



**Eric Langley**  
2700 U.S. Highway 280  
Suite 240E  
Birmingham, AL 35223  
205-783-5750  
[eric@langleybromberg.com](mailto:eric@langleybromberg.com)

April 30, 2018

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

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

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On April 26, 2018, Pam Ellis (Utility Business Development Service Manager, American Electric Power Service Corporation), Tom St. Pierre (Associate General Counsel, American Electric Power Service Corporation), Allen Bell (Distribution Support Manager, Georgia Power), Natalie Beasman (Senior Counsel, Georgia Power) and I met with Michael Ray, Lisa Hone, Adam Copeland, Daniel Kahn, and Annick Banoun of the Wireline Competition Bureau. Also present in the meeting were Jiaming Shang and Catherine Matraves (by telephone).

During the meeting, we primarily discussed the points raised in the attached letter, which was filed on April 24, 2018, and a copy of which was provided to those who attended the meeting in-person.

We also briefly discussed the need for a different regulatory approach to wireless pole attachments than the approach taken by the Commission over the last forty years with respect to wireline attachments. Wireless antenna attachments are fundamentally different than wireline pole attachments, from both an economic and physical perspective, and should be treated differently from a regulatory perspective. The Commission should not merely try to “convert” rules and policy developed specifically in the wireline pole attachment context into rules/policy applicable to wireless pole attachments. The Commission’s regulatory approach with respect to wireless pole attachments should be “light touch” and should send signals to the stakeholders that it expects sophisticated investor-owned firms to reach negotiated solutions that bring value to both parties.

At the very end of the meeting, we urged that whatever rule (if any) the Commission adopts with respect to overloading should allow for reasonable advance notice, consistent with the approach taken by 8 of 9 state PUCs to address this issue within the past decade. We also explained that advanced notice is the only way an electric utility can exercise its right to deny access under section 224(f)(2).

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: Michael Ray ([michael.ray@fcc.gov](mailto:michael.ray@fcc.gov))  
Lisa Hone ([lisa.hone@fcc.gov](mailto:lisa.hone@fcc.gov))  
Adam Copeland ([adam.copeland@fcc.gov](mailto:adam.copeland@fcc.gov))  
Daniel Kahn ([daniel.kahn@fcc.gov](mailto:daniel.kahn@fcc.gov))  
Annick Banoun ([annick.banoun@fcc.gov](mailto:annick.banoun@fcc.gov))  
Jiaming Shang ([jiaming.shang@fcc.gov](mailto:jiaming.shang@fcc.gov))  
Catherine Matraves ([catherine.matraves@fcc.gov](mailto:catherine.matraves@fcc.gov))