

**Eight of Nine State PUCs to Address this Issue Within the Past Ten Years Have Ratified or Adopted Some Form of Advance Notification Requirement for Overlashing.**

STATE	YEAR	ADVANCE NOTICE REQUIRED?	# DAYS	COMMENTS
Arkansas	2016	Yes	45	“The evidence continues to support the need for a permit for overlashing because of safety and reliability concerns.”
Connecticut	2008	Yes	unknown	“Providing advanced notice is certainly not an unreasonable or burdensome requirement, and the Department believes such notice is necessary to preserve CL&P’s ability to manage the physical integrity of its infrastructure.”
Iowa	2013	Yes	7	“Overlashing of existing lines by a communications company may create situations that the pole owner will need to address prior to the overlashing being installed.”
Louisiana	2014	Yes	15	
Maine	2018	No	n/a	Did not mention or address any safety or reliability concerns.
North Carolina	2018	Yes	2-30	Notice period depends on number of poles impacted.
Ohio	2016	Yes	unspecified (probably 45 days)	“The Commission agrees with DP&L that overlashing an existing facility increases the load on a pole and that it is necessary to determine whether a pole can safely accommodate the additional load before the facility is overlashed.”
Utah	2012	Yes	10	Limited exception to regular permitting requirement, based on type of pole line and size of fiber.
Washington	2015	Yes	15	

**The CATVs and Telecoms Are Asking the Commission to Reject the Informed Judgment of All But One State PUC to Address this Issue Within the Past Ten Years.**