October 16, 2014

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Acceleration of Broadband Deployment by Improving Wireless Facilities Siting Policies, WT Docket No. 13-238

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I am a practicing municipal planner with 25 years of experience and I am familiar with local, California, and federal regulations related to the siting of wireless telecommunication facilities. I am the guy on the other side of the counter when the wireless industry seeks permits at City Hall. I am the guy that attempts to balance the desires of the industry and a local community's desire to promote an appropriate aesthetic. I am the guy that wrote the local ordinance (with legal assistance) that my City Council adopted.

I am writing this letter as a concerned citizen and not in any capacity related to my employment. I recognize that this comment reaches the FCC late in the process, but we all have more important things going on in our lives. With that said, your proceedings in the referenced matter will have wide ranging effects.

The devil is in the details as you know and the definition a "base station" remains unclear in my mind and is in desperate need of clarification.

(1) Base Station. A station at a specified site that enables wireless communication between user equipment and a communications network, including any associated equipment such as, but not limited to, radio transceivers, antennas, coaxial or fiber-optic cable, and regular and backup power supply. It includes a structure that currently supports or houses an antenna, transceiver, or other associated equipment that constitutes part of a base station. It may encompass such equipment in any technological configuration, including distributed antenna systems and small cells.

Does this highlighted portion of the proposed definition include buildings? Regardless of the answer to this simple question, please add a clause to include them or exclude them.

If buildings are included, adding up to 20 feet to the height of a building based upon the proposed rule to clarify what constitutes a "substantial change" to an existing facility will have a devastating effect on public and private views and will degrade building architecture across the county when unwitting property owners agree to whatever inexpensive "solution" the industry proposes when modifying an existing facility. Please understand the ramifications of this devilish detail.

Thank you for considering my very late comment.

Jim Campbell