## Jim Pierce

From: Sent: To: Cc: Subject:	Clarence West [cawest@cawestlaw.com] Thursday, February 26, 2004 8:10 PM Bruce Grantham; Steve Chutchian; Clarence West; Mike Murphy; Luke Jalbert; Jim Pierce; Angela Washington Jenny Nicewander; Jerry Holder; Katura Curry Re: Arapaho Road 3 - Franchise Utility Relocation Reimbursement Status
Bruce, You are generally correct. If the utility is in a dedicated utility easement, not a private one, or in an alleyway or other publicly dedicated property, then they may have to move at the utility's cost. It is only when they are in a private easement that the franchise would not apply. As to telephone and electric, if it is not a widening and/or straigtening of a road, they will challege having to move at their cost.	
Bruce Grantham <bgrantham@gra-ce.net> wrote: &gt; I spoke with Angela today at Luke's request regarding the status of the &gt; above referenced project. &gt; For clarification purposes, here is my understanding of where this matter &gt; stands:</bgrantham@gra-ce.net>	
<pre>&gt; only be used to re &gt; facilities at no e &gt; right-of-way. (e.c &gt; - Within the lin &gt; Road 3, the Town w &gt; relocation expense &gt; - The franchise &gt; except for SBC who &gt; - We were unable &gt; utilities in the t &gt; Arapaho 3 right-of &gt; - However, giver &gt; to be a compelling &gt; with copies of the &gt; these documents. &gt;</pre>	nits of the new right-of-way acquired by the Town for Arapaho will need to reimburse the franchise companies for their es. companies are currently working on their relocation costs, o has already furnished a cost to the Town. e to find existing easements for all the affected franchise citle documents furnished to our office by Angela for the
Clarence A. West 1201 Rio Grande Street, Suite 200 Austin, Texas 78701	
512-499-8838 fax: 512-322-8884	

1