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By the Acting Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau:

# INTRODUCTION

1. On September 2, 2020, the Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians (Paskenta Band or “the Tribe”) submitted a request for waiver in connection with an application it filed in the 2.5 GHz Rural Tribal Priority Window (Tribal Window).[[1]](#footnote-3) Paskenta Band seeks a waiver of section 27.1204(b)(2) of the Commission’s rules,[[2]](#footnote-4) which defines eligible Tribal lands for purposes of the Tribal Window. In this *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, we grant the Paskenta Band’s Waiver Request because it meets the Commission’s waiver standard.[[3]](#footnote-5)

# BACKGROUND

1. In July 2019, the Commission approved an order modernizing the portion of the 2.5 GHz band formerly known as the Educational Broadband Service.[[4]](#footnote-6) Among other things, the order created a Rural Tribal Priority Window during which eligible Tribal entities could apply for licenses for currently unassigned 2.5 GHz spectrum. To obtain a license in the Rural Tribal Priority Window, an applicant must meet four requirements. First, the applicant must be an eligible entity, which the rule defines as a “federally recognized American Indian Tribe or Alaska Native Village; or an entity that is owned and controlled by a federally-recognized Tribe or a consortium of federally-recognized Tribes.”[[5]](#footnote-7) Second, the applicant must apply for eligible Tribal lands, as defined in section 27.1204(b)(2) of the Commission’s rules.[[6]](#footnote-8) Third, the eligible Tribal lands must be in a rural area, which is defined as “lands that are not part of an urbanized area or urban cluster area with a population equal to or greater than 50,000.”[[7]](#footnote-9) Finally, the applicant must have a local presence on the eligible Tribal lands for which it is applying.[[8]](#footnote-10)
2. Recently, the Commission denied a petition for reconsideration seeking adoption of the broader definition of Tribal lands contained in part 73 of our rules, which includes off-reservation trust lands, in the Tribal Window.[[9]](#footnote-11) Specifically, “[t]he Commission required the direct participation of Tribal governments, or entities owned and controlled by such Tribes, in the 2.5 GHz context to ensure that licensees would have the requisite authority over the deployment of facilities and service on their rural Tribal lands.”[[10]](#footnote-12) The Commission recognized, however, that there might be “exceptions to the general rule” where case-by-case waivers would be appropriate to allow for the licensing of off-reservation lands in the Tribal Window.[[11]](#footnote-13)
3. The Paskenta Band is a federally recognized Tribe with a reservation, known as a rancheria, located in Northern California.[[12]](#footnote-14) The Paskenta Band filed two applications within the Tribal Window. The first application, which sought a license for the Tribe’s reservation lands, has been granted.[[13]](#footnote-15) The second application, which is the subject of this *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, requests a waiver of the Tribal lands definition to license 58.61 acres previously owned in fee by the Tribe and placed into trust in October 2018.[[14]](#footnote-16) The trust lands are located directly across from the reservation, separated only by a highway.[[15]](#footnote-17)
4. As detailed in its application, the Paskenta Band is constructing a Tribal Complex on the trust land that will include a community center and tribal administrative offices.[[16]](#footnote-18) The Tribal Complex will serve as the central and most important space for the Tribe, equipped with spaces for educational classes, business meetings, and other various Tribal activities.[[17]](#footnote-19) The Tribe believes the ability to provide mobile and wireless Internet service over the Tribal Complex is important, as it will become the “administrative and government nerve center” of the Tribe.[[18]](#footnote-20)
5. The Paskenta Band’s application was accepted for filing on November 10, 2020.[[19]](#footnote-21) No petitions to deny or oppositions were filed against the application.

# DISCUSSION

1. A request for a waiver may be granted if it is shown that: (i) the underlying purpose of the rule(s) would not be served or would be frustrated by application to the instant case, and that a grant of the requested waiver would be in the public interest; or (ii) in view of unique or unusual factual circumstances of the instant case, application of the rule(s) would be inequitable, unduly burdensome or contrary to the public interest, or the applicant has no reasonable alternative.[[20]](#footnote-22) Here, we find that the Paskenta Band’s showing meets the first prong of the Commission’s waiver standard. Accordingly, we grant a waiver of section 27.1204(b)(2) of the Commission’s rules to allow licensing of the non-reservation trust lands specified in the application.
2. The Commission established a Tribal Priority Window to address the acute problem of lack of access to wireless communications services in rural Tribal areas.[[21]](#footnote-23) In this instance, we find that strictly applying the Tribal lands definition would be inconsistent with the Tribal Window’s purpose of providing wireless communications services in rural Tribal areas. First, we find that the Paskenta Band have shown that the trust lands in question are held for the specific benefit of the Tribe, and the Tribe’s authority over the lands is adequately demonstrated by the fact that the Tribe is currently constructing a Tribal Complex on the trust lands. We find, based upon the showing made by Paskenta Band, that treating these rural lands as eligible Tribal land under the Tribal Window would be consistent with the Tribal Window’s purpose.[[22]](#footnote-24) We note that the lands in question are areas subject to the Tribe’s current, demonstrated authority and are contiguous to the reservation lands for which we already have issued a license. Granting a waiver under these particular facts and circumstances would facilitate service on the Tribe’s reservation by creating a larger contiguous service area covering both the reservation and adjoining trust lands. In addition, we find that a waiver would be in the public interest because the Paskenta Band have plans to use the spectrum to provide mobile and wireless Internet service on rural lands specifically held in trust for the Tribe’s benefit. As such, we find the Tribe has adequately demonstrated that it has “the requisite authority over the deployment of facilities and service[s]”[[23]](#footnote-25) over the lands at issue, and they have therefore demonstrated that strictly applying the Tribal lands definition would be inconsistent with its purpose.
3. We note that the Paskenta Band must ensure that any system it deploys complies with our technical rules. In particular, our rules for the 2.5 GHz band limit the field strength that can be radiated at the border of a licensee’s service area.[[24]](#footnote-26) Also, a licensee’s entitlement to interference protection is dependent on its compliance with the height benchmark, which is dependent on the height of the antenna and the distance to another licensee’s geographic service area.[[25]](#footnote-27) Absent agreements with neighboring licensees or a waiver of those rules, the Paskenta Band must comply with those rules.
4. We note that our decision here is limited to the suitability of these specific trust lands found as eligible Tribal lands under the Tribal Window. We make no determination as to the status of these trust lands with respect to other Commission rules or programs, nor for any other purpose.

# ORDERING CLAUSES

1. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to sections 4(i), 303(c), and 309(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 303(c), 309(a), and section 1.925(b)(3) of the Commission’s Rules, 47 CFR § 1.925(b)(3), that the waiver request filed by the Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians on September 2, 2020 IS GRANTED, and section 27.1204(b)(2) of the Commission’s rules IS WAIVED to allow licensing of the land specified in the application.
2. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to sections 4(i) and 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 309, and section 27.1204 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR § 27.1204, that the licensing staff of the Broadband Division SHALL PROCESS the application filed by the Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians for a new 2.5 GHz license (File No. 0009210332) in accordance with this *Memorandum Opinion and Order* and the Commission’s rules and policies.
3. This action is taken under delegated authority pursuant to sections 0.131 and 0.331 of the Commission’s Rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.131, 0.331.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Joel Taubenblatt

Acting Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
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