



September 18, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, District of Columbia 20554

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

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On behalf of Chevy Chase Village, a municipal corporation located in Montgomery County, Maryland, we write to express concerns about the Federal Communications Commission's proposed Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order regarding state and local governance of small cell wireless infrastructure deployment. Chevy Chase Village is a small residential community consisting of just over 720 single-family homes. Approximately one half of our community has been designated as historic and has been included in the Master Plan for Historic Preservation for Montgomery County, Maryland. We have relatively narrow public rights-of-way and a robust mature tree canopy.

While we appreciate the Commission's efforts to engage with local governments on this issue and share the Commission's goal of ensuring the growth of cutting-edge broadband services for all Americans, we remain deeply concerned about several provisions of this proposal. Local governments have an important responsibility to protect the health, safety and welfare of residents, and we are concerned that these preemption measures compromise that traditional authority and expose wireless infrastructure providers to unnecessary liability.

- **The FCC's proposed new collocation shot clock category is too extreme.** The proposal designates any preexisting structure, regardless of its design or suitability for attaching wireless equipment, as eligible for this new expedited 60 day shot clock. When paired with the FCC's previous decision exempting small wireless facilities from federal historic and environmental review, this places an unreasonable burden on local governments to prevent historic preservation, environmental, or safety harms to the community. The addition of up to three cubic feet of antenna and 28 cubic feet of additional equipment to a structure not originally designed to carry that equipment is substantial and may necessitate more review than the FCC has allowed in its proposal. With a small administrative staff, we are simply

CHEVY CHASE VILLAGE

5906 Connecticut Avenue
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815

Phone (301) 654-7300

Fax (301) 907-9721

ccv@montgomerycountymd.gov
www.chevychasevillagemd.gov

BOARD OF MANAGERS

ELISSA A. LEONARD
Chair

ROBERT C. GOODWIN, JR.
Vice Chair

DAVID L. WINSTEAD
Secretary

RICHARD M. RUDA
Assistant Secretary

GARY CROCKETT
Treasurer

MINH LE
Assistant Treasurer

NANCY E. WATTERS
Board Member

VILLAGE MANAGER
SHANA R. DAVIS-COOK


LEGAL COUNSEL
SUELLEN M. FERGUSON

not equipped with the staffing or technical expertise to review collocation applications within the shot clock period that is proposed and we would have to hire outside assistance, which would add to our processing time.

- **The FCC's proposed definition of "effective prohibition" is overly broad.** The draft report and order proposes a definition of "effective prohibition" that invites challenges to long-standing local rights of way requirements unless they meet a subjective and unclear set of guidelines. While the Commission may have intended to preserve local review, this framing and definition of effective prohibition opens local governments to the likelihood of more, not less, conflict and litigation over requirements for aesthetics, spacing, and undergrounding.
- **The FCC's proposed recurring fee structure is an unreasonable overreach that will harm local policy innovation.** We disagree with the FCC's interpretation of "fair and reasonable compensation" as meaning approximately \$270 per small cell site. Local governments share the federal government's goal of ensuring affordable broadband access for every American, regardless of their income level or address. That is why many cities have worked to negotiate fair deals with wireless providers, which may exceed that number or provide additional benefits to the community. Additionally, the Commission has moved away from rate regulation in recent years. Why does it see fit to so narrowly dictate the rates charged by municipalities?

While our community is willing and eager to work with private businesses to build the best broadband infrastructure possible for our residents, we oppose this effort to restrict local authority and stymie local innovation, while limiting the obligations providers have to our community. We urge you to oppose this declaratory ruling and report and order.

Sincerely,



Shana R. Davis-Cook
Manager, Chevy Chase Village

Cc: Chevy Chase Village Board of Managers
Suellen Ferguson, Village Counsel