

## **Southern California Joint Pole Committee**

279 E. Arrow Hwy., Suite 104

San Dimas, CA 91773

Phone (909) 599-3801

**May 20, 2026**

A meeting of the **Routine Revision Committee** took place on the above date, **at 10:46 a.m. via teleconference**. Those in attendance were:

Ms. Maria Ortiz	MCI Metro ATS/MCI Telecommunications/XO Communications
Ms. April DeBarge	Southern California Edison
Mr. Michael Pearson	Southern California Edison
Mr. Samuel Picazo	Southern California Edison
Ms. Marisol Bailey	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kevin Flores	Southern California Edison
Ms. Silvana Ray	Southern California Edison
Mr. Kristoffer Scheetz	Southern California Edison
Ms. Shelby Mulvehill	Southern California Edison
Ms. Aarize Dizon	Crown Castle NG West Inc. (Arium Networks)
Mr. Jeremy Effinger	Crown Castle NG West Inc. (Arium Networks)
Ms. Jacqueline Costa	Crown Castle NG West Inc. (Arium Networks)
Mr. Lex Treepaisan	Frontier Communications
Ms. Kay Black	AT&T California
Ms. Joy Young	AT&T California
Mr. Barry Consulter	AT&T California
Mr. Alvin Robielos	AT&T California
Ms. Veronica Casanova-Romero	AT&T California
Mr. John Bacon	City of Los Angeles
Ms. Lynne LaFrenais	Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc.
Mr. Alex Parra	City of Riverside
Mr. Salvador Zambrano	City of Burbank
Mr. Ben Coffey	City of Banning
Ms. Yesenia Delgado	Time-Warner Cable
Mr. Dave Campo	City of Lompoc
Mr. Nick Van Stryk	City of Vernon (Petrelli Electric)
Mr. David Navar	City of Colton
Mr. Hugo Martinez	City of Vernon
Ms. Alicia Smith	Sprint Nextel/Sprint Communications
Mr. Edward Castro	City of Glendale

Ms. Shawn Henderson	T-Mobile USA
Ms. Linda McLean	Extenet Systems
Ms. Angela Pranata	Committee Staff
Ms. Kathleen Allen	Committee Staff
Ms. Anali Spencer	Committee Staff

Guests:

Mr. Joe Serrato	Zayo Group
Ms. Kendall Edwards	Zayo Group

Ms. Ortiz called the meeting to order at 10:46 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 opened to Section 7 updates and asked if there are any updates to go over. Ms. Black stated that AT&T California had this as an agenda item to meet with SCE which was postponed. Ms. Ortiz stated this item will be tabled for now. Ms. LaFrenais stated that she had something for Example C9. She stated there is Item number four with no explanation of that is and requested the members review it. Ms. LaFrenais explained there is note box number four but no note at the top section for it. Ms. Ortiz explained that the last note where it explains the anchor transfer should be fixed to a number four instead of a one.

Ms. Pranata asked if the members will be starting with reviewing Section 1 or the glossary first. The members agreed to start with the glossary. Ms. Ortiz started with A. Location for Replacement Poles and if there were any questions. Ms. LaFrenais asked if A2 was only one foot or if it should be one to two feet. Ms. Ortiz asked for members who work more with pole replacements if they had input. Ms. LaFrenais stated that she knows the width of the pole is generally a third or more and with some space in between them and dirt removed for the new pole it is probably a little larger than one foot. Mr. Bacon stated that he is not opposed to it but the problem with that is when they get into risers if they have a riser pole and they go two feet away now they are a doing an engineering job because the cable does not stretch. Anything that LADWP has for underground cable going up to that riser and they put the pole two feet away the riser is not going to connect. He stated two feet away adds a lot of problems in regards to transferring facilities. Ms. LaFrenais thanked Mr. Bacon for the explanation and stated she is fine, leaving this as it is.

Ms. Black asked about pole relocation. She stated that she is getting a bunch of them and wishes there was a section code but maybe if they can define

how many feet away a new pole is supposed to be before it becomes a pole relocation. Mr. Bacon stated that anything that is more than a foot or two would be an interset pole. Ms. Black stated that it is not an additional pole but a replacement where she stated today she saw one where the pole is being moved 60 feet. Mr. Bacon stated that it does happen and they can adjust span lengths and if they are removing one pole and setting another 30 or 40 feet away that would be a relocation and is unsure how they could do a footage designation to it since each situation is going to be different. Ms. Black stated that it disrupts planning and should be clearly identified as a pole relocation, not merely a pole replacement, in the Location and Nature of Work. Mr. Bacon inquired or does it become a whole new pole within itself. Ms. DeBarge asked if this is being addressed at the time of signing the copy. Ms. Black stated they are, but when they redline, they are supposed to have something they can point to but that she does not have anything to point to in this case. Ms. Black stated if no others are having issues with this then she can leave it. Mr. Bacon stated that when setting a pole more than one or two feet away they are not relocating but setting a new pole and removing the old pole making it a remove and install not a relocation. Ms. Ortiz agreed this is how she has seen it come through. Ms. Black stated that maybe that needs to be in the definitions. Ms. DeBarge stated that there is a piece of Section 7 that refers to relocation in one of the letters. Mr. Bacon asked Ms. DeBarge if SCE is setting a pole 30 or 40 feet away will SCE designate a new pole number or keep the original pole number. Ms. DeBarge stated that it would have the same number. Ms. Bacon asked if this was the case even if the pole is not in the same location or even within 100 feet. Ms. DeBarge stated that would not be a replacement then if it gets a new number. She stated SCE's standard is if it is a replacement, it gets the same number unless they are upgrading numbers and moving to a different series of numbers. Ms. DeBarge stated she does not know when it will fall into place for Ms. Blacks point when the pole is being removed and the new pole set in a different place. Ms. Black stated the relocation section is under Section 7.11 (c). Mr. Treepaisan stated that the definitions under A are for replacement poles where over one foot it would put it outside a replacement not making it clearly defined. Ms. Black stated she agrees with this and feels there is a hole somewhere with the relocation part. Ms. DeBarge stated that maybe when they get to Section 7.11 the (c) can get more defined. There were no further comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to B. Property Line. Ms. Ortiz asked why North was separate and if all directions should be in parenthesis or if even matters. Ms. DeBarge stated she thinks it is just to let the members know that it pertains to any of the directions. The members agreed to leave it as is.

Ms. Ortiz opened to C. Service drops. No changes made.

Ms. Ortiz opened to D. Pole Space. Ms. Black stated that she would like to see pole top because she does not know how to calculate when there is a pole top in the pole space or the pole top extension. Ms. Bacon stated that he thinks this was brought up once before and he supplied a JPA that showed a pole top

extension. Ms. Pranata stated there is an example (Example B6) for this. Ms. Black asked if this could be added to the glossary. Ms. DeBarge asked Ms. Black what the question was for this. Ms. Black stated that, for example, a 50-foot pole with a pole top extension she wants to know what the height of the pole now is. Ms. DeBarge stated that it is still 50 feet from her understanding and the PTX is just equipment on the pole not increasing the pole length. Mr. Bacon stated that it is not usable space, LADWP or whoever adds it, but the official height remains at 50 feet with a pole top extension. Ms. Black stated that answers her question because this answers how she will calculate the usable space math by not including the pole top extension and continue to calculate it like a 50-foot pole. There were no further comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to E. Equipment. There were no comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to F. Approved Maintenance Program. Ms. Black stated that she has things on hold that she wants to add here so there will be more to follow. There were no comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to G. Revisions. There were no comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to H. Pole Definitions. Ms. LaFrenais asked if they need to add the age for Composite Fiber and Steel or asked if this is just limited to a wood pole. Ms. Ortiz stated that it does not specify in the definitions. Ms. Ortiz asked if they should add Section 7.14 and if the members objected or agreed or had any comments. Ms. Pranata asked if they could just delete Section 7.11 and Section 7.3 because it is for all sections. Mr. Treepaisan stated that it does not specify wood by itself, but he believes at the time it was written it was predominantly wood poles. Ms. Ortiz asked if the members were good with removing the section numbers. Ms. Black stated that they have a different useful life for non-wood poles and they would need to keep this and put wood pole and give a bullet to non-wood pole with the useful life of 80 years. Ms. LaFrenais stated that she agrees with Ms. Black on this. Mr. Bacon stated that he has never heard of a lifespan of a steel pole and wanted to know who was throwing that out as a standard. Ms. Ortiz stated she remembers having a discussion on this to come up with one. Ms. Black is stating they possibly came up with one in the North and not for the South. Ms. LaFrenais stated that they would need to change this then to specify that it is for wood poles. Mr. Bacon agreed that it would need to be defined as wood. Ms. Ortiz stated that they will update it to say useful life of a “wood” pole. There were no further comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to Clearance Pole. Ms. Black asked if this was an Interset Pole. Ms. Ortiz stated there is a definition for Interset Pole below. Mr. Treepaisan stated that the Interset Pole would almost serve the same purpose to provide Clearance. Ms. Ortiz asked if both are needed. Mr. Bacon stated that if an Interset pole is being used not as a Clearance but a service or something, he stated they are running into a lot of problems with a lot of companies coming in

and because the pole is not going to pass wind loading they are Intersetting poles and calling it an Intersect Pole. Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP is rejecting those only for the sense that they are picket fencing the City of Los Angeles as they get multiple carriers coming in that do not want to wait six months for the power company to come and change out the pole. He stated they are seeing a lot of Intersect Poles going in. He stated the definition of an Intersect Pole should be strictly on being a Clearance Pole more so than Intersetting a pole because they do not want to wait or do not have the contractors to go and set a new pole. Ms. Ortiz asked if they should combine or leave the definitions as is. The members agreed to keep both. Ms. DeBarge stated that the definitions are clear and looking at it from a JPA perspective they are both Clearance and look the same. Ms. Smith asked if at the bottom of the Clearance Pole definition it stated interest or interest. The members agreed it should say interset. There were no further comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to Customer's Temporary Pole. There were no comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to Cut and Kick. Ms. DeBarge asked if SOP got added to this glossary. Ms. Black stated it did. There were no further comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to Distribution Pole. Mr. Bacon stated that for LADWP they do not go over a 4,800V system and the 5000V would not apply to them. Mr. Van Stryk stated it should probably be changed to 1000V. Mr. Bacon asked if SCE's 66KV is not a distribution pole. Mr. Van Stryk stated he thinks they call it transmission. Mr. Treepaisan stated that from a communications protection point of view at 66KV they call it transmission and will consider 33KV sub-transmission. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he agrees that if LADWP systems are at 4800V then it would be more accurate to change it to that. Ms. Ortiz asked if they would like to change the 5000 to 4800, Mr. Van Stryk stated that they can drop it all the way down to 1000. There were no further comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to Farmers/Private Pole. There were no comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to Guy Pole. Ms. Black stated that she has seen on Guy Poles where there is an HOA (Height of Attachment) and maybe a Comm but there is not a Guy written as it also. She asked if they cannot have facilities on a guy pole since the definition says used for guying only. Mr. Van Stryk stated they can, but it changes the definition of the pole. Ms. Black asked if they can have facilities on a pole that others are using to guy. Mr. Van Stryk confirmed they can and the definition of the pole changes. There were no further comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to Intersect Pole. There were no comments or concerns from the members on this.

Ms. Ortiz opened to Jointly Owned Pole. There were no comments or concerns from the members on this.

Mr. Ortiz opened to Power Pole. Ms. LaFrenais asked what would be considered Low, High, and "T." Mr. Treepaisan stated that he thinks those defined as classifications in GO 95 and that he believes "T" stands for trolley. Ms. LaFrenais stated, since they need to look at GO 95, which should be stated here. Mr. Bacon stated that on the JPA they designate low voltage with "L" and if it is High voltage that was eliminated and now, they put 34.5KV or 66KV whatever it is for the High voltage. Mr. Treepaisan stated that he believes the distinction between low and high voltage is 600 volts or something along those lines. Mr. Treepaisan stated he can double check and the members can come back to this.

Mr. Ortiz opened to Priority Pole. Ms. LaFrenais stated that this only seems to be maintenance. Mr. Bacon stated LADWP has third party notifications, but he believes this is for the individual utility and defines priority poles timelines through their maintenance program. He further stated that they have other priority poles that as defined require immediate corrective action, but it is more to the individual company. Ms. LaFrenais stated that BVE has several kinds of priority poles like poles knocked down from snow, wind, pole leaning due to driveway construction loosening the ground, car hit poles, etc. She stated she believes there are a lot of different kinds of priority poles besides those just in the maintenance program. Mr. Bacon asked if she would classify this internally for each individual utility as to how they define it and that they leave this definition alone due to it being internal and depending on how the base owner determines the pole. Ms. LaFrenais asked if this is how the SCJPC staff determine which JPAs get prioritized. Mr. Bacon stated that LADWP has a list of Priority one, two, or three poles. Priority one the base is rotten. Priority two has two white flags on it and they need to replace it. He stated that it is individual to each member. Ms. LaFrenais stated what she is getting stuck on is the word maintenance program. Mr. Van Stryk stated it comes back to the Section 7.11 subsection for identified during routine maintenance program and it needs to be replaced faster than 45 days, but it is not a priority in the sense that it needs to get final billed in a fast manner. He stated it is just considering a cause for concern when doing general replacements. Ms. LaFrenais stated she thinks it needs to be reworded due to the word maintenance program. Mr. Van Stryk stated it needs to be identified by some means. Ms. LaFrenais asked if a car hits a pole and the pole falls down is that part of the maintenance program. Mr. Van Stryk stated that would not be a priority pole but an emergency replacement. Ms. LaFrenais stated that there is a different definition for emergency replacement. Mr. Van Stryk stated it is a different section (7.6) for a car hit pole or storm and the pole is destroyed and inoperable. He stated a priority pole is they are trying to replace a pole before it is inoperable. Mr. Van Stryk stated he is not sure if there is an emergency pole definition. Ms. Ortiz confirmed that she does not see one. Ms. LaFrenais stated she can concede with it staying the way it is if she is the only one with the wording issue. Mr. Bacon stated that the maintenance program just indicates inspection cycles, one year visual, every five

years intrusive inspections and through this program they have identified priority poles. Mr. Treepaisan stated that is how he reads it as well that the maintenance program infers that there is an inspection process and the priority poles were identified during the inspection process. Ms. Black suggested that they define emergency pole replacements to show they are different than priority poles. Ms. LaFrenais stated she is also trying to tie this with the SCJPC office and how they define priority poles with the SCJPC staff. Mr. Van Stryk stated that priority billing is not going to be the same. Ms. DeBarge stated that it is not the same type of priority, for the SCJPC staff a priority might be a JPA that needs to bill before another JPA. Ms. DeBarge stated the type of priority in the definition is based on field conditions whereas the SCJPC staff priority is based on billing priority. Ms. LaFrenais stated that she does not think the definition is fully giving an explanation to someone who is first looking at the Routine Handbook to understand if a pole is priority or not. Ms. DeBarge stated that this could be the opportunity to add emergency pole to the glossary because they are different from priority poles. Mr. Van Stryk agreed the definition is vague. Mr. Treepaisan stated that emergency pole is defined in Section 7.6 and they could add that into the glossary. Ms. Black stated that for priority pole they could add that it is replaced prior to the JPA being sent out. Mr. Van Stryk stated that it is under Section 7.11F. Mr. Treepaisan stated that there is a distinction between priority and emergency poles. The emergency being that it is an immediate replacement fix that needs to be done due to safety. Mr. Van Stryk stated also to turn the power back on. Mr. Bacon stated that the first word in a priority pole defines it. It says “each utility” defines their priority pole and the timelines to replace. It is not member to member, but each utility has its own priority list. Ms. Ortiz asked if the members were good with creating an emergency pole definition. The members agreed.

Ms. Pranata asked if any members would like to volunteer to create the two sections. Ms. Black stated she nominates Ms. LaFrenais for the emergency pole and herself for non-wood poles and 80 years. Mr. Treepaisan second this. Ms. Ortiz asked if they were going to add anything for the power pole definition or just reference GO 95 or come back next month. The members agreed to come back next month. Mr. Bacon stated they will look up the CPUC for the different class circuits but that they are already doing the voltage itself.

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

**Agenda Item 3 – Item 1697: 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. DeBarge confirmed 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 looked at Section 4.1 and there were no changes there, was unable to look at Section 3.5, and still needs to make the sketch so 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 still in discussion with SCE and meeting monthly about the edits 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 Miscellaneous Issues –**

### ***Other Miscellaneous Items:***

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 –**

- Ms. Black is going to make some edits to the 25 years for wood and then mention the non-wood.
- Ms. LaFrenais is going to work on creating a definition for emergency wood poles.
- The members will come back and pick up reviewing the Routine Handbook where they left off next month.

The Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m. until June 17, 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 | 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.)**

<del>(a) Reserved for future use</del>	
<del>(b) Partial Dig</del> .....	<del>261</del>
<del>(c) Sound and Bore</del> - .....	<del>261</del>
<del>(d) Full Treatment</del> .....	<del>261</del>
<del>(e) Reject</del> - .....	<del>261</del>

~~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.... <del>only once per pole per 12 mos, unless special agreement</del> .....	161
(b) Replacing Visibility Strips .....	<del>only once per year, unless special agreement</del> .....163

---

## GLOSSARY

### DEFINITIONS

#### A. Locations for Replacement Poles:

(1) Hard-North (South/East/West): Setting a new pole against the existing pole in the direction specified.

(2) One foot (any direction): Setting a replacement pole a specified number of feet (any direction) measured face to face.

(3) Same area: Designated general area for pole placement when the exact final location is not critical.

(4) Same hole: Setting a replacement pole in the same hole as the original pole.

#### B. Property Line - North (South/East/West)

Designates that line separating different properties or the perimeter of an owned property. The direction is viewed from the pole access location. (See Section 15.4)

#### C. Service Drops

Service drops are the conductors between the building or structure served and the adjacent line pole. (See Section 11.0)

#### D. Pole Space

(1) A - Electrical Safety Clearance Zone: Jointly owned vertical pole space required by General Order 95, Rule 38, to safely separate facilities in alignment with Section 19.2 (January 2010)

(1) B - Antenna Safety Clearance Zone: The utility owned vertical pole space of two feet required by General Order 95, Rule 94 to safely separate facilities from an antenna. The utility placing antenna must buy the antenna SCZ (June 2023)

(2) Encroachable Safety Zone: Portion of the Safety Clearance Zone which may be purchased when allowed in accordance with General Order 95 after taking the appropriate safety precautions. (See Section 4.3, 19.2)

(3) Supporting Structure Space: Supporting structure space is that jointly owned vertical pole space below the lowest attached line or cable.

(4) Common Area or Shared Space or Non-Useable Footage: Includes Safety Clearance Zone, Pole Butt, and Supporting Structure Space. This space

can be used for the placement of risers, guys, switches, metering equipment, or other items that comply with General Order 95.

(5) Useable Space: Vertical pole space specifically available to a Member for placement of their facilities, or portions of the Encroachable Safety Zone which have been properly occupied in accordance with Sections 4.3 and 19.2.

#### E. Equipment

(1) Terminal: A fused termination point that connects communication conductors to service drop(s).

#### (2) GUYS

(a) Span Guy: All overhead guys (pole to pole, arm to arm, arm to pole.)

(b) Down Guy: Guy connected from pole to anchor rod.

(c) Sidewalk Guy: Guy connected from pole to pipe brace to anchor rod (January 2012).

#### 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.

#### G. Revisions

Changes in Routine Handbook sections and Authorized Costs. Date changes will be noted in parenthesis following text, or cost changes, additions, or deletions.

#### H. Pole Definitions

- 25 Years (Useful life of a wood pole): To determine which replacement Section of the SCJPC Routine Handbook to use (7.11 or 7.3), the SCJPC Administrative Board determined that the useful life of a pole is 25 years.
  - For replacement of a pole 25 years or older, use Section 7.11.
  - For replacement of a pole less than 25 years old and found to be unfit for service, use Section 7.11.
  - For replacement of a pole less than 25 years old and found to be fit for service, use Section 7.3.

(Added January 2014)

Add non wood pole here? See Sec 7.11 (Lynne will create)

- Clearance Pole: A pole placed exclusively to provide clearance from ground level to facilities. May be placed to increase or maintain horizontal clearances between dissimilar facilities. May be Solely owned or Jointly owned. May or may not have Tenant contact or shared under a Joint Use Agreement. Include poles intersets/underset for like clearance purposes.
- Customer's Temporary Pole: Temporary poles used for secondary power, and communications or commercial and private job sites. Typically are 6"x8"x12' painted lumber and are provided, erected and removed by developer's customer.
- Cut and Kick: The construction procedure that includes the clearance of the top portion of the pole, cutting and moving the top portion of the pole over, supporting the remaining section of the pole, and pulling the butt. (Added April 2013)
- Distribution Pole: A utility pole utilized for Supply Voltages in excess of 51,000V but less than 60KV. May be solely Owned or Jointly Owned. May or may not have Tenant Contact or shared under Joint Use Agreement.
- Farmers/Private Pole: A pole set and maintained by a private party.
- Guy Pole: A pole utilized for guying only. If pole has facilities attached other than Guys the pole no longer fits criteria for Guy Pole. This includes attachment by Communications or Tenant for Clearance or Supply attachments via pole top extension. Note: all poles are subject to the placement and utilization of guys.
- Interset Pole: A pole placed (set) between two existing poles in an existing lead.
- Joint Owned Pole: A utility pole which is legally owned by more than one party. Predominance of Joint Poles in California are administered under the Northern California Joint Pole Association (NCJPA) and the Southern California Joint Pole Committee (SCJPC). Joint Ownership is established via the Joint Pole Process and finalized on the Form 44, "Bill of Sale",

issued in conjunction with Monthly Accounts Billing Cycle and recorded as Jointly Owned.

- Power Pole: A pole used primarily for L, H, and T Class Circuits. May or may not be misused in context. ??? Come back? Research and come back next month.
- Priority Pole: Each utility defines priority poles and timelines through its maintenance program that include identification of priority poles that require immediate corrective action due to significant safety and/or reliability risks. (Added March 2016)
- Create Emergency Pole definition??? KBlack will create.
- Push Brace Pole: A pole utilized for Guying only. Pole is designed to push against another pole. Used in locations where it is physically impossible or uneconomic to place and maintain down guys or anchor rods. Occasionally used to comply with existing Rights-of-Way restrictions.
- Service Pole: A pole in a lead on private property or public way, which supports Supply or Communication Service to service connection. May be Solely Owned, or Jointly Owned. May or may not have tenant contact, or shared under Joint Use Agreement.
- Solely Owned Pole: A utility pole which is 100% owned by one utility, municipality or other party. May or may not have a tenant or other rental contact in place. May or may not be shared with another utility administered by a valid Joint Use Agreement.
- Telephone Pole: A pole used primarily for C Class Circuits. May or may not be misused in context.
- Temporary Pole: A pole set for temporary use Section 3.5. Often used in conjunction with Development and Public Requirement Projects. May or may not have Tenant Contact or shared under a Joint Use Agreement. Includes poles interest/underset for like purpose. Temporary poles by agreement are for periods of one (1) year or less.

Formatted: List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering, Tab stops: Not at 0.2"

- **Transmission Pole:** Utility pole utilized for Supply Voltages in excess of 60KV or above. May be Solely Owned, or Jointly Owned. May or may not have tenant contact, or shared under a Joint Use Agreement.
- **High Fire Threat Districts:** Urgent pole replacement is where the need to replace a pole is not immediate but must be performed before the prescribed approval time period shown in Section 18.1(d), the other utilities shall respond within 15 days, however the rules of Section 7.11 will be followed to determine 'proposed' purchase in new pole and pole shall be replaced under Section 7.11. Note: See G.O. 95 Rule 18. (Added May 2018).
- **Section of Pole (SOP):** Section of pole left in field after a pole replacement, consisting only of communication attachments, awaiting transfer by attachment owner(s). SOP is not to include any portion of the support structure. SOP is not billable. Items 83 and 5C cannot be billed with SOP. (See Section 21, Example C1) (Revised January 2023)
- **Treatment:** Poles that have been fully treated from butt to top by any treatment that has been used throughout CA history, can include Penta, Cellon, Chemonite, DCOI, CCA. (The full list is large and not consistent between all IOUs and municipals.) (Revised January 2023).
- **Fire Mesh Wrap:** Wrap that is specifically designed to withstand wildfires by adding a fire protective layer to the pole. It is an intumescent (swelling up when heated) grid made of 23-gauge galvanized steel or fiberglass gridded mesh coated with a durable intumescent polymer. It is designed to protect the pole by expanding at temperatures greater than 300°F and creating a barrier that protects and shields the wooden structure from radiant

heat and fire. NOTE: Poles with this wrap can be climbed with gaffs or can have pole steps placed on it after the wrap is installed. Intrusive Testing shall not degrade the Fire Mesh Wrap on the pole. Sound and Prod Testing of the pole will not be hampered by the wrap. (Revised January 2023).

- **Sound and Prod Testing:** Test conducted with a hammer and probe to detect decay pockets above ground and below ground to determine if a pole is safe to climb. (Revised January 2023).
- **Free Attachment:** Free attachments are specific to paralleling Member's leads with service conductors crossing thoroughfares directly to a premise served. Service drops that qualify as a Free Attachment do not have a Messenger and usually travels only one pole span. When free attachments travel multiple spans it is because a clearance drop is required to reach multiple premises being served off the free attachment. Free attachment requirements are detailed in Section 11.0 and depicted in Examples A and C on Page 11-2. (A free attachment remains a Free attachment when the pole is replaced) (Revised 3/15/2023).
- **Clearance Drop:** A clearance drop is defined as being a free attachment that is needed to reach a multiple premise locations that will be served from the free attachment. These facilities have no messengers. A clearance drop is not to be confused with a clearance pole. (Revised 3/15/2023).

Note: See General Orders 95 (G.O. 95) Rule 22.1 for more pole definition

## I. Time Frame

**Days:** Calendar days.

(Revised September 2020)