

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

SEP 23 2 18 PM '99

September 9, 1999

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

ORIGINAL

Say
OFF



OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
(320) 255-7204

RECEIVED

SEP 28 1999

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Chairman William Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Ex Parte Filing in Cases WT 99-217; CC96-98

Dear Chairman Kennard:

Please do not adopt the rule proposed in these cases allowing any phone company to serve any tenant of a building and to place their antenna on the building roof.

In some states 70 or more new phone companies have been certificated to provide service. Add in the wireless phone companies and under your rule you may have 100 companies allowed to place their wires in a building, and their antennas on the roof - all without the landlord's permission.

The FCC lacks the authority to do this. It would violate basic property rights - a landlord, city or condominium has the right to control who comes on their property. Congress did not give the FCC the authority to condemn space for 100 phone companies in every building in the country.

The FCC cannot preempt state and local building codes, zoning ordinances, environmental legislation and other laws affecting antennas on roofs. Zoning and building codes are purely matters of state and local jurisdiction which under Federalism and the Tenth Amendment you may not preempt.

For example, building codes are imposed in part for engineering related safety reasons. These vary by region, weather patterns and building type - such as the likelihood of earthquakes, hurricanes and maximum amount of snow and ice. If antennas are too heavy or too high, roofs collapse. If they are not properly secured, they will blow over and damage the building, its inhabitants or passers-by.

Similarly, zoning laws are matters of local concern which protect and promote the public health, safety and welfare, ensure compatibility of uses, preserve property values and the character of our communities. We may restrict the numbers, types, locations, size and aesthetics of antennas on buildings (such as requiring them to be properly screened) to achieve these legitimate goals, yet see that needed

400 2nd Street South • St. Cloud, MN 56301-3699
FAX: (320) 255-7205
<http://ci.stcloud.mn.us>

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

041

services are provided. This requires us to balance competing concerns – which we do every day, with success. Everyone wants garbage picked up, no one wants a transfer station. Everyone wants electricity, no one wants a substation near their home.

The application of zoning principles is highly dependent on local conditions. These vary greatly state by state, from municipality to municipality and within municipalities. We have successfully applied these principles and balanced competing concerns for eighty years. Zoning has not unnecessarily impeded technology or the development of our economy, nor will it here. There is simply no basis to conclude that for a brand-new technology (wireless fixed telephones) with a minuscule track record that there are problems on such a massive scale with the 38,000 units of local government in the U.S. as to warrant Federal action.

I am equally concerned with the proposals regarding municipal rights of way, local management of them is essential to protect the public health, safety and welfare. Congress has specifically prohibited you from acting in this area. The City of St. Cloud is a prime example of why local control is essential. This City has experienced one major gas line explosion and a multitude of gas line strikes by those excavating in our rights of way. Our community has suffered significant property damage and loss of life. I know of no method by which you could manage these rights of way at the federal level. It is a bad idea.

We believe the telephone providers' complaints about rights-of-way management and fees are overblown, as shown by the small number of court cases on this – only about a dozen nationwide in the three years since the 1996 Act. With 38,000 municipalities nationwide and thousands of phone companies, this number of cases shows that the system is working, not that it is broken.

Finally, we are surprised that you suggest that the combined Federal, state and local tax burden on new phone companies is too high. The FCC has no authority to affect state or local taxes any more than it can affect Federal taxes.

For these reasons, please reject the proposed rule and take no action on rights of way and taxes.

Very truly yours,



Jan F. Petersen
City Attorney

JFP:jj