

**STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL O'RIELLY**

Re: *Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, WT Docket No. 17-79; *Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, WC Docket No. 17-84

I enthusiastically support the intent of today's item and the vast majority of its content, as it will lower the barriers that some localities place to infrastructure siting. By tackling exorbitant fees, ridiculous practices, and prolonged delays, we are taking the necessary steps to expedite deployment and make it more cost efficient. Collectively, these provisions will help facilitate the deployment of 5G and enable providers to expand services throughout our nation, with ultimate beneficiaries being the American people.

While this is a tremendous step in the right direction, there are some things that could have been done to improve the situation further. For instance, the agreement reached by all parties in the 1996 Telecommunications Act was that states and localities would have no role over radio frequency emission issues, could not regulate based on the aesthetics of towers and antennas, and were prohibited from imposing any moratoriums on processing wireless siting applications. State and localities did not honor this agreement and the courts have sadly enabled their efforts via harmful and wrongly decided cases. Accordingly, I would have preferred that the aesthetics related provisions in the item be deleted, but I will have to swallow it recognizing that I can't get the rest without it. At the very least, I do appreciate that, at my request, it was clarified that the aesthetic requirements, which must be published in advance, must be objective.

I am also concerned that by setting application and recurring fees that are presumed to be reasonable, the Commission is inviting localities to adopt these rates, even if they are not cost based. Providers should be explicitly provided the right to challenge these rates if they believe they are not cost based. Even if not stated, I hope that providers will challenge unreasonable rates. I thank my colleagues for agreeing to my edits that the application fee presumption applies to all non-recurring costs, not just the application fee.

Further, I think there should be a process and standards in place if a locality decides that it needs more time to review batched applications. Objective criteria are needed regarding what are considered "exceptional circumstances" or "exceptional cases" warranting a longer review period for batch processing, when localities need to inform the applicant that they need more time, how this notification will occur, and how much time they will get. For instance, the item appears to excuse a locality that does not act within the shot clocks for any application if there are "extraordinary circumstances," but there are no parameters on what circumstances we are envisioning. Is a lack of adequate staff or having processing rules or policies in place a sufficient excuse? Such things should be determined upfront, as opposed to allowing courts to decide such matters. Without further clarity, I fear that we may be creating unnecessary loopholes, resulting in further delay.

Finally, I would have liked today's item to be broader and cover the remaining infrastructure issues in the record. First, the Commission's new interpretation of sections 253 and 332 applies beyond small cells. While our focus has been on these newer technologies, there needs to be a recognition that macro towers will continue to play a crucial role in wireless networks. One tower provider states that "[m]acro cell sites will continue to be a central component of wireless infrastructure . . .," because 80 [percent] of the population lives in suburban or rural areas where "macro sites are the most efficient way

to transmit wireless signals.”¹ Further, many of the interpretations in today’s item apply not only to these macro towers, but also to other telecommunications services, including those provided by traditional wireline carriers and potentially cable companies.

Second, the Commission needs to close loopholes in section 6409 that some localities have been exploiting. While these rules pertaining to the modification of existing structures are clear, some localities are trying to undermine Congress’s intent and our actions. For instance, localities are refusing ancillary permissions, such as building or highway permits, to slow down or prevent siting; using the localities’ concealment and aesthetic additions to increase the size of the facility or requiring that poles be replaced with stealth infrastructure for the purpose of excluding facilities from section 6409; placing improper conditions on permits; and forcing providers to sign agreements that waive their rights under section 6409. And, I have been told that some are claiming that section 6409 does not apply to their siting processes. This must stop. I appreciate the Chairman’s firm commitment to my request for an additional item to address such matters, and I expect that it will be coming in the very near future.

Third, there is a need to harmonize our rules regarding compound expansion. Currently, an entity seeking to replace a structure is allowed to expand the facility’s footprint by 30 feet, but if the same entity seeks to expand the tower area to hold new equipment associated with a collocation, a new review is needed. It doesn’t make sense that these situations are treated differently. And while we are at it, the Commission should also harmonize its shot clocks and remedies. These issues should also be added to any future item.

Lastly, the Commission also must finish its review of the comments filed in response to the twilight towers notice, make the revisions to the program comment, and submit it to Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for their review and vote. These towers are eligible, yet not permitted, to hold an estimated 6,500 collocations that will be needed for next-generation services and FirstNet. It is time to bring this embarrassment, which started in 2001, to an end.

Not only do I thank the Chairman for agreeing to additional infrastructure items, but I also thank the Chairman and Commissioner Carr for implementing several of my edits to the item today. Besides those already mentioned, they include applying the aesthetic criteria, including that any requirements must be reasonable, objective, and published in advance, to undergrounding; stating that undergrounding requirements that apply to some, but not all facilities, will be considered an effective prohibition if they materially inhibit wireless service; and adding similar language to the minimum spacing section of the item. Further, the minimum spacing requirements will not apply to replacement facilities or prevent collocations on existing structures. Additionally, localities claiming that an application is incomplete will need to specifically state what rule requires the submission of the missing information.

With this, I approve.

¹ American Tower Ex Parte Letter, WT Docket No. 17-79, n.6 (Aug. 10, 2018).