

Southern California Joint Pole Committee

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

March 18, 2026

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 10:33 a.m. via teleconference. Those in attendance were:**

Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Mr. Howard Chadwick	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Samuel Picazo	Southern California Edison
Ms. Shelby Mulvehill	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. Joe Serrato	Crown Castle NG West Inc.
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Kay Black	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 10:33 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. Ortiz opened to Section 7 updates to the Routine Handbook presented by SCE (see attached). Ms. DeBarge stated that SCE is asking for “wood and non-wood” to be added to both Sections 7.3 and 7.6. Ms. Mulvehill stated that previously Sections 7.7 and 7.13 were updated to state “wood and non-wood” so they would not have to add Section 7.14 to those sections. SCE is asking to do this to Sections 7.3 and 7.6 to decrease memos. Ms. Ortiz asked if the members had any objections. Mr. Van Stryk asked of on the left-hand side of the JPA it will show the notation if it is non-wood like LS or CF. Ms. Mulvehill stated that they just copied and pasted as it is for Sections 7.7 and 7.13. Mr. Van Stryk stated that the section 7.14 for non-wood was added so that members would be able to differentiate internally when a wood pole is being replaced by a non-wood pole. Ms. Mulvehill stated she believes that is a declaration of Section 7.11 so Sections 7.11 and 7.14 would still be in the Routine Handbook but if a Section 7.3 or 7.6 is used then Section 7.14 would not need to be also added if it is another than wood pole. Ms. DeBarge asked if they could review the sections that were updated showing wood and non-wood. Ms. Pranata asked if the SCJPC office would no longer see Section 7.14 used on finals anymore. Ms. Mulvehill stated if it was a wood to non-wood pole Section 7.14 would still be used. She stated currently for example for a car hit pole they need to use a Section 7.6 and in addition a Section 7.14 as well if it is being changed out for a non-wood pole. She stated for memo purposes they would like that to be taken off as it was for Section 7.13. Ms. Ortiz asked if it is a regular replacement not involving Sections 7.7, 7.6, 7.3, and 7.13, they would either use Section 7.11 or 7.14. Ms. Mulvehill stated that for Sections 7.7 and 7.13, adding Section 7.14 is not required and they would like to do the same for the overbuild, car hit pole, and fire JPAs (Section 7.3 and Section 7.6 A and B). Ms. DeBarge stated it does not change any billing because the treatment of the new pole will still be the same, it will only require one less section being added to the JPA making it one less memo sent back for a missing section. Ms. Black stated that

she is learning something she did not know which was she believed a Section 7.14 was always required when a wood pole was being changed out with a non-wood pole because that section code is important to the receiving members. Ms. Ortiz stated it makes it stand out on the JPA. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California takes notice when it is a Section 7.14. Ms. Black stated that she can see why on Section 7.7 it was agreed to change this because they are unauthorized, but if the pole gets buried or removed and AT&T California is a joint owner they would like to know if the wood pole is being replaced by a non-wood pole. Ms. Black stated AT&T California would like to remain having Section 7.14 called out. Ms. DeBarge asked if just seeing the new pole treatment was not enough. Ms. Black stated it was not for her team. Ms. DeBarge stated it does not make much sense that “wood and non-wood” was added to some sections but not to all. Mr. Van Stryk stated that with Section 7.7 and 7.13 is the JPA is being written after the fact so there is no way a member will say no, but with Section 7.3 the pole is being replaced because the member wants to replace it and it is not part of maintenance. Ms. LaFrenais stated that Bear Valley Electric is changing out a lot of its wire lines with covered conductors which creates a different weight in SPIDA CALC on the pole and sometimes the pole has to be replaced before the 20 or 25 years. Ms. LaFrenais does not think of that as Overbuilt. Mr. Van Stryk stated that it would probably end up being a subsection of Section 7.11 because it is probably for joint benefit maintenance wise, and it could be considered. Ms. Mulvehill stated that a lot of members are requesting Section 7.3 for SCE JPA’s, and they see it quite often. Mr. Van Stryk stated that he does not see an issue with adding the verbiage to Section 7.3. He stated that some companies benefit from having Section 7.14 and that it seems Section 7.3 and Section 7.14 can be used together. Mr. Treepaisan stated that the Section 7.3 reference in Section 7.14 is for members having less than 20 years in the committee so there is some unique nuance with that. He stated in terms of it not affecting the finances it sounded like the only benefit would be that they would not have to add Section 7.14 to the JPA. Mr. Treepaisan asked if there was any other benefit besides that. Ms. DeBarge stated that is what it was and to go along with the other sections that were changed, making it less sections required and less room for error. Mr. Van Stryk stated that in reviewing Section 7.14 he is unsure if it would apply to Section 7.3 because the language does not match up. He stated Section 7.14 sounds like it is for maintenance. Ms. DeBarge stated that Section 7.14 speaks of the pole type being set which is captured on the JPA with the pole treatment. Ms. Mulvehill stated that is how she understands it. She stated SCE is getting memos if they have a Section 7.3 being replaced with for example with a LS pole and Section 7.14 is missing, but if they change the section to stated “wood and non-wood” they could have just the Section 7.3 and it be billed and not a memo for missing Section 7.14. Mr. Van Stryk asked if Section 7.3 implied mutual benefit because he understood it was for sole benefit for whoever just decided they wanted to replace the pole. Ms. Allen stated that years ago it was decided that Section 7.14 would be added to all the other section

sevens when it was other than wood and had nothing to do with billing purposes. It was just to call out for the members that they are replacing a wood pole with a non-wood pole. Ms. Allen stated from an SCJPC standpoint it would be preferred that Section 7.14 not be required on other Section 7 JPAs because there are JPAs being sent back as memos only for the reason that Section 7.14 is not on there. She stated this also goes for Section 4.X missing Section 4.14. Ms. Allen stated the SCJPC would go by the pole treatment and class and if Section 7.14 is not required on JPA. Ms. Allen added that not adding Section 7.14 would not affect the billing and would give one less reason to return the JPA via memo. She stated that Section 7.14 with Section 7.3 is just informing members that the pole is other than wood and billers do not follow the Section 7.14 rules in this situation for billing. Mr. Van Stryk stated that Section 7.3 is like Sections 7.7 and 7.13 in that fact that they are not for mutual benefit. Ms. LaFrenais asked if when placing a non-wood pole, if they would need a Section 3.14 as well as a Section 4.14. Ms. Allen stated no if they are placing a new pole a Section 3.14 would be ok alone. She stated they do not need Section 3.1 and Section 3.14 or if purchasing interest into an existing pole both Section 4.0 and Section 4.14 are not needed, just the other than wood section should be used. Ms. Allen stated the same is for Section 7.11, it could just be Section 7.14 for other than wood pole. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California would like time to discuss this internally and would prefer this stay open in ad hoc. Ms. Ortiz stated this will stay open and members can discuss internally and then return next month to decide.

Ms. Allen had a question on an anchor that she was unable to locate any related information in the Routine Handbook. The goal is to eliminate memos going back and forth. Ms. Allen showed an example with double wooden arms, H/S Anc Guys and H/S Span Guys. She asked how this should be shown on the JPA. Ms. Ortiz stated Ms. Allen reached out to her but she had never seen H/S Anchors and suggested this be brought up to the Routine Revision Committee to review. Ms. Mulvehill stated this was an SCE memo, but she also had not seen this either and was unsure of how to fix this memo. Ms. Black stated that she would prefer that anything that is written in the Bill of Sale not be required to be put onto the JPA and she also questioned the necessity of having a memo for this purpose. Ms. Black added that it was new to her that members were required to review the Bill of Sale and incorporate the information documented there into the final bill. Ms. Black expressed a preference for simplifying the process, noting that if information is not included in the additional information section of the pole record (SCJPC website pole record), the biller should not be required to issue a memo. Ms. DeBarge agreed that it would be great. Mr. Van Stryk stated the abbreviation H/S usually means high strength and there are many abbreviations with regards to span guys and arms that are not in the Routine Handbook or at the end of the Authorized Costs sheet. Ms. Allen asked if these H/S Anc Guys and H/S Anchors were still valid or transferable. Mr. Van Stryk stated it would be weird to have that on the Bill of Sale. Mr. Van Stryk asked if they happened

to have a photo of this pole before and after to guess at what it was. Ms. Black stated that she would like to return to the original questions and expressed the view that information written in the Bill of Sale should not be considered required. She suggested that members should only be responsible for the additional information fields within the SCJPC website pole record. Based on the discussion, there appeared to be interest in potentially moving toward this approach. She noted that AT&T California would be very supportive of such a change. Ms. Dizon asked what DWA stood for. The members stated it was for Double Wood Arm. Ms. Pranata stated SCJPC does record anchors and arms under additional information. She then inquired if SCJPC would forget about the H/S guys. Ms. Mulvehill brought up the fact that sometimes anchors are not in the additional information and only in the Bill of Sale and asked what the difference is. Ms. Pranata stated that would be typing errors of the SCJPC staff. Ms. Allen stated it was from past SCJPC staff when the pole cards were typed into the database in the 1990's and SCJPC is working to not let this happen further. Ms. Pranata stated that if they could set a rule that they only capture arms and anchors and not guys it would be great. Ms. DeBarge inquired if this is from the Bill of Sale field that members do not need to read the information within it. Ms. Pranata stated that it is up to the committee whether they would like to capture anchors or not on the final JPA. Ms. Black stated that she had a suggestion. She proposed that members should not be required to review the Bill of Sale and should instead focus solely on the additional information fields, noting that SCJPC billers were responsible for transferring information when necessary. She explained that in cases where information in the Bill of Sale does need to be added to the record, which she indicated is rare, the billers should enter it at that time. She emphasized that this information should not require a memo, particularly for staff who are focused on clearing backlogs and finalizing bills efficiently. Ms. Black asked whether this approach would be workable. Ms. Pranata stated that it depends on the scenario. If it is a Section 7 and the pole is being replaced and there is an anchor on record, they need to know if the anchor is transferred or removed. Ms. DeBarge asked if they are talking about one in the Bill of Sale and not on the additional info. Ms. DeBarge gave a scenario where a pole has been replaced and there is no anchor on the JPA or the additional information but there is a history of an anchor in the Bill of Sale notes, just having the JPA written the way that it is would not be sufficient. Ms. Pranata asked for the new pole would SCJPC be ignoring the existing anchor. Ms. DeBarge stated they would bill and record what is on the JPA. Ms. Ortiz stated that if there is no anchor in the field, no anchor recording in the additional info, and no anchor on the JPA, then they should be good meaning the SCJPC staff should not go to the Bill of Sale and question what happened to the old anchor listed there. Ms. Ortiz stated that if the members do see one in the field and it is not on the record then it should be added to the JPA, and it will get recorded. Mr. Van Stryk stated that he found the pole in question and an image from 2019 shows a pole back in the trees for the Span Guys. Ms. Ortiz asked going forward

if the SCJPC staff is not to go through the Bill of Sale History and only what is on the additional info and the JPA. Ms. Black stated AT&T California agrees. Mr. Van Stryk stated that his only objection is if it says transfer like transferred guy or transferred anchor, they would not want that information to go on the new one. Ms. Allen stated she would like to repeat to make sure it is recorded properly. She stated that if there is an anchor in the Bill of Sale but not in the additional information on the SCJPC website pole record, SCJPC staff are not to question, not to return, and leave as is. The SCJPC staff does not need to transfer or remove if it is a replacement and just move forward. Ms. Ortiz and Ms. DeBarge agreed.

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. Due to no response Ms. Ortiz stated this item is still on hold and will be kept 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 would like to table this item for next month.

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. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California is working on a few issues with SCE and meeting monthly until it is resolved and would like to keep this item on hold.

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 asked if this was to remain on hold as well and Ms. Black confirmed.

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. Ms. Ortiz stated that Mr. Chadwick and herself will need to take this offline to review Section 18 and make any suggested red lines accordingly and then come back and present something in that manner.

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 –

- Section 7 “Wood and Non-wood” proposed changes Members are to review and come back next month to make a decision on how to move forward.
- Ms. Allen to update staff that members are no longer looking at the Bill of Sale history regarding anchors.
- Items 1798, 1800, and 1808: tabled to discuss next month.

The Meeting adjourned at 11:13 a.m. until April 15, 2026.

Transcribed by Anali Spencer – Committee Staff

RR Agenda # 2 - SCE 3/12/2026

7.3 Overbuild (Wood and Non-Wood Pole)

This section provides for the replacement of a solely owned or a jointly owned pole, less than 25 years old for the sole benefit of an incoming Member or one joint owner. This section also applies to poles replaced due to damage caused by facilities of a joint owner, poles replaced due to California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) mandates directed at specific member facilities, and to all solely owned or jointly owned poles replaced for the sole benefit of Members having less than 20 consecutive years of

Joint Pole Committee membership. (Revised January 2023).

The cost to benefiting Member shall include:

- (a) Equity of overbuilt Member's structural value of existing pole, less salvage
- (b) Cost of transfer
- (c) Additional material installed to comply with requirements of joint ownership
- (d) Sidewalk or pavement repairs
- (e) Entire removal cost

The sole owner, or each joint owner as appropriate, shall bill the benefiting Member for the portion of pulling and transportation it performs. The Member recovering pole shall allow salvage to other owner(s) for its relinquished interest. Member placing new pole shall bill an interest to other Members.

When a benefiting Member replaces pole and another Member desires additional grade or space, replacement shall be made in accordance with rule of the Routine relating to Section 7.11. Mutual benefit shall not apply where a non-benefiting owner is forced to increase grade or space as a result of the activities undertaken by the benefiting Member.

RR Agenda # 2 - SCE 3/12/2026

7.6 A. Replacement of Pole Due to Damage Caused by Any Person, Firm or Corporation Which Is Not a Party to the Joint Pole Agreement (Wood and Non-Wood Pole)

The Member replacing pole shall sell interest to each Member concerned. Each Member shall receive salvage on maximum value recoverable and shall pay pulling and transportation. Each Member shall transfer its facilities and shall bill party responsible for the damage for its share of the net cost of replacement.

Emergency pole installation is where the pole must be replaced immediately: The joint owner(s) must be notified by telephone or email of emergency installations within 24 hours by setting Member. Setting Member must issue Form 2 Preliminary within 45 calendar days from date of pole replacement, otherwise Section 7.13 will apply. Telephone notification must be confirmed by either Form 2 or Form 48 showing, if known:

- (a) Time and date of accident
- (b) Time and date joint owner notified
- (c) Name of person notified
- (d) Police report number

In cases where the urgency for new pole installation is not immediate, notification rules of this section will still apply, however the rules of 7.11 will be followed to determine “**proposed**” purchase in new pole. (Revised January 2016)

RR Agenda # 2 - SCE 3/12/2026

7.6 B. Replacement of Pole Due to Natural Causes (Storm, Catastrophe) (Wood and Non-Wood Pole)

The Member replacing the pole(s) may proceed with replacements prior to issuing Form 2. The Member shall sell interest to each Member concerned. Each Member shall receive salvage on maximum value recoverable and shall pay pulling and transportation. Each Member shall transfer its facilities.

Setting Member must issue Form 2 Preliminary with date and identification of natural cause (Form 48 may be attached). Setting Member must issue Form 2 Preliminary within 180 calendar days from date of pole replacement. After 180 calendar days, Section 7.13 will apply unless mutually agreed by all parties to extend.

In cases where the urgency for new pole installation is not immediate, notification rules of this section will still apply, however the rules of 7.11 will be followed to determine **“proposed”** purchase in new pole (Added January 2012).

Section 7.13 does not apply if JPA issued within 180 days of construction (Effective January 2016)

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 | 3rd 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 3rd 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 5th 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