

---

**From:** Nick Van Stryk <nick@petrellelectric.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 15, 2023 2:22 PM  
**To:** JHarmon@motiveis.com <JHarmon@motiveis.com>; 'Earle Carrion' <Earle.Carrion@crowncastle.com>  
**Cc:** AT&T (Joint Pole) Kay Black <kayblack@att.com>; Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; 'john.bacon at ladwp.com' <john.bacon@ladwp.com>; Lex Treepaisan <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>  
**Subject:** Antennas - Types ,Clearances and the Purchasing of Space

Good Afternoon,

I have been sent a set of plans regarding antenna attachments and I keep getting mixed answers.

I am trying to understand how an antenna attached to a pole requires one clearance but once an Antenna is attached to the messenger it no longer is required to mean as much of a separation. I have attached an image of a pole in which the member has submitted plans to install an antenna. They do not plan on attaching the antenna to the pole. I can only assume then that the antenna will be on a messenger.

There is no purchase of interest required. My concern is that they are sharing an arm and will (with the added weight) also end up sagging into the line below them. If they installed a vertical 12" stand off to maintain the separation; the equipment would still not be 12" apart.

As you can see in an example I found, in the photos "4 cables one antenna", their attachment is not radially separated. The most recent attachment on the pole is the antenna owner.

My question is how can an antenna attached to a messenger be exempt from the rules of 94.4 which apply to antennas on a pole? I don't completely understand what is exempting antennas on a messenger from the clearances in 94.4. I

## Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas

don't understand why the requirements exist for when it is attached direct to an arm or pole and then no longer are required after they are installed 2ft off the pole.

Respectfully,

**Nicholas Van Stryk** • *P.E. Electrical* • **Direct:** 323.583.8811 Ext. 618 • **Cell:** 818.300.4682

*Service Planning • Electrical Inspections • SCJPC Representative • Fiber Services • GIS Coordinator*

**Petrelli** **ELECTRIC CO.**

---

**SAFETY • QUALITY • SERVICE**

---

**ST. LIC. 444795**

Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



Item 1798: Strand Mount Antennas



# Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Handbook Review

## Anali Spencer

---

**From:** Silvana Ray <Silvana.Ray@sce.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 7, 2025 5:47 PM  
**To:** April DeBarge; Angela Pranata; aaska@anaheim.net; Alex Parra; ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com; Ben Coffey; DAILEY (AT&T CA), TODD M DAILEY; Daniel Lippert; David Campo; Heidi Seropian; Hien Vuong (Azusa); John Vu; Bacon John R.; Joint Pole BURBANK; BLACK, KAY R; Linda McLean; Marco Murillo; Megan Stewart; Nick Van Stryk (Vernon); pb4420@att.com; Torbati, Iman; 'Vinh Tran'; Lex Treepaisan; Baldwin, Kimberly [CTO]; Lynne LaFrenais; Alicia Smith; Maria Ortiz; Akerson, Victoria; Isaiah.Zamorano@bvesinc.com; Brian Botteri; Ken.haley@sonic.com; Arellano, Claudia; Aarize Dizon; maggie.howell@americantower.com; Kristen.Stathis@AmericanTower.com; Patricia.Ringo@sonic.com; Gabriel.Tansey@sonic.com; Dianell Caamano; Ghilardi, Anthony; Michael S Pearson; Kristina.Nagy@CrownCastle.com; Marisol Bailey; Truong, Michael; Johnny Villalobos; Shawn Henderson; Samuel Picazo; Jeffrey York; Kevin Jimmy Flores; Joseph.Iedesma10@T-mobile.com; Joe Armstrong; renzo.garzon@boldyn.com; Dawn Laffoon; Asset Management - US NAT; CClark@burbankca.gov; ba3817@att.com; Maribel Sanchez; SZambrano@burbankca.gov; Steven Chagolla; jgreaney@anaheim.net; Jeremy.Effinger.contractor@crowncastle.com; Costa, Jackie; howard.chadwick@verizon.com; tamara.zaki@boldyn.com; Elias Avila; phinojos@coltonca.gov; rommel.balba@ladwp.com; George Varghese; AVerma@Glendaleca.gov; Jason Smith; Joseph DeLaTorre; iorzuna@glendaleca.gov; jatodaro@motiveis.com; April.Flores@crowncastle.com; Yesenia Delgado; Kathleen Allen; Anali Spencer; Kristoffer Scheetz  
**Subject:** Re: 2025 Oct 15 SCJPC Meeting: Administrative Board, Operating Additional Information  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Due By:** Wednesday, November 19, 2025 8:00 AM  
**Flag Status:** Flagged  
**Categories:** IMPORTANT, MTG

Good afternoon All,

Please see the attached redlines below for item 1799:

## Item 1799 - Maintenance Program – edits in red

(Please also review the related edits for Item 1800 for Authorized Cost Review.)

### Glossary

#### F. Approved Maintenance Program

An Approved Maintenance Program will be one that was presented to the Administrative Board, and approved through the normal voting process, as outlined in the current Agreement.

Membership “approval” is needed to bill shared costs through the Form 44 process.

Membership “approval” does not mean the Membership is “approving” a Utility’s actual Maintenance Programs specific details. The criteria used to define “mutual benefit, “to share costs in intrusive testing, is outlined in section 19.5. ~~Before January 1 each year, the owner implementing the pole intrusive inspection and treatment program will identify the expected number of poles to be tested that year, with their approximate locations and submit the data to each pole owner, prior to starting the work.~~

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

- (a) Re-Tagging... ~~only once per pole per 12 mos, unless special agreement~~.....
- (b) Replacing Visibility Strips ..... ~~only once per year, unless special agreement~~..... 16

Regards,

**Silvana Ray**

Sr. Supervisor

Joint Pole Operations | Regulatory, Ops. Mgmt. & Engagement

T. (909) 357-6130 | M. (714) 465-0038

PIV1 | 1 Innovation Way Pomona, CA 91768 | 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor



Energy for What's Ahead



Mental Health  
FIRST AIDER

VALUES BASED  
INSPIRING EACH OTHER  
CENTERED ON SAFETY  
ONE TEAM

# Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Handbook Review

Safety | Integrity | Excellence | Respect | Continuous Improvement | Teamwork  
Questions? Click Here: [JOINT POLE OPERATIONS](#)

---

**From:** April DeBarge <April.DeBarge@sce.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, October 16, 2025 1:16 PM

**To:** Angela Pranata <angela@scjpc.net>; aaska@anaheim.net <aaska@anaheim.net>; Alex Parra <AParra@riversideca.gov>; ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com <ATC.OutdoorDAS@americantower.com>; Ben Coffey <bcoffey@banningca.gov>; DAILEY (AT&T CA), TODD M DAILEY <td3494@att.com>; Daniel Lippert <DLippert@burbankca.gov>; David Campo <D\_Campo@ci.lompoc.ca.us>; Heidi Seropian <hseropian@extenetsystems.com>; Hien Vuong (Azusa) <hvuong@azusaca.gov>; John Vu <JVu@anaheim.net>; Bacon John R. <John.Bacon@ladwp.com>; Joint Pole BURBANK <JointPole@burbankca.gov>; BLACK, KAY R <kb6314@att.com>; Linda McLean <lmclean@extenetsystems.com>; Marco Murillo <marco.murillo@verizonwireless.com>; Megan Stewart <Megan.Stewart@ftr.com>; Nick Van Stryk (Vernon) <nick@petrellelectric.com>; pb4420@att.com <pb4420@att.com>; Torbati, Iman <ITorbati@ci.vernon.ca.us>; 'Vinh Tran' <VTran@anaheim.net>; Lex Treepaisan <lex.treepaisan@ftr.com>; Baldwin, Kimberly [CTO] <Kimberly.2.Baldwin@t-mobile.com>; Lynne LaFrenais <lynne.lafrenais@bvesinc.com>; Alicia Smith <ASmith@motiveis.com>; Maria Ortiz <MOrtiz@motiveis.com>; Akerson, Victoria <VAkerson@burbankca.gov>; Isaiah.Zamorano@bvesinc.com <Isaiah.Zamorano@bvesinc.com>; Brian Botteri <brian.botteri@sonic.com>; Ken.haley@sonic.com <Ken.haley@sonic.com>; Arellano, Claudia <carellano@ci.vernon.ca.us>; Aarize Dizon <aarize.dizon@crowncastle.com>; maggie.howell@americantower.com <maggie.howell@americantower.com>; Kristen.Stathis@AmericanTower.com <Kristen.Stathis@AmericanTower.com>; Patricia.Ringo@sonic.com <Patricia.Ringo@sonic.com>; Gabriel.Tansey@sonic.com <Gabriel.Tansey@sonic.com>; Dianell Caamano <dcaamano@motiveis.com>; Ghilardi, Anthony <aghilardi@cityofpasadena.net>; Michael S Pearson <michael.pearson@sce.com>; Kristina.Nagy@CrownCastle.com <Kristina.Nagy@CrownCastle.com>; Marisol Bailey <Marisol.Bailey@sce.com>; Truong, Michael <MTruong@burbankca.gov>; Johnny Villalobos <jvillalobos@tpx.com>; Shawn Henderson <SHenderson@networkconnex.com>; Samuel Picazo <SAM.PICAZO@SCE.COM>; Jeffrey York <jyork@cogentco.com>; Kevin Jimmy Flores <kevin.flores@sce.com>; Joseph.ledesma10@T-mobile.com <Joseph.ledesma10@T-mobile.com>; Silvana Ray <Silvana.Ray@sce.com>; Joe Armstrong <jarmstrong@cityofpasadena.net>; renzo.garzon@boldyn.com <renzo.garzon@boldyn.com>; Dawn Laffoon <dawn.laffoon@boldyn.com>; Asset Management - US NAT <am.us@boldyn.com>; CClark@burbankca.gov <CClark@burbankca.gov>; ba3817@att.com <ba3817@att.com>; Maribel Sanchez <MSanchez@motiveis.com>; SZambrano@burbankca.gov <SZambrano@burbankca.gov>; Steven Chagolla <schagolla@anaheim.net>; jgreaney@anaheim.net <jgreaney@anaheim.net>; Jeremy.Effinger.contractor@crowncastle.com <Jeremy.Effinger.contractor@crowncastle.com>; Costa, Jackie <jacqueline.costa@crowncastle.com>; howard.chadwick@verizon.com <howard.chadwick@verizon.com>; tamara.zaki@boldyn.com <tamara.zaki@boldyn.com>; Elias Avila <Eavila@coltonca.gov>; phinojos@coltonca.gov <phinojos@coltonca.gov>; rommel.balba@ladwp.com <rommel.balba@ladwp.com>; George Varghese <VGeorge@Glendaleca.gov>; AVerma@Glendaleca.gov <AVerma@Glendaleca.gov>; Jason Smith <jsmith@banningca.gov>; Joseph DeLaTorre <Joseph.DeLaTorre@azusaca.gov>; iorzuna@glendaleca.gov <iorzuna@glendaleca.gov>; jatodaro@motiveis.com <jatodaro@motiveis.com>; April.Flores@crowncastle.com <April.Flores@crowncastle.com>; Yesenia Delgado <Yesenia.Delgado@charter.com>; Kathleen Allen <kathleen@scjpc.net>; Anali Spencer <anali.spencer@scjpc.net>; Kristoffer Scheetz <Kristoffer.Scheetz@sce.com>

**Subject:** 2025 Oct 15 SCJPC Meeting: Administrative Board, Operating Additional Information

Hello, everyone.

There was a lot of discussion yesterday, the opportunity to mention this point slipped by us:

- Concerning COG. Being that the handbook, agreement, and bylaws are all confidential and prohibited from disclosure to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party based on section 1.3, we would like to confirm that the

## Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Handbook Review

attorney is drafting an NDA template and that it is fully executed before anything further is shared with this entity.

Additionally:

- SCE would like to move items 1799 Approved Maintenance Program Routine Handbook Review and 1800 Approved Maintenance Program Review back to discussion, considering new information gathered from SCE senior management.

Thank you.

april  
Be Safe Always...

## Item 1799 - Maintenance Program – edits in red

(Please also review the related edits for Item 1800 for Authorized Cost Review.)

### Glossary

#### F. Approved Maintenance Program

An Approved Maintenance Program will be one that was presented to the Administrative Board, and approved through the normal voting process, as outlined in the current Agreement.

Membership “approval” is needed to bill shared costs through the Form 44 process.

Membership “approval” does not mean the Membership is “approving” a Utility’s actual Maintenance Programs specific details. The criteria used to define “mutual benefit, “to share costs in intrusive testing, is outlined in section 19.5. Before January 1 each year, the owner implementing the pole intrusive inspection and treatment program will identify the expected number of poles to be tested that year, with their approximate locations and submit the data to each pole owner, prior to starting the work.

### Section 2.7 – Other Billing Directives

#### H. Approved Maintenance Program

Per Section 19.5, those utilities currently involved in an approved ~~intrusive inspection/inspection & treatment~~ maintenance program are shown below:

##### Member Date of Board Approval

SCE (Edison) October 1993

~~\*steel stub/fiberglass April 2007~~  
~~wrap added~~

M (DWP) July 2000

MP (Pasadena) July 2000

J (Riverside) June 2001

MA (Azusa) August 2001

D (City of Anaheim) January 2006

BVE (Bear Valley Electric) January 2006

LLW (City of Lompoc) March 2009

B (City of Burbank) April 2016

All intrusive inspection/inspection and treatment joint pole authorizations will be final billed within three years of inspection date. ~~May only be billed once every 5~~

## Item 1799: Approved Maintenance Program Handbook Review

~~years.~~ Inspections completed prior to the members Board approval date, cannot be billed to other members. (Revised April 2016).

~~Billing Members shall send the list of poles from intrusive inspection (and item 15a re-tagging if any) to the other owners by the 5<sup>th</sup> of each month.~~

~~The receiving member should respond within 15 days to advise if there are any discrepancies. After 15 days, the list can be submitted to the SCJPC office to be added onto the F44.~~

## Section 19

### ~~19.5 Intrusive Inspection, or Inspection and if needed Treatment of Poles~~

~~Inspection, or inspection and treatment of joint poles subject to GO 165 or GO 95 may be made by any joint owner without expense to the other owner(s).~~

~~When an approved maintenance program exists (see Glossary), the expense will be shared equally by each owner of the pole (See Item 12, may include item 6, and 15. See Section 2.7H for members with approved maintenance program). ~~May only be billed once every 5 years. (January 2012).~~~~

~~Criteria for pole intrusive test shared billing will be to adhere to requirements outlined in GO 165, Table 1, and to provide required test data at the time of invoicing.~~

~~The required data must include at a minimum, the Pole Tag, Year Set, Height, Class, Lat/Long, Address, Inspection Vendor Name, Current Inspection date, Past Inspection Date (if any), Pass/Fail Results, Original Circ, Effective Circ, Intrusive Inspection Type, Reject Status, Remaining Strength, Treatment Performed, Intrusive Test Recommended Corrective Action.~~

~~The required data shall be in excel format and shall have all fields answered.~~

~~Additional intrusive testing may be conducted at the discretion of the base owner or upon request from another member to ensure compliance with General Order 95 Rule 44.2; however, such additional testing shall be performed at the expense of the requesting party, with no cost-sharing among members.~~

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