

maintained by a utility, because it constitutes a bottleneck facility to which competitive telecommunications carriers must have access to serve customers, the Commission should use its Section 224 authority to require the utility to provide rooftop access for telecommunications carriers.¹⁹

Section 224 contains a reverse preemption provision which allows a State to assume jurisdiction over rights-of-way regulation, but only if it does so in an "effective" manner and so certifies. While Section 224 obligates the Commission to act, it does not establish an "all or nothing" structure in which two jurisdictions battle for authority.²⁰ Rather, Section 224,

by utilities." Id. This interpretation of Section 224(f) counsels strongly in favor of adopting Teligent's position that where a utility's distribution facilities exist on a building rooftop by virtue of a right-of-way, Section 224 continues to apply as it would on a street -- namely, it continues to require the provision of access to the right-of-way for telecommunications carriers.

¹⁹ The Commission's use of Section 224 to effect rooftop access obligations will avoid any remotely colorable takings claims by utilities. Congress provided for any required compensation for the use of rights-of-way through Subsections 224(d) and (e)'s prescriptions for just and reasonable rates. The Commission may wish to clarify the appropriate application of the statutory formula to rights-of-way although, in practice, the formula may be used simply to define the range of acceptable privately negotiated rates.

²⁰ See 47 U.S.C. § 224(c)(1). The scope of Section 224's reverse preemption provision is limited and does not eliminate the Commission's authority to regulate rights-of-way. Section 224(c)(1) states that "[n]othing in this section shall . . . give the Commission jurisdiction with respect to . . . access to . . . rights-of-way . . . in any case where such matters are regulated by a State." (emphasis added) Therefore, although Section 224(c)(1) provides for the exercise of State authority, it cannot limit the Commission's jurisdiction over rights-of-way derived from other parts of the Act, such as authority to take action

although creating a duty for the Commission to act when not all States have done so, designs a dual regulatory structure that offers the opportunity for a harmonious resolution of the issue through cooperative efforts between the Commission and the States. Ultimately, this structure protects consumers by providing for State authority over those matters that the State is regulating effectively while leaving enforcement of all other Section 224 provisions to the Commission's jurisdiction.

Section 224 requires States, if they choose to use the "reverse preemption" scheme of Section 224, inter alia, to issue and make effective rules over the rates, terms, and conditions of rights-of-way.²¹ In fulfilling its statutory obligations, the Commission must look behind a State certification of regulation under Section 224(c) (2) to determine whether the State has enacted rules to provide nondiscriminatory access which are "effective."²²

Before adoption of the 1996 Act, when Section 224 extended rights to cable operators but not to telecommunications carriers, the Commission indicated its unwillingness to look behind a State certification of regulation for substantive review.²³ However,

pursuant to Sections 253 (eliminating barriers to entry), 332(c) (7) (eliminating barriers to entry and other siting restrictions for personal wireless services), and 706 (the promotion of advanced telecommunications services).

²¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 224(c) (2) (A) and (3) (A).

²² See 47 U.S.C. § 224(c) (3) (A) (requiring state issuance of effective rules).

²³ See, e.g., Certification by the Maryland Public Service Commission Concerning Regulation of Cable Television Pole

the 1996 Act significantly changed the scope of Section 224. For example, the 1996 Act imposed the obligation on a utility to provide nondiscriminatory access to any right-of-way owned or controlled by it.²⁴ Moreover, where the benefits of Section 224 used to apply only to cable television systems, the 1996 Act extended the access benefits to non-ILEC telecommunications carriers in order to advance the Act's goal of promoting telecommunications competition for all services.²⁵ Finally, in the 1996 Act, Congress added new rate structures,²⁶ created notice requirements²⁷ and modification requirements,²⁸ and imposed additional State certification requirements.²⁹ As a result, regulators must implement a significant number of new federally-mandated requirements. The changed circumstances caused by the 1996 Act, as well as the Commission's generally expanded responsibilities to oversee the implementation of local

Attachments, File No. ENF 85-46, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, Mimeo No. 3621 at ¶ 5 (1986) ("While we believe that a regulatory scheme should be specific enough to put the parties on notice as to how a complaint will be handled, we will not look behind a certification unless we have evidence that a party is unable to file a complaint with the state Commission or the state Commission has failed to act on a complaint within the prescribed period").

²⁴ 47 U.S.C. § 224(f) (1).

²⁵ Id.; see also 47 U.S.C. § 224(a) (4).

²⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 224(d) (3) and (e).

²⁷ 47 U.S.C. § 224(h).

²⁸ 47 U.S.C. § 224(h) and (i).

²⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 224(c) (2) (B) (requiring States to consider the interests of subscribers of the services offered via the

exchange competition, plainly render certifications made prior to the 1996 Act incomplete and ineffective. These changes also warrant reconsideration of the Commission's policy of not looking behind State certifications.³⁰ In reviewing State certifications, whether they are "renewal" certifications or first-time certifications, the Commission should require that States' right-of-way regulations satisfy the Commission's baseline rules as a means of ensuring "effective" rules under Section 224(c)(3)(A). This oversight will protect consumers' abilities to access facilities-based alternatives regardless of the responsible regulating body.³¹

attachments, not just the subscribers of cable television services).

³⁰ See Bechtel v. F.C.C., 957 F.2d 873, 881 (D.C. Cir. 1992), cert. denied, Galaxy Communications v. F.C.C., 506 U.S. 816 (1992) ("[C]hanges in factual and legal circumstances may impose upon the agency an obligation to reconsider a settled policy . . ."); see also Geller v. F.C.C., 610 F.2d 973, 979 (D.C. Cir. 1979) (noting the Commission's duty to reexamine policies in light of changed circumstances).

³¹ On reconsideration of the Interconnection Order, the Commission has before it the issue of rooftop access for fixed wireless carriers pursuant to Section 224's provision of access to utilities' rights-of-way. See Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, WinStar Communications, Inc. Petition for Clarification or Reconsideration (filed Sep. 30, 1996) ("WinStar Petition"). The Commission's ongoing consideration of this issue, and the opportunity granted to parties for notice and comment, allows it to fashion appropriate rules in an expeditious manner, consistent with the clear meaning of Section 224.

B. The Commission Should Require Building Owners And Utilities To Permit Telecommunications Carrier Access to Telephone Inside Wire And Risers.

The Commission has noted the importance of access to inside wire in multi-tenant buildings for competitive carriers³² and has contemplated the competitive implications of restrictions on building access.³³ These observations should motivate the Commission to ensure that competitive carriers can obtain access to the risers within a building, as well as the telephone inside wire to the customers' premises, in order to provide competitive telecommunications service.³⁴ Otherwise, many businesses and individuals in multi-tenant buildings will not be full participants in the savings and innovation of a competitive telecommunications market.

³² See Interconnection Order at ¶ 392 ("When a competitor deploys its own loops, the competitor must be able to connect its loops to customers' inside wiring in order to provide competing service, especially in multi-tenant buildings"). The Commission sought to provide this access by requiring ILECs to offer access to their network interface devices on an unbundled basis. See id.

³³ See Telecommunications Services Inside Wiring, CS Docket No. 95-184, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 11 FCC Rcd 2747 at ¶ 61 (rel. Jan. 26, 1996) ("Inside Wire Notice") ("if one service provider has an unrestricted right of access to private property -- even over the objection of the property owner -- that service provider would be able to compete for individual subscribers in every multiple dwelling unit building, private housing development and office building, while the provider without such a right could only compete in those buildings in which it had managed to obtain the property owner's consent"). This rulemaking remains pending and offers the Commission an ideal forum for ensuring, in a timely and effective manner, that all telecommunications carriers enjoy the right of access to telephone inside wire and riser cables within office buildings. WinStar Communications recently filed comments in this rulemaking concerning the issue of building access. See Telecommunications Services Inside Wiring, CS Docket No. 95-

In its Interconnection Order, the Commission required ILECs to offer access to their NIDs on an unbundled basis but did not provide access to riser cables within a building.³⁵ Access to the ILEC's NID, an important element in providing telecommunications service to a multi-unit building, is obtained at ground level by carriers delivering service with copper or fiber. However, the CLECs delivering service with microwaves obtain NID access by using the building's riser cables between the rooftop, the CLEC IDU, and the ground-level ILEC NID

184, *Comments of WinStar Communications, Inc.* (filed Aug. 5, 1997).

³⁴ The mandatory provision of access to telephone inside wire and risers will not raise complicated takings issues because their use does not qualify as a physical invasion as described in Loretto. Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp., 458 U.S. 419 (1982). For purposes of a takings analysis, the difference between a physical invasion and mere use is a crucial distinction. See id. at n.12.

Nevertheless, to the extent that a building owner permits a utility to run its own risers and wires through a building, the Commission should mandate that the building owner treat competitive telecommunications carriers in a nondiscriminatory fashion. That is, if a utility is permitted to occupy riser space with its own facilities (rather than those of the building owner) or otherwise install its own equipment, the building owner should be required to permit such occupation and installation by competitive telecommunications carriers on a nondiscriminatory basis, as well.

³⁵ See Interconnection Order at ¶ 392 and n.853 (noting the importance of a competitor being "able to connect its loops to customers' inside wiring in order to provide competing service, especially in multi-tenant buildings" but nevertheless stating that "access to an incumbent LEC's NID does not entitle the competitor to the riser and lateral cables between the NID and individual units within the building, which may be owned or controlled . . . by the premises owner").

location. As part of its unbundling requirement, the Commission can and should ensure that competitive carriers have access not only to the ILEC's NID, but also to the riser cables of office buildings so that microwave CLECs can avail themselves of the NID access that wireline CLECs can utilize.

C. The Small Number of States Mandating Building Access Compels Commission Action.

A number of states have addressed the building access issue through legislation or, in one instance, through a Public Utility Commission order. For example, Section 16-2471 of the Connecticut General Statutes requires building owners to allow a telecommunications provider to install wire to provide service so long as: (1) a tenant requests services from the provider; (2) the costs are assumed by the telecommunications provider; (3) the provider indemnifies the building owner for any damages caused by the wiring; and, (4) the provider complies with State inside wire regulations.³⁶ The statute allows for reasonable compensation. A similar Texas statute prohibits property owners from interfering with or preventing a telecommunications utility from installing telecommunications service facilities on the owner's property at the request of a tenant.³⁷ Once again, the statute allows for reasonable compensation while prohibiting the building owner from demanding unreasonable payments.

³⁶ See Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 16-2471 (West 1997).

³⁷ See Tex. Rev. Civ. Stat. Ann. art. 1446c-0, § 3.2555 (West 1997).

Lacking a State statute to this effect, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio held in an order that

no person owning, leasing, controlling, or managing a multi-tenant building shall forbid or unreasonably restrict any occupant, tenant, lessee, or such building from receiving telecommunications services from any provider of its choice, which is duly certified by this Commission.³⁸

Teligent supports the efforts of these states to ensure tenant access to competitive telecommunications markets and encourages similar action by other states. But, the Commission must adopt rules that govern states that have not acted similarly.³⁹

In light of the fact that most states have not effectively addressed the building access issue to date, Section 253(a)

³⁸ Commission's Investigation into the Detariffing of the Installation and Maintenance of Simple and Complex Inside Wire, Case No. 86-927-TP-COI, Supplemental Finding and Order, 1994 Ohio PUC LEXIS 778 at *20-21 (Ohio PUC Sep. 29, 1994).

³⁹ The concept of mandatory building access has arisen in many states to benefit the ILEC. In the context of Shared Tenant Services, many State PUCs have required STS providers to allow ILEC access to tenants who prefer to take service from the ILEC over the STS provider (often the building owner). Florida offers a recent example. In April, the Florida Public Service Commission required all STS providers to allow LECs direct access to tenants who want local service from the LEC. Moreover, the Order provides for reasonable compensation for LEC use of the STS provider's or the building owner's cable. In the event that the STS provider and the building owner are not the same entity, the Order requires that the STS provider guarantee and obtain the permission of the building owner for the requisite LEC access. See Proposed Amendment of Rule 25-24.575, F.A.C., Shared Tenant Service Operations, and Proposed Adoption of Rule 25-24.840, F.A.C., Service Standards, Docket No. 961425-TP; Order No. PSC-97-0437-FOF-TP, 97 FPSC 325 (Fla. PSC Apr. 17, 1997). Conceptually, the same requirements could be made available to CLECs.

provides an additional source of Commission authority. If States, by not expressly forbidding access restrictions, protect the ability of building owners to restrict competitive carrier access, the Commission must assume responsibility. The Commission can address the restrictions directly through its Section 224 authority wherever utilities maintain rights-of-way. Alternatively, the Commission can recognize that a State's silence on this issue (and the building owners' concomitant legal authority under State laws to restrict access) operates as a barrier effectively prohibiting competition which mandates Commission action under Section 253(a).⁴⁰

In addition, Section 706 of the 1996 Act supports the Commission's requirement of building access.⁴¹ Section 706 requires the Commission to promote deployment of advanced telecommunications capability to all Americans in a timely fashion.⁴² Teligent already provides and intends to continue providing advanced telecommunications capability to consumers through its provision of high-speed data services and Internet

⁴⁰ It is significant that the preservation of State and local government authority in Section 253(c) is limited to public rights-of-way. See 47 U.S.C. § 253(c).

⁴¹ Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56, 153 at § 706 ("Section 706").

⁴² See Section 706(c)(1) ("The term 'advanced telecommunications capability' is defined, without regard to any transmission media or technology, as high-speed, switched, broadband telecommunications capability that enables users to originate and receive high-quality voice, data, graphics, and video telecommunications using any technology").

access. By enhancing the ability of carriers like Teligent to offer these advanced telecommunications services, federally-mandated building access regulation would promote the objectives of Section 706.

V. THE COMMISSION POSSESSES THE AUTHORITY TO GRANT TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER ACCESS TO BUILDINGS.

The Commission receives authority from many different sources to grant access to building rooftops, riser space, and telephone inside wire. As noted above, several sections of the Communications Act direct the Commission to take action consonant with the building access sought by Teligent. Moreover, judicial rulings, including the Eighth Circuit's recent opinion in Iowa Utilities Board v. F.C.C., confirm the Commission's authority over the States to mandate the requisite building access and the Commission's personal jurisdiction over building owners necessary to order building access.

A. The Eighth Circuit's Recent Decision Confirms The Commission's Significant Authority To Regulate Building Access.

While the Eighth Circuit's recent decision concerning the Commission's Interconnection Order would circumscribe the Commission's authority regarding some matters,⁴³ the decision confirms the Commission's authority and duty to act under Section 224. As discussed below, action by the Commission to implement Section 224 simply is not subject to a Section 2(b) analysis. Moreover, the Commission's interpretation, in light of its

⁴³ Iowa Utilities Board v. F.C.C., No. 96-3321 (8th Cir. July 18, 1997).

plenary authority, will be afforded Chevron deference by reviewing courts.⁴⁴

In Iowa Utilities Board, the court observed that because Congress amended Section 2(b) to grant exclusive jurisdiction to the Commission over the regulation of CMRS rates and entry, Commission action taken pursuant to Section 332 is not subject to the traditional Section 2(b) analysis.⁴⁵ The exemption led the court to retain Commission rules from the Interconnection Order, otherwise vacated, as they apply to CMRS providers,⁴⁶ confirming the Commission's plenary authority under Section 332 due to its express exemption from Section 2(b).

The same analysis would apply to the Commission's authority to regulate access to rights-of-way under Section 224. As with Section 332, Congress expressly exempted Section 224 from the reach of Section 2(b).⁴⁷ Therefore, the Commission retains exclusive authority to interpret and implement the terms of Section 224 without Section 2(b) limitations and subject only to a State's appropriate use of the reverse preemption provision contained in Section 224. To use the language of the Eighth Circuit, the Commission has no "2(b) fence" to overcome in its regulation under Section 224.

⁴⁴ See Chevron, U.S.A., v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 467 U.S. 837 (1984).

⁴⁵ See Iowa Utilities Board at n.21.

⁴⁶ See id. at n.39.

⁴⁷ See 47 U.S.C. § 152(b) ("Except as provided in sections 223 through 227, inclusive, and Section 332 . . .").

B. Case Law Sustains FCC Jurisdiction Over Access To Telephone Inside Wire and Riser Cables.

Inside wiring, like consumer premises equipment ("CPE"), plays a critical role in the transmission of interstate communications. As the Fourth Circuit noted with respect to CPE,

[u]sually it is not feasible, as a matter of economics and practicality of operation, to limit the use of such equipment to either interstate or intrastate transmissions.⁴⁸

The Commission has recognized that inside wiring shares this attribute of CPE.

[T]he provision of inside wiring cannot, as a permanent matter, be subject to separate federal and state requirements. . . . Since inside wiring is . . . jointly used for interstate and intrastate services, it 'is a practical and economic impossibility' for customers to have two inside wiring systems, one for interstate uses and another for intrastate uses.⁴⁹

The interstate communications function of inside wire and riser cables permits regulation by the Commission pursuant to its authority over interstate communications in Section 2(a). The judicial precedent supports this conclusion.

For example, in Louisiana PSC, the Supreme Court observed that "state regulation will generally be displaced to the extent that it stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment of the full

⁴⁸ North Carolina Utilities Comm. v. F.C.C., 537 F.2d 787, 791 (4th Cir. 1976), cert. denied, 429 U.S. 1027 (1976).

⁴⁹ Detariffing the Installation and Maintenance of Inside Wiring, CC Docket No. 79-105, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 1 FCC Rcd 1190 at ¶ 18 (1986), quoting North Carolina Utilities Comm. v. F.C.C., 552 F.2d 1036, 1043 (4th Cir. 1977), cert. denied, 434 U.S. 874 (1977).

purposes and objectives of Congress."⁵⁰ The objectives of Congress are clear. Since its inception, the Communications Act has described the central purpose of the Commission as the regulation of wire communication

"so as to make available . . . to all the people of the United States . . . a rapid, efficient, Nation-wide . . . wire . . . communication service."⁵¹

The philosophy of promoting nationwide telecommunications was expanded and reemphasized in the 1996 Telecommunications Act.⁵²

Using its interstate authority, but exercising only indirect jurisdiction, if it chooses, the Commission can require access to inside wire. In some instances in which the Commission's personal jurisdiction over particular entities was challenged, the Commission has nonetheless been able to foster important pro-competitive goals indirectly by imposing relevant requirements on entities over which it clearly has jurisdiction. For example, through this exercise, the Commission has controlled the telephone rates of hotel owners by placing requirements upon carriers,⁵³ and has accomplished effective regulation of

⁵⁰ Louisiana Public Service Comm. v. F.C.C., 476 U.S. 355, 374 (1986).

⁵¹ 47 U.S.C. § 151 (emphasis added). The policy applies to individuals living and working in multi-unit buildings.

⁵² See S. Rep. No. 230, 104th Cong., 2nd Sess. at 1 (Conference Report accompanying the Telecommunications Act of 1996 noting purpose of Act being "to provide for a pro-competitive, de-regulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans").

⁵³ Ambassador, Inc. v. United States, 325 U.S. 317 (1945).

broadcast network activities through its regulation of individual broadcast licensees.⁵⁴ Likewise, the Commission's jurisdiction over building owners could be exercised indirectly by prohibiting ILEC interconnection with inside wire facilities not available on a nondiscriminatory basis to competitive carriers.

The Commission also may regulate access to inside wire pursuant to its direct jurisdiction. The Commission's authority to regulate cable television offers a close analogy. Although cable television facilities were almost entirely intrastate and were operated by individuals not previously regulated by the Commission, they carried interstate (in this case, broadcast) signals over which the Commission retained clear authority.⁵⁵ Before the words "cable television" appeared in the Communications Act, a line of cases developed the Commission's authority to regulate extensively cable television systems ancillary to its jurisdiction over broadcasting. These cases explain that cable television systems fall literally within Section 2(a)'s grant to the Commission of jurisdiction over interstate wire communication. Moreover, they note that the purpose of the Commission's cable television regulation is fairly derived from the substantive goals of the Act as they relate to broadcast television.

⁵⁴ CBS v. F.C.C., 453 U.S. 367 (1981); see also Mt. Mansfield Television v. F.C.C., 442 F.2d 470 (2nd Cir. 1971).

⁵⁵ Capital Cities Cable v. Crisp, 467 U.S. 691 (1984); United States v. Midwest Video Corp., 406 U.S. 649 (1972); United States v. Southwestern Cable, 392 U.S. 157 (1968).

The Commission's authority to regulate non-carrier-owned inside wire becomes apparent when viewed through such an analysis. Like cable television, non-carrier-owned inside wiring facilities are almost all confined within one state's boundaries and are owned by entities not licensed by the Commission. Nevertheless, inside wiring facilities transmit interstate communications signals, thereby coming within the literal terms of the Commission's authority. Moreover, like cable television regulation, the Commission's direct authority to regulate non-carrier-owned inside wiring is derived as reasonably ancillary to the effective performance of its responsibilities in the regulation of common carriers under Title II.⁵⁶

Finally, concurrent state and federal building access regulation may be incompatible: federal access guarantees would be negated by state laws permitting building owners to restrict access (or by the absence of affirmative obligations to provide access). Where, as with the case of control over inside wire, the subject matter of the regulation cannot be separated into interstate and intrastate components, federal preemption is warranted in those instances where State regulation would negate federal regulation.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ If the Commission would find it helpful, Teligent would be pleased to provide a more expansive analysis of the Commission's jurisdictional authority for these purposes.

⁵⁷ See Louisiana Public Service Comm. v. F.C.C., 476 U.S. at n.4.

The decisions of the Appeals Courts are consistent with this position.⁵⁸ Considering installation and maintenance of inside wiring, the D.C. Circuit noted that the Commission "may preempt inconsistent state regulation so long as it can show that the state regulation negates a valid federal policy."⁵⁹ The Ninth Circuit applied a similar rationale to affirm the Commission's preemption of State regulation of enhanced services by common carriers inconsistent with or more stringent than the Commission's non-structural safeguards.⁶⁰ The jurisprudence thus provides ample support for the Commission's authority to regulate building access for telecommunications carriers.

VI. THE COMMISSION SHOULD ENSURE THAT GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT DOES NOT CREATE BARRIERS TO ENTRY.

In some instances, governments are erecting barriers that impede competition, raise costs, and deprive consumers of the full benefits of competition. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 is designed to facilitate competition in the provision of telecommunications services and, by its terms, intends that

⁵⁸ See, e.g., North Carolina Utilities Commission, 537 F.2d at 795-796 ("the Communications 'Act must be construed in light of the needs for comprehensive regulation and the practical difficulties inhering in state by state regulation of parts of an organic whole"), quoting General Telephone Co. of California v. F.C.C., 413 F.2d 390, 398 (1969), cert. denied, 396 U.S. 888 (1969).

⁵⁹ National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners v. F.C.C., 880 F.2d 422, 431 (D.C. Cir. 1989).

⁶⁰ See People of the State of California v. F.C.C., 39 F.3d 919, 933 (9th Cir. 1994), cert. denied, 115 S.Ct. 1427 (1995).

governments foster -- not obstruct -- that goal.⁶¹ Yet, across the country, some governmental units are using their legitimate statutory authority to manage public rights-of-ways as a guise for generating revenue or regulating entry. Teligent understands that even carriers that do not use public rights-of-way, such as resellers or fixed wireless carriers, may be assessed right-of-way fees or be subjected to right-of-way franchise requirements. The authority to manage public rights-of-way should not be used to assess fees on companies that do not use the public rights-of-way.

AT&T recently filed a complaint against the City of Austin, Texas for practices by the City which, AT&T alleges, violate, inter alia, the 1996 Telecommunications Act.⁶² The complaint states that Austin's public right-of-way regulation requires the production of extensive information unrelated to the use of public rights-of-way before a carrier can obtain the requisite "municipal consent." AT&T alleges that Austin's regulation constitutes a barrier to entry that exceeds its legitimate authority to regulate its public rights-of-way.⁶³ Moreover, AT&T states that Austin requires a competitive carrier using UNEs to pay franchise fees.⁶⁴ UNE-based carriers rely upon the network

⁶¹ See, e.g., 47 U.S.C. § 253(a).

⁶² See AT&T Communications of the Southwest v. City of Austin, A-97CA-532SS, *Complaint for Injunctive Relief and Declaratory Judgment* (U.S.D.C. Tex. Western Dist., Austin Div. July 15, 1997).

⁶³ See id. at 11.

⁶⁴ See id. at 12.

facilities of the ILEC and, hence, pay a portion of the ILEC's franchise fees through charges for UNEs. The assessment of additional franchise fees by the city on UNE-based carriers constitutes a double payment that, according to AT&T, is anticompetitive and discriminatory.⁶⁵

AT&T's complaint offers just one instance of a competitor facing government-imposed barriers. The litigation of these disputes on a city-by-city or state-by-state basis would result in a tragic waste of resources otherwise available for network construction and rate discounts. Moreover, the sums of money necessary to accomplish this task may be unavailable to smaller carriers. The Commission has a statutory obligation to prevent the erection of barriers by governments⁶⁶ and should use this authority when the bounds of legitimate right-of-way management are exceeded.

⁶⁵ See id.

⁶⁶ See 47 U.S.C. § 253(a).

VII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Teligent urges the Commission to ensure that the benefits of telecommunication competition will be available to tenants in multi-unit buildings by adopting the recommendations proposed herein to provide the requisite building access for competitive carriers.


Respectfully submitted,

TELIGENT, L.L.C.

Laurence E. Harris
David Turetsky

TELIGENT, L.L.C.
11 Canal Center Plaza
Suite 300
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 299-4400

By:


Philip L. Verveer
Gunnar D. Halley

WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 328-8000

ITS ATTORNEYS

Dated: August 11, 1997


ATTACHMENT A

TO THE

**COMMENTS OF
TELIGENT, L.L.C.**

CCBPOL 97-9

AUGUST 11, 1997



AS-BUILTS	REVIEWED	ISSUED	NO.	REVISIONS	DATE
MJD	RC	7/31/97		DESCRIPTION	
DRAWING #					
TEL - FD					
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"					
NETLOG LTD. CONFIDENTIAL					

TELIGENT
ACCESS SITE

NET100

14120H Sullyfield Circle
Chantilly, Virginia 22021
(703) 818-8606

ATTACHMENT B

TO THE

**COMMENTS OF
TELIGENT, L.L.C.**

CCBPol 97-9

AUGUST 11, 1997



**Guidelines for Property Owners, Developers
and Managers for the Provision of Facilities
within Property Developments for Access
to Public Telecommunications and
Broadcasting Services**

Table of index

TA Statement: Building Access Guidelines

Guidelines for Property Owners, Developers and Managers for the Provision of Facilities within Property Developments for Access to Public Telecommunications and Broadcasting Services

- **For Whom are these Guidelines Prepared?**
- **Purpose of these Guidelines**
- **The Value of the Property is Enhanced**
- **Delays, Disruptions and Inconvenience of Having to Add Access Facilities After Completion of Construction are Avoided**
- **Hong Kong is Moving to a Multi-Network Operator Environment for Public Telecommunications and Broadcasting Services**
- **Government Promotes Effective Competition Among the Network Operators to Bring About Benefits to Consumers**
- **Consumers Should Have the Right of Unimpeded Access to Public Telecommunications and Broadcasting Services of Their Choice**
- **Developers Should Provide Access Facilities for Public Telecommunications and Broadcasting Services**
- **Cabling facilities**
- **Cables and Ancillary Equipment**
- **Network Operators have Statutory Right of Access to Install Their Networks within Property Developments to Serve Their Customers**
- **Access Facilities Should be Shared Among Network Operators**
- **There should be No Exclusive Deals or Restrictive Agreements**
- **There Should be no Discriminatory Treatment**
- **There Should be no Access Charge for Cabling Facilities**
- **Access Should be Granted for Rollout of Networks**
- **Cables and Ancillary Equipment Operated by Developers should be Interconnected with Public Networks on a Non-Discriminatory Basis**
- **Planning Adequate Access Facilities**
- **Coordination for New Buildings**
- **Coordination for Existing Buildings**
- **Enquiries and Contacts**

Annex 1

Annex 2

Annex 3

First Issue: May 19

**Guidelines for
Property Owners, Developers and Managers
for the Provision of Facilities
within Property Developments
for Access to
Public Telecommunications and Broadcasting Services**

For Whom are these Guidelines Prepared?

1. These guidelines (which may be referred to as the "Building Access Guidelines") are issued by the Telecommunications Authority (TA) and are intended for property owners, developers and managers (referred to as the "developers" in the rest of these guidelines) in the public and the private sectors, including developers who are statutory or public corporations like the Housing Authority, Mass Transit Railway Corporation, Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation and the Provisional Airport Authority.

Purpose of these Guidelines

2. These guidelines are to assist developers in the planning and provision of facilities ("access facilities") within their property developments to a standard which the developers consider desirable for their future customers' need. Although the standard of the facilities to be provided is the decision of the developers, there is a public policy that a minimum standard should be met which enables the occupiers to have unimpeded access to public telecommunications and broadcasting services provided in Hong Kong.

Benefits to Developers and Consumers of Providing Adequate Access Facilities for Public Telecommunications and Broadcasting Services

The Value of the Property is Enhanced

3. If adequate access facilities were not provided, the occupiers of the property might not be able to have unimpeded access to the full range of public telecommunications and broadcasting services and this would degrade the value and attractiveness of the property to potential purchasers and occupiers.

Delays, Disruptions and Inconvenience of Having to Add Access Facilities After Completion of Construction are Avoided

4. Generally it is a less satisfactory arrangement for the access facilities to be provided after the completion of the construction of the property as delays, disruptions and inconvenience (such as disturbance of building finishes, opening up of private roads within the property development) may be involved. In some cases, it may even be physically impossible to add the access facilities (such as

be involved. In some cases, it may even be physically impossible to add the access facilities (such as equipment accommodation) which have not been incorporated into the original design. The future occupiers would then suffer permanent constraints in their access to public telecommunications and broadcasting services. It is therefore recommended that adequate access facilities be planned and provided during the construction stage of new property developments.

Hong Kong is Moving to a Multi-Network Operator Environment for Public Telecommunications and Broadcasting Services

5. The Government has announced its policy of introducing competition in the provision of local public fixed telecommunication network services. The exclusive franchise for the local public telephone services by wire granted to Hong Kong Telephone Company Limited (HKTC) under the Telephone Ordinance will expire on 30 June 1995. As from 1 July 1995, HKTC will continue to provide public telephone services in Hong Kong on a competitive basis. The Government will license three more operators to operate local fixed telecommunication networks in competition with HKTC. These new operators are named below:
 - o Hutchison Communications Limited (HCL)
 - o New T & T Hong Kong Limited (NT&T)
 - o New World Telephone Limited (NWT)

The three new operators and HKTC will each be granted a "fixed telecommunication network services (FTNS) licence" under the Telecommunication Ordinance.

6. In addition to the FTNS operators, the Government has already granted a licence to Wharf Cable Limited (WCL) for the operation of subscription television broadcasting services under the Television Ordinance. WCL is given an exclusive right to operate subscription television broadcasting services in Hong Kong until 31 May 1996. Whether additional operators for such services will be licensed after 31 May 1996 will be reviewed by Government.
7. HKTC, HCL, NT&T, NWT and WCL (referred to as the "network operators" in these guidelines) have all been given the "utility" status by the Government. This means that they have the right to install their networks in public streets, unleased land and leased land subject to the necessary approval under the law.

Government Promotes Effective Competition Among the Network Operators to Bring About Benefits to Consumers

8. Effective competition among the four FTNS operators will bring about benefits to the users of telecommunications services. The Government is therefore committed to a policy of ensuring fair competition among the four FTNS operators. Through legislation and licence conditions, the Government will ensure that the four FTNS operators will be treated on a non-discriminatory basis in the access to their customers in property developments.
9. The same policy of fair competition and non-discriminatory access is expected to apply to subscription television broadcasting services if such services are open to competition after 31 May 1996.