GREATER AUSTIN AREA TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (GAATN) INTERLOCAL AGENCY

GAATN TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

November 15, 2022 at 1:30 p.m.
City of Austin Permitting and Development Center
6310 Wilhelmina Delco Dr, Rm 1202, Austin, TX 78752
Teams Videoconference link provided 72 hours prior to meeting on homepage of www.gaatn.org
Remote audio-only option for public access: (512) 831-7858, Access Code: 475 583 004#

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order (Including a roll call):**
   GAATN Technical Subcommittee Chairman Jaime Guerra called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.
   The following announced as present at the start of the meeting:
   Gary Weseman, on behalf of Austin Community College (remote)
   Steve Pyle, on behalf of State of Texas DIR (remote)
   Jaime Guerra, on behalf of UT-Austin (on site)
   Dain Herbat, on behalf of Travis County (remote)
   Leslye Conoley, on behalf of City of Austin (remote)
   Justin Slocum, on behalf of Austin ISD (remote)
   Mace Royston, on behalf of Lower Colorado River Authority (remote) – left meeting at 2:09 p.m.
   Harold Nall, on behalf of UT-Austin (remote)
   Anthony Breckenridge, on behalf of City of Austin (remote)
   Bo Kinsey, on behalf of Travis County (remote)
   Frank Ammons, on behalf of GAATN/COA (remote)
   Carlos DeMatos, on behalf of GAATN/COA (remote)
   Sarah Eichelberger, on behalf of GAATN/COA (remote)
   A quorum was established at roll call.
   Members of the public/GAATN contractors:
   Oliver Higgs, on behalf of Austin Energy (remote)
   Chris Gonzales, on behalf of BryComm (remote)
   Doug Wilson, on behalf of JC Communications (remote)

2. **Citizen Communications:** There were no citizen communications.

3. **Review and approve minutes from the regular Technical Subcommittee meeting of October 18, 2022**
   Gary Weseman moved to approve the draft minutes as presented; Steve Pyle seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Jaime Guerra requested to discuss Agenda Item 6B next, since it was concerning Austin Energy, and then to return to 4A and follow the rest of the agenda in the order as written.

4. **Maintenance Contractor's Report**
   A. **Maintenance report**
      Chris noted that, since the last meeting, BryComm completed inspections C1N and C1S with 19 corrected deficiencies between the two rings.
   B. **Inventory report**
      Chris reported that, since the last meeting, there were two 20k foot reels of 192-count fiber added to the GAATN stock, R713 and R714. He also noted that they used 748 feet of COA fiber for the B1N repair between Fire Station 5 and Martin Hill Tower. Frank said that GAATN may want to look at purchasing additional fiber to have in stock for future projects. Jaime asked Frank to bring that proposal to an upcoming meeting for consideration.

5. Network Manager's Report

A. Project status report

Frank reviewed the following upcoming and recently completed projects:

- B2S MET3 Replacement of 114ct with 288ct north node – scheduled to complete 11/17
- A2N/SRS Maintenance hole relocation at Lamar and Toomey – will be forthcoming soon, management will send a notice as soon as it is scheduled
- COA A1N PARD Lions Golf Course new node – completed 10/27
- C2S/B1N UT Applied Research Labs – scheduled to complete 11/29 – splice date was scheduled after the report for the handouts was created, but notice was sent via GAATN Alerts

B. Network status report

Frank said there were no updates to this report since there were not any unplanned outages since the last meeting.

C. Job budget report

Sarah reported that management is tracking 41 jobs, including the two that are being considered for recommendation today, totaling $2.8 million. For FY23, GAATN has been invoiced $110k in project expenses.

6. Committee Chairperson's Update – discussion and possible action on:

A. FY2024 GAATN Site List

Sarah notified members that the deadline to respond to the FY24 Preliminary site list was November 18 and she was still lacking responses from four entities. She noted that the changes would be compiled into the FY24 Proposed Site list which will be brought to the December 6 Board meeting for approval.

B. GAATN procedures for stub poles

Frank updated the members that the previously scheduled meeting on November 8 with COA Right-of-Way (ROW) had to be rescheduled due to the division manager's availability. The purpose of that meeting was to discuss the eight stub poles on San Antonio street which is related to the A1N/A2N Ronald Earle Building projects. Frank said that meeting is rescheduled for November 28. He said that AE is looking to create a GIS file that shows the stub poles in order for GAATN to determine which poles might be slated for removal (not pending transfer to a new pole). Oliver said that he was concerned that presenting the GIS file would create a false sense of worry with regards to the stub poles; he said the vast majority of stub poles have a new pole that comms will transfer to. He said that when AE comes across a stub pole that doesn't have a new pole to transfer to, they will work with the carriers on those poles for the carriers to either place a new pole, go underground or find another solution to remove their attachments. He said that the GIS file does not differentiate between stub poles that have a new pole close by to attach to and ones that do not, but the majority of stub poles do have another pole placed nearby to transfer to and are not a concern to the network. Dain asked what happens if a stub pole that does not have a new pole placed for transfer; Oliver said typically if a storm comes through, AE would be the first to respond to make the area safe, but then they would contact the entities attached to the pole to let them know that they need to replace the pole or make emergency repairs to that location – AE would not go back and replace the pole in that scenario. Jaime asked for clarification that GAATN could go and replace that kind of pole in an emergency; Oliver said potentially and that depends on the other carriers and GAATN would have to work that out with them based on who has the appropriate materials in stock. He said the carriers typically work that out amongst themselves, but there is not a strict written policy for that situation. Dain asked if the approval authority is COA ROW; Oliver said ROW would have to answer that question as to whether a permit would be required in an emergency situation. Frank said GAATN has

the ability to go out and respond to emergency events without a permit and that has to do with FCC regulations and providing services to public safety. Jaime asked Oliver why AE abandoned the poles that he was displaying and whether AE made an accommodation for AE; Oliver said he could not say for sure without researching it. Jaime asked if there is a way for AE to contact GAATN when a developer is requesting they move their infrastructure so GAATN can potentially be moved underground by the developer as well; Oliver said AE has started an advanced notice process for comms that are affected by such projects so they can proactively work with the developer to find a solution for their infrastructure. Oliver reviewed the AE GIS file and how stub poles are labeled as 8 foot class 3 poles; he reiterated that there is nothing in the GIS that differentiates between stub poles with a new pole to transfer to and ones that do not. Frank asked Oliver to confirm that all stub poles are slated for removal regardless of whether there is a new pole to transfer to; Oliver said that is correct. Frank said that the maintenance contractor's inspection report shows how many poles are awaiting transfer per GAATN ring and that GAATN could take the total number of stub poles and subtract the amount awaiting transfer from the maintenance report to get a sense of the issue. However, Frank asked Oliver if AE would be able to confirm whether all stub poles on the GIS file would eventually have a new pole to transfer or not; Oliver said they would not be able to confirm that information except on a case-by-case basis through the pole application process. Oliver said during the application review, AE confirms that the pole is owned by AE and they make a site visit to determine ownership. Jaime asked if all AE poles have the yellow tags, Oliver said yes but AT&T poles can also have the same tags. Frank said that if the Technical Subcommittee considers a policy regarding stub poles, he suggests it addresses what to do in the event of an emergency and the network manager's authority to replace a certain number of poles. He also suggested that GAATN purchase poles to have in stock. Jaime thanked Oliver for his time and expertise on the matter.

C. Notification of DIR removal of node at TxDOT E. Riverside location

Steve said that TxDOT is moving out of that building and so they are removing that node location. This location will be removed from DIR's site list from A2N.

D. Seeking recommendation for UT tie cable at 1303 San Antonio entity-specific project at no cost to GAATN

This item was discussed in executive session under Texas Government Codes 551.089 and 418.181. Upon reconvening in open session, Gary Weseman moved to recommend for Board approval the UT tie cable at 1303 San Antonio entity-specific project at no cost to GAATN; Dain Herbat seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

E. Seeking recommendation for SRS/B1S TxDOT Capitol Extension South IH35 from SH71 to SSH45 GAATN-funded TxDOT 100% reimbursable project at a cost not to exceed $364k to be funded from the FY23 and FY24 GAATN MAC budgets

This item was discussed in executive session under Texas Government Codes 551.089 and 418.181. Upon reconvening in open session, Gary Weseman moved to recommend for Board approval the SRS/B1S TxDOT Capitol Extension South IH35 from SH71 to SSH45 GAATN-funded TxDOT 100% reimbursable project at a cost not to exceed $364k to be funded from the FY23 and FY24 GAATN MAC budgets; Dain Herbat seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

F. Seeking recommendation for Longhorn Dam conduit relocation developer initiated GAATN-funded project at a cost not to exceed $89k to be funded from the FY23 GAATN MAC budget

This item was discussed in executive session under Texas Government Codes 551.089 and 418.181. Upon reconvening in open session, Gary Weseman moved to recommend for Board approval the Longhorn Dam conduit relocation developer initiated GAATN-funded project at a cost not to exceed $89k to be funded from the FY23 GAATN MAC budget; Dain Herbat seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

7. **Executive Session**: At 2:09 p.m., Jaime Guerra adjourned the GAATN Technical Subcommittee for closed session under one or more of Tex. Gov't Code sections 551.089 and 418.181, to preserve confidentiality as permitted by law (including but not limited to pending, anticipated or contemplated litigation concerning) regarding Agenda Items 6D, 6E, and 6F.

   At 2:22 p.m., Jaime Guerra reconvened the GAATN Technical Subcommittee in open session. Agenda Items 6D, 6E, and 6F were the only items discussed in executive session. Any additional discussion held or action taken on agenda items discussed in executive session is noted in the summary for that agenda item.

8. **Updated roll call upon reconvening in open session (only if Executive Session taken)**:
   Upon reconvening in open session, an updated roll call was taken. All members that announced as present at the first roll call were present at the second roll call except for Mace Royston. A quorum was re-established upon reconvening in open session.

9. **Confirm date, time, and location for the next Technical Subcommittee meeting as December 13, 2022 at 1:30 p.m. at City of Austin Permitting and Development Center 6310 Wilhelmina Delco Dr, Room 1202, Austin, TX 78752 and via Microsoft Teams Videoconference.**
   The date, time and location for the next Technical meeting were confirmed; the meeting adjourned at 2:28 p.m.