

Meeting Minutes

Project: AASHTO Utility Accommodation & Safety Technical Committee

Date/Time: September 5, 2016 from 2:30 PM to 4:00 PM (EST)

Location: Conference Call

Purpose: Quarterly committee conference call to discuss hot topics, areas where research is needed, and to bounce ideas off one another.

Attendees: See attached attendance sheet.

Meeting Summary:

- The meeting started with general introductions of those on the call followed by a quick overview of and expectations for the call.
- **Old Business**
 - Wireless Cell Networks Discussion – Microcell/Small Cell/Distributed Antenna Systems.
 - Louisiana inquired as to what fees DOT's were charging for small wireless facilities
 - In Florida wireless companies are now considered a utility by statute; however, this causes issues for neutral host providers that are not true wireless providers.
 - Wireless providers are trying to keep their costs as low as possible.
 - Indiana required wireless providers go through their lease agreement process.
 - Delaware recently had legislation passed which allows for up to \$100 permit fee per wireless site and contemplates the review/inspection costs be reimbursed to the Department.
 - Wireless Cell Networks Discussion – Attaching to DOT Poles
 - Michigan does not allow for attachment to DOT poles.
 - Delaware law allows for wireless providers to attach to DOT owned poles.
 - Louisiana mentioned concern for allowing attachment to DOT poles.
 - Surveys:
 - Casing vs. No casing – It was mentioned that this may have been previously studied under NCHRP 20-7 task 248 back in 2009.
- **New Business**
 - Pole Safety discussion:
 - Georgia has a pole safety program. Costs are split 50/50 with pole owners to get hazardous poles moved. It can take a long time and funding comes from safety funds through their traffic section.
 - Several states requested Georgia share their program requirements. **(See info from Georgia at the end of the minutes.)**
 - It was mentioned that California, Florida & Texas has most pole strikes.
 - Florida has a good policy for placement of poles outside the clear zone and if there is a safety issue with pole then utility is ordered to move.
 - Indiana does not have specific policy but do use safety funds. Typically there are items outside of utility poles that cause safety issues. There are cases where road right-of-way has not been increased over the years so poles are close to the edge of pavement. Federal guidance gives input on higher priority priority

area to review. Poles aren't going anywhere so there is good merit to how to proactively deal with these.

- Florida to share information on pole policy with Indiana.
- By law, Florida does not allow poles within the clear zone. If there is one within clear zone, the utility company needs to move it out of the clear zone. If there is a safety issue, the utility company is required to move by order.
- It was questioned whether impact attenuators are ever required to be installed around poles.

- **General Discussion**

- ASCE Asbuilt Standard is almost finished. The main feature of this standard is how you capture and depict geo-spatial information. The hope is that a draft version of the standard will be ready for the next AASHTO Conference.
- Discussed if those on the call were satisfied with the technical council discussions and the information that has come out of the council. Feedback from those involved in call was positive.
- Oregon asked how other DOT's deal with or accommodate private lines within right-of-way.
 - Florida said private lines are considered a utility and allowed in the right-of-way.
 - Arkansas does not allow longitudinal installations of private lines in the right-of-way.
 - California does not allow longitudinal installations (private or public) in controlled access rights-of-way but allow on a case-by-case basis within conventional road rights-of-way.
 - Wyoming handles on a case-by-case basis typically by proof there are no other options for installation.

- **Action Items**

- **NCHRP Update**...On 10/5/17 Jennifer McCleve notified us that NCHRP 20-7 Utility Installations to Specific Geo-spatial Location & **RNS_20-7_Accommodation-Small-Cell-Sites** were selected for funding under NCHRP 20-7. Two others, **RNS_20-7_Managing-Util-Facilities-Taken-OOS-Within-ROW** & RNS 20-7 Utility ROW Acquisition and Reimbursement, were requested to be rewritten as NCHRP proposals. This is great news! Our TC created the two RNS's highlighted above and we supported and discussed the other two as well.
- Coordinate subcommittee surveys for:
 - Cased vs. uncased utility crossing requirements
 - Safe accommodation, placement, and maintenance of overhead utilities, lighting and traffic signals
- Follow up on potential shared website for utility agreements to help with nationwide consistency.

- **Next Meeting**

- Tentatively scheduled for December 5, 2017 at 2:30 PM (EST). More details will be circulated as the meeting gets closer.
- Annual AASHTO Subcommittee Conference scheduled for 2018 in Baltimore, MD.

- **Technical Council Website:** <http://rightofway.transportation.org/Pages/Technical-Council-on-Utility-Accommodation-and-Safety.aspx>

cc: Meeting Attendees
Technical Council Members

Here is information regarding Georgia's pole safety program and wireless facilities that was provided following the call.

The information for our pole policy is in Chapter 8 of our [2016 Utility Accommodation Policy & Standards Manual](#) (UAM). As a result of the policy, we have established a Clear Roadside Committee (GDOT + metro aerial owners); we conduct quarterly meetings and review crash data for 3 mile corridor segments to identify viable projects which are funded via the Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program. Projects are typically programmed every 2 years and/or as funding is available. Projects are delivered via Force Account Agreements with each utility owner after environmental and right of way concurrence. We have faced challenges delivering these projects as specific schedules are not set like traditional construction projects - we're working on enhancements to the project delivery aspect. Since 2005, we've delivered 4 projects with a 5th one currently awaiting environmental clearances. ROW is typically not an issue since we are working within existing ROW, but the Utilities may have issues obtaining trimming easements. Of the 4 projects, to-date, only 1 has been completed but not closed out, 2 others are mostly complete, and 1, which was programmed in 2015, is under construction.

All of the projects so far have been in metro Atlanta where there is very limited available ROW. We may only be able to move the poles back a foot or two, but the improvements can be profound - the upside is that the project areas seem to become some sort of impetus for urban renewal projects.

On the subject of wireless, please see Chapter 5.11 for what Georgia is currently doing. We are also in heavy conversation regarding possible policy updates that encourage colocation but possibly include stand-alone poles as a last resort. We're trying to determine what that policy would look like.