

WILEY, REIN & FIELDING

ORIGINAL

1776 K STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006
(202) 429-7000

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

KATHERINE M. HOLDEN
(202) 429-7245

FACSIMILE
(202) 429-7049

March 21, 1996

William F. Caton
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 122
Washington, D.C. 20554

MAR 21 1996

Re: EX PARTE COMMUNICATION; In the Matter of Amendment of the Commission's Rules To Permit Flexible Service Offerings in The Commercial Mobile Radio Services. WT Docket No. 96-6

Dear Mr. Caton:

This letter provides notification that Rob Cohen and Rob Hoggarth of the Personal Communications Industry Association ("PCIA") and the undersigned met today with John Cimko and Michael Wack to discuss PCIA's views on the above-referenced proceeding as reflected in its comments and the attached document.

Sincerely,



Katherine M. Holden

cc: John Cimko
Michael Wack

Attachment
KMH/chh

[Handwritten signature]



**CMRS LICENSEE PROVISION OF FIXED SERVICES -- WHETHER
LOCAL LOOP OR OTHERWISE -- SHOULD BE TREATED UNDER
THE SAME REGULATORY SCHEME AS CMRS MOBILE SERVICES
WT DOCKET NO. 96-6**

Section 332 Gives the Commission Plenary Authority Over the Fixed Service Offerings of CMRS Carriers. With the enactment of Section 332(c) of the Communications Act, Congress deliberately chose a federal regulatory framework to apply to all commercial mobile radio services ("CMRS"). Because CMRS services "by their nature, operate without regard to state lines . . .,"¹ such services were specifically exempted from the dual federal and state regulatory regime originally established to govern interstate and intrastate services. Congress' intent was to create a seamless federal regulatory framework for CMRS providers. Thus, if CMRS carriers are subject to multiple layers of regulation based on the make-up of their service offerings at any given point in time, Congress' goal of achieving regulatory parity and uniformity in rate and entry regulation would be thwarted. Moreover, CMRS carriers' ability to add value to their mobile service offerings by marketing a menu of services, including fixed wireless loop service, would be severely restricted.

A handful of parties argue that wireless local loop services offered as an integral part of CMRS services by a CMRS provider do not qualify as mobile services and thus, are not exempt from state rate and entry regulation. However, by defining "mobile service" as "any service for which a license is required in a personal communications service established pursuant to the [PCS] proceeding . . . or any successor proceeding," Congress made clear that all PCS services, whether they are fixed or mobile in nature, are to be defined as CMRS and regulated under Section 332. Consistent with the federal mandate to promote regulatory parity, the FCC is required to treat all other CMRS offerings in the same manner.

Several parties assert that all local loop services must be subject to comparable regulation, or else the Commission is promoting regulatory discrimination based on technology. Congress, however, has directed in Section 332 that CMRS be subject to federal regulation as described above. Arguments about technology-based discrimination do not affect the congressional mandate. In addition, in other contexts and under other sections of the Communications Act, the Commission has concluded that different types of carriers providing similar services may warrant different levels of regulation.

¹ Budget Act House Report at 260; cf. H.R. Rep. No. 103-213, 103rd Cong., 1st Sess. 494 (1993).

The Inseverability of Intrastate and Interstate CMRS Offerings Supports Federal Jurisdiction. While Section 332(c)(3)(A) of the Communications Act imposes no prohibition on state regulation of "other terms and conditions" of commercial mobile services, that jurisdiction remains subject to the "inseverability" doctrine. This doctrine, developed by the Supreme Court in *Louisiana PCS*, granted the FCC authority to preempt conflicting state rules where the Commission could not "separate the interstate and the intrastate components of [its] asserted regulations."² Where "compliance with both federal and state law is in effect physically impossible," federal law must prevail.³

State Regulation of CMRS Offerings Is Impermissible Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The FCC's proposal to subject fixed services offered by CMRS carriers to the same regulatory scheme as their mobile service offerings is consistent with the competitive policies recently adopted in the Telecommunications Act of 1996. New Section 253(a) of the Act states that "[n]o State or local statute or regulation, or other State or local legal requirement, may prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting the ability of any entity to provide any interstate or intrastate telecommunications service."⁴ As any state entry or rate regulation would violate Section 253(a) by effectively prohibiting the provision of fixed services by CMRS carriers, it would be subject to preemption pursuant to Section 253(d).⁵ Moreover, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 specifically preserved the preemption provisions of Section 332(c)⁶ and excluded CMRS providers from the definition of "local exchange carrier."⁷ Thus, the Telecommunications Act of 1996 reaffirms Congress' intent that federal regulation supersede state law with respect to CMRS, however defined.

² *Louisiana PCS*, 476 U.S. 355, 376, n.4 (1986).

³ *Id.*, at 368.

⁴ 47 U.S.C. § 253(a).

⁵ 47 U.S.C. § 253(d).

⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 253(e).

⁷ 47 U.S.C. § 3(44).