

Media Contact:

Cecilia Sulhoff, (202) 418-0587 cecilia.sulhoff@fcc.gov

For Immediate Release

FCC STREAMLINES REVIEW PROCESS FOR REPLACEMENT UTILITY POLES TO FACILITATE BUILD OUT OF NEXT GENERATION WIRELESS INFRASTRUCTURE

WASHINGTON, November 16, 2017—The FCC today acted to remove barriers to wireless infrastructure deployment by determining that replacement utility poles that have no potential effect on historic properties do not need to complete historic preservation review.

Specifically, the Order eliminates historic preservation review when a pole is replaced with a substantially identical pole. Some of the conditions the replacement pole must meet include that the original pole is not a historic property, that it does not cause new ground disturbance, and that it is consistent with various other size, location, and appearance restrictions detailed in the rule.

The Order also consolidates the Commission's historic preservation review rules and procedures, currently in a variety of rules and orders, into a single rule, making it simpler to find, understand, and comply with the rules.

New infrastructure deployment will be critical to support the small cell technologies needed for the rollout of next generation services. The Commission's decision today will advance the public interest by providing significant efficiencies in the deployment of replacement poles, so that new equipment can be deployed without the delay of unnecessary procedures while still protecting against adverse effects on historic properties.

Action by the Commission November 16, 2017 by Report and Order (FCC 17-153). Chairman Pai, Commissioners Clyburn, O'Rielly, Carr and Rosenworcel approving. Chairman Pai, Commissioners Clyburn, O'Rielly and Carr issuing separate statements.

WT Docket No. 17-79

###

Office of Media Relations: (202) 418-0500 TTY: (888) 835-5322 Twitter: @FCC www.fcc.gov/office-media-relations

This is an unofficial announcement of Commission action. Release of the full text of a Commission order constitutes official action. See MCI v. FCC. 515 F 2d 385 (D.C. Circ 1974)