



Eric Langley
2700 U.S. Highway 280
Suite 240E
Birmingham, AL 35223
205-783-5750
eric@langleybromberg.com

March 16, 2018

Marlene Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: Ex Parte Notice
WC Docket No. 17-84**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On March 14, 2018, Mike Tautphaeus (Joint Use Manager, Ameren Missouri), Bob Hamric (Line Clearance & Construction Services Manager, Tampa Electric), George Cox (Construction Services Supervisor, Tampa Electric) and I met with Claude Aiken, Commissioner Clyburn's Wireline Legal Advisor in connection with the above-referenced docket.

During the meeting, we explained the need for advance notice of overlashing in order to properly engineer the new load on the pole. We explained, using the photograph attached hereto from Tampa Electric's system, that overlashing is not a "one time" thing on a single messenger strand. Instead, multiple attaching entities seek to overlash on multiple different occasions. The cumulative effect of the increased bundle size, along with the increase in the size of individual fiber cables, creates wind and ice loading issues. We also explained, using the chart attached hereto, that 8 of the 9 state public utility commissions to address this issue in the past 10 years have adopted some form of permitting or advance notice requirement for overlashing. We asked that the Commission make clear, either through a policy statement or a new rule, that advance notice of overlashing is a reasonable term/condition in pole attachment contracts. We also suggested that existing rule 1.1403(b) should provide the presumptively reasonable time period for advance notice.

We also reiterated our support for one-touch make-ready in the communications space. The major bottleneck in the pole access process is the existing, sequential make-ready process in the communications space. We explained that the best opportunity for expediting broadband deployment without sacrificing infrastructure reliability is by streamlining the communications space make-ready process. We highlighted data from Tampa Electric demonstrating that the average time for completion of communications space make-ready was 278 days. On the other hand, Tampa Electric's data showed that the average time for more complicated electric make-

ready was only 55 days. The problem is communications space make-ready—not electric make-ready. The solution should focus on the problem. We noted that the three governmental entities who have adopted one-touch make-ready laws (Louisville, Nashville and West Virginia) have all excluded the power supply space and electric facilities from one-touch make-ready.

We also very briefly discussed the unique and varied joint use relationships between ILECs and electric utilities. We stated that Commissioner Clyburn “got it right” in 2011 when she wrote that “joint use contracts are not just simple pole attachment contracts” and that a rule of general applicability would be a poor fit for such varied relationships.

This ex parte notice is being filed electronically in the above-referenced docket pursuant to section 1.1206(b) of the Commission’s rules.

Very Truly Yours,

/s/Eric B. Langley

Eric B. Langley

EBL/lk

Enclosures

cc: VIA EMAIL
Mr. Claude Aiken (claude.aiken@fcc.gov)