

MINUTES OF MEETING

FLORIDA UTILITIES COORDINATING COMMITTEE

May 3, 1963

Sarasota, Florida

The regular quarterly meeting of the Florida Utilities Coordinating Committee, held at the Landmark Motel in Sarasota, Florida, was called to order by Mr. Ed O'Connor. Due to a large attendance, the introduction of the following regular guests was omitted.

E. K. Nelson, III	Tampa Electric Company	Box 111, Tampa, Fla.
H. D. Broome	Tampa Electric Company	Box 111, Tampa, Fla.
Karl M. Allison, Sr.	Lee Co. Elect. Coop., Inc.	Box 190, Ft. Myers
Jack Sutton	Lee Co. Elect. Coop., Inc.	Box 190, Ft. Myers
J. K. Daniel	Florida Power & Light	Box 1150, Sarasota
R. S. Davis	Florida Power & Light	Box 1150, Sarasota
Wilkins Linhart	Fla. R.R. & P.U. Commission	Fruitland Park
S. S. Gray	Florida Power Corporation	Lake Wales, Fla.
R. E. Nilsson	Florida Power Corporation	Clearwater, Fla.
L. W. Abrams	Florida Power Corporation	Clearwater, Fla.
G. T. Mitchell	Florida Power Corporation	St. Petersburg, Fla.
J. L. Munroe	Florida Power & Light	Cocoa, Florida
Paul E. Eleazer	Florida Power Corporation	Lake Wales, Fla.
D. A. Wilson	Inter County Tele. Co.	Ft. Myers, Fla.
C. J. Chambers	Inter County Tele. Co.	Ft. Myers, Fla.
Maurice H. Phillips	Florida Power Corporation	Lake Wales, Fla.
Charles Whitaker	Florida Telephone Corporation	Leesburg, Florida
Kenneth Head	Florida Telephone Corporation	Leesburg, Florida
E. M. Salley	State Road Department	Tallahassee, Fla.
Jim Kellermann	Sumter Electric Coop.	Sumterville, Fla.
G. A. Reed	Clay Electric Coop.	Keystone Hts.
D. J. Thigpen, Jr.	Sumter Electric Coop.	Sumterville, Fla
Thomas E. Lewis	Clay Electric Coop.	Keystone Heights, Fla.
Ralph Reid	Sumter Electric Coop.	Sumterville, Fla.
C. A. Wickens, Jr.	General Tele. Co.	St. Petersburg, Fla.
H. L. Conoly, Jr.	General Tele. Co.	Box 29, Sarasota, Fla.
J. C. Sedell	General Tele. Co.	507 Jackson, Tampa, Fla.
Fred Galluccio	General Tele. Co.	E.A. Lime St., Lakeland, Fla.
Stanley Warth	Southern Bell Tele. & Tele.	Jacksonville, Florida
Ivon Tilyou	Peace River Electric Coop.	Wauchula, Florida
D. R. Eyman	Florida Power & Light	Box 3100, Miami, 1, Florida
Homer D. Wilson	Florida Power Corporation	Winter Park, Florida
Ben Darlington	General Telephone Co.	Tampa, Florida
R. R. Perez	Florida Power & Light	Ft. Myers, Florida
S. Hollingsworth	Southern Gas Corporation	Box 3540, Sarasota
W. H. Anderson	Florida Power & Light	Sarasota, Florida
L. G. Zelenka	American Tele. & Tele. Co.	Jacksonville, Florida
Robert L. Traxler	Gulf Power Company	Pensacola, Florida
J. T. Bayer	Southern Bell Tele. & Tele.	Jacksonville, Florida
R. L. Burkhart	Winter Park Tele. Company	Winter Park, Florida
Ken Radekin	North Florida Tele. Co.	Live Oak, Florida
Willie J. Wooley	North Florida Tele. Co.	Live Oak, Florida
Walter B. Oliver, III	North Florida Tele. Co.	Live Oak, Florida
K. L. Peterson	North Florida Tele. Co.	Live Oak, Florida
E. J. O'Connor	Florida Power Corporation	St. Petersburg, Florida
W. P. Malloy	Southeastern Telephone Co.	Box 2214, Tallahassee, Fla.
W. B. Bunker	Tri-County Elec. Coop.	Madison, Florida
J. G. Spencer	Florida Power & Light	Sarasota, Florida
Glenn V. Fleischer	General Telephone Co.	507 Jackson St., Tampa
J. H. Blanchard	Florida Power Corp.	Box 14042, St. Petersburg
E. T. Depew	Florida Power Corporation	Box 14042, St. Petersburg
Martinez, Jr.	General Telephone Company	Box 110, Tampa, Florida

Special guests from the State Road Department were introduced as follows:

Mr. M. N. Yancey	Engineer of Right-of-Way
Mr. Rolfe Mickler	Assistant Highway Engineer
Mr. J. P. Herndon	Assistant Maintenance Engineer
Mr. S. D. Hall	District Maintenance Engineer, Dist. III
Mr. E. A. Thompson	District Maintenance Engineer, Dist. IV
Mr. D. N. Pappas	District Maintenance Engineer, Dist. V
Mr. V. G. Marcoux	District Maintenance Engineer, Dist. I
Mr. W. J. Murphy	District Maintenance Engineer, Dist. II
Mr. M. D. Johnson	District Maintenance Engineer, Dist. II

The secretary read the minutes of the previous meeting of February 23, 1963. They were corrected to read as follows on the second page, 6th paragraph, and were then approved:

Mr. Noa briefly described Gulf Power's program for expansion of lines in the West Florida area. Mr. Noa made a motion that the Committee continue its procedure to have the distribution line voltage limitation removed on lines along State Rights-of-Way. Mr. Thigpen seconded Mr. Noa's motion.

The Program was a panel discussion with the State Road Department Engineers and Secretary, Bill Malloy, moderating the panel. For your review and reference the questions and answers are included in these minutes.

#### I. APPLICATIONS AND INCONSISTANCIES:

1. Question: Pertaining to buried plant. Why is it one Road District requires that installations be placed on the shoulder of the road at a point where the shoulder meets the front slope of the ditch, while another district will permit an installation on the road shoulder?

Answer: State Road Department does not have a hard and fast rule with reference to buried cable. Cable, however, should be placed where the shoulder meets the front slope of the ditch to permit widening strip and placing of signs.

#### II. POLICY:

- 1.a. Question: The State Road Department has a policy not to let one utility occupy both sides of the road rights-of-way, yet we have road rights-of-way that are 200 feet or more which make it impossible to span. If an agreement by joint use or otherwise is worked out with the various utility companies servicing that area, why can't applications be submitted for placing facilities on both sides of the right-of-way so long as letters of concurrence are attached from the other utility companies?

Answer: So long as the lines are limited to one pole line each side of right-of-way, this will be permitted. Letters of concurrence should accompany permits to state that joint use will be allowed other utilities on a company that proposes to occupy both sides of right-of-way.

- b. Question: What is the State Road Department's policy on two pole lines on the same side of the road?

Answer: The Road Department wishes to keep the right-of-way as clear and absent of signs and poles as possible - two pole lines on the same side of right-of-way and on road right-of-way will not be permitted unless unusual circumstances exist which must be clearly explained. Exception - Street light circuit and pole line.

2. Question: Why can't buried installations be made (terrain permitting) 6½' off rights-of-way, the same as pole lines?

Answer: This is the space allocated for poles. Permit will be granted to place buried facilities from 4' to 5' off right-of-way line but all riser poles, etc., must be 6½' off right-of-way.

Question: Why should a crossing permit for service drops be required when a permit has been granted to be on the State Road rights-of-way and why do some districts require a permit while others do not?

Answer: If the service drop is extended to an existing pole whether it be owned by crossing company or joint use pole and vertical clearance can be maintained over State Road, a permit will not be required. However, if in placing the service drop a new pole is required, a permit must be obtained for pole and service drop.

- b. Question: When a buried cable is placed along or across State Road right-of-way, and is near an existing pole line, why can't we be permitted to dig a splice pit or bury a side leg of cable for a very short distance in order to place a terminal on a nearby pole so that a particular customer might be served without applying for a permit. A permit has been obtained for the main buried cable.

Answer: A permit will not be required so long as the splice pit and/or lateral leg of cable to be picked up is not extended over 6' to an existing pole in a grass plot. Permit will be required if pavement or any permanent construction is disturbed.

- c. Question: When a utility proposes to place a new pole line across or along State Road right-of-way, it is our understanding that a State Road permit is not necessary when a pole is replaced or when an intermediate pole is placed. We recommend that we be allowed to place an occasional clearance pole across the highway from an existing pole line.

Answer: When replacement of poles or setting of intermediate poles is required in a pole line previously permitted, additional permit is not required. However, if a clearance pole or additional pole is set on opposite side of road from main pole line, a permit is required.

- 4.a. Question: Why should a permit to cross a State Road be required when no facilities are located on highway property and proper clearance maintained?

Answer: State Road policy to control the placing and crossing of road right-of-way. Permit required.

- b. Question: This is in reference to question #1. Where transmission lines are located on private property and requires a guy on opposite sides of road from pole line, would a permit be required for that portion of guy wire crossing over State Road right-of-way?

Answer: Yes - see above answer for question 4-a.

5. Question: In some cases, property owners along rights-of-way widening projects have asked that certain trees be left standing on rights-of-way if they do not interfere with road construction and the Project Engineer agrees to leave the trees. Does the utility have the right to remove the trees if it interferes with the utility's lines?

Answer: Project Engineer should okay removal of trees. If this cannot be worked out, a meeting should be held with District Engineer to show why tree should be removed. It is Road Department policy to allow trees to be removed for line construction but utility must remove stump or cut trunk of tree 6" to 10" below finish grade.

6. Question: For an emergency job, who can give an okay for construction if the permit has not been completely processed?

Answer: District Engineer of Maintenance can okay so long as he has the permit in his hand - formal approval can follow later.

7. Question: Why is it necessary for Company "A" to obtain a State Road permit when they attach to Company "B's" poles. Company "B" has been issued a State Road permit.

Answer: Original permit issued is to cover construction of pole line with certain facilities attached to it, by placing additional facilities or under joint use the pole line as originally permitted has been changed and a permit should be obtained.

- 8.a. Question: What are State Road policies on luminaires on white way systems serving public interests?

Answer: As long as light fixtures are placed on existing poles for public interest permit will not have to be obtained. This includes placing intermediate poles.

- b. Question: What are State Road policies on luminaires on white way systems serving private interests?

Answer: If a light fixture is placed to serve private interest, it can be placed on an existing pole without permit but must face away from highway (toward private property). Permit to place new pole and light fixture to serve private interest on State Road right-of-way will not be permitted.

### III. CRITICISM:

1. Question: After we prepare and submit road applications and permits to the Road Department, why doesn't this information get to the maintenance crews? We know of installations where maintenance crews have placed signs on newly installed cables; where shrubbery has been planted directly over buried cables, and trees planted directly under aerial construction. What can be done to improve this situation?

Answer: Closer coordination with district maintenance crews is necessary. Utilities should assist in several respects by furnishing district officer with locations of utilities, advising district offices with location signs for buried facilities are there for their references. Work closer with garden circles that promote planting on State Road right-of-way.

2. Question: Can't some revision of procedures be made to reduce permit processing delays in the State Road Department offices?

Answer: Permits should be addressed to District Engineer but sent to <sup>Local</sup> District Maintenance Engineer. Normal processing will take approximately 15 days providing permits do not have to be returned for correction. However, several things can happen to delay permits. For example - parties having to sign are out of the office or the legal department who approves permits are not available.

3. This is question 8-b on the CHECK LIST FOR UTILITY AND USE PERMITS WHEN INSTALLATION IS ON CONSTRUCTION.

8. On the sketch, be sure the following information is included:

- b. Station numbers from the beginning and end of installation, any crossings, and any irregularities in red.

Question: Can't this requirement be waived for notes and other incidental information? Underlining these in red constitutes a lot of extra work.

Answer: This is required to permit ready reference to the location of proposed construction and designed to speed up permit processing for utilities.

### IV. SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS:

1. Question: Road Department should issue booklet of requirements for information of placing utilities on rights-of-way and any changes should have an effective date.

Answer: Road Department agrees this needs to be done. Utilities could assist by preparing a list of items that could be included in booklet - not in form, but just a list. (NOTE: This sub-committee consists of Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Burkhart, Mr. Darlington, Mr. Walter Anderson, Mr. Ed Nelson, and Mr. Glenn Fleischer.)

2. Question: Suggest State Road Department stipulate applications for use permit to include insert of location using a scale of 1 inch to 2 miles map for location. This could be accomplished by cutting out or having reproduced an 8½" x 14" segment of the 1 inch to 2 miles map to cover location.

Answer: This is for the utilities to work out.

3. Question: Why can't standards be set up for location of all necessary facilities so that road design engineers would be required to consider the utilities in designing drainage and other road requirements?

Answer: Predesign conferences already setup to work to this end.

It was pointed out that in order to expedite processing of permits that copies of all Road permits should be increased from 4 to 5 copies on normal applications, and from 5 to 6 copies where inter-state systems are involved.

Sub-Committees that were appointed to work on the list for booklet (see question IV-1) and committee designated to discuss with legal department the requirement of corporation seal on all permits, will report their findings in the near future. These committees have been active and as soon as written reports are available, they will be distributed.

I would like to express the appreciation of the entire coordinating committee to the Florida Power & Light Company for hosting this meeting.

Respectfully Submitted:

*William P. Malloy*

WILLIAM P. MALLOY  
Secretary

WPM/ej