

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

SPRINT CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

CITY OF BOWIE, Maryland; CITY OF EUGENE, Oregon;
CITY OF HUNTSVILLE, Alabama; CITY OF WESTMINSTER,
Maryland; COUNTY OF MARIN, California; CITY OF
ARCADIA, California; CULVER CITY, California; CITY OF
BELLEVUE, California; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington;
CITY OF BURLINGAME, Washington; CITY OF GIG
HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington;
CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS,
Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF
MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California;
CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND,
Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN
JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF
YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California;
TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California; CITY OF NEW YORK,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

No. 19-70123

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,

Petitioner,

CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE,
California; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF

No. 19-70124

BURLINGAME, Washington; CITY OF GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CULVER CITY, California; CITY OF NEW YORK; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

PUERTO RICO TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC.,

Petitioner,

CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE, California; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF BURLINGAME, Washington; CITY OF GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California;

No. 19-70125

CULVER CITY, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California;
CITY OF NEW YORK,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

CITY OF SEATTLE, Washington; CITY OF TACOMA,
Washington; KING COUNTY, Washington; LEAGUE OF
OREGON CITIES; LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES;
LEAGUE OF ARIZONA CITIES AND TOWNS,

Petitioners,

CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, California; CITY OF COCONUT
CREEK, Florida; CITY OF LACEY, Washington; CITY OF
OLYMPIA, Washington; CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES,
California; CITY OF TUMWATER, Washington;
COLORADO COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITY ALLIANCE;
RAINIER COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; COUNTY OF
THURSTON, Washington; CITY OF ARCADIA, California;
CITY OF BELLEVUE, Washington; CITY OF BURIEN,
Washington; CITY OF BURLINGAME, California; CITY OF
GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH,
Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF
LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California;
CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO,
California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF
PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California;
CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER,
California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS

No. 19-70136

ANGELES, California; CULVER CITY, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California; CITY OF NEW YORK,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE, Washington; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF BURLINGAME, California; CULVER CITY, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California; CITY OF GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona,

Petitioners,

CTIA—THE WIRELESS ASSOCIATION; COMPETITIVE CARRIERS ASSOCIATION; SPRINT CORPORATION; VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.; CITY OF NEW YORK; WIRELESS INFRASTRUCTURE ASSOCIATION,

Intervenors,

v.

No. 19-70144

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

No. 19-70145

CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH,

Petitioner,

CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE,
Washington; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF
BURLINGAME, California; CITY OF GIG HARBOR,
Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF
KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada;
CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY,
California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF
PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon;
CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN JOSE,
California; CITY OF SHAFER, California; CITY OF
YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California;
CULVER CITY, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California;
CITY OF NEW YORK,

Intervenors,

v.

No. 19-70146

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, Maryland,

Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

No. 19-70147

CITY OF NORTH LITTLE ROCK, Arkansas, and
MISSOURI ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPAL UTILITIES,

Petitioners,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

No. 19-70148

AT&T SERVICES, INC.,

Petitioner,

CITY OF BALTIMORE, Maryland; CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO, California; MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL
LEAGUE; CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, New Mexico;
NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES; CITY OF BAKERSFIELD,
California; TOWN OF OCEAN CITY, Maryland; CITY OF
BROOKHAVEN, Georgia; CITY OF COCONUT CREEK,

No. 19-70326

Florida; CITY OF DUBUQUE, Iowa; CITY OF EMERYVILLE, California; CITY OF FRESNO, California; CITY OF LA VISTA, Nebraska; CITY OF LACEY, Washington; CITY OF MEDINA, Washington; CITY OF OLYMPIA, Washington; CITY OF PAPILLION, Nebraska; CITY OF PLANO, Texas; CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES, California; CITY OF ROCKVILLE, Maryland; CITY OF SAN BRUNO, California; CITY OF SANTA MONICA, California; CITY OF SUGARLAND, Texas; CITY OF TUMWATER, Washington; CITY OF WESTMINSTER, Maryland; COLORADO COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITY ALLIANCE; CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, California; COUNTY OF MARIN, California; INTERNATIONAL CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION; INTERNATIONAL MUNICIPAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION; LEAGUE OF NEBRASKA MUNICIPALITIES; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS; RAINIER COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; THURSTON COUNTY, Washington; TOWN OF CORTE MADERA, California; TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH, California; TOWN OF YARROW POINT, Washington; CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE, Washington; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF BURLINGAME, California; CITY OF CULVER CITY, California; CITY OF GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,

Petitioner,

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, New Mexico; NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES; CITY OF BROOKHAVEN, Georgia; CITY OF BALTIMORE, Maryland; CITY OF DUBUQUE, Iowa; TOWN OF OCEAN CITY, Maryland; CITY OF EMERYVILLE, California; MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE; TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH, California; CITY OF LA VISTA, Nebraska; CITY OF MEDINA, Washington; CITY OF PAPILLION, Nebraska; CITY OF PLANO, Texas; CITY OF ROCKVILLE, Maryland; CITY OF SAN BRUNO, California; CITY OF SANTA MONICA, California; CITY OF SUGARLAND, Texas; LEAGUE OF NEBRASKA MUNICIPALITIES; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS; CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, California; CITY OF FRESNO, California; CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES, California; CITY OF COCONUT CREEK, Florida; CITY OF LACEY, Washington; CITY OF OLYMPIA, Washington; CITY OF TUMWATER, Washington; TOWN OF YARROW POINT, Washington; THURSTON COUNTY, Washington; COLORADO COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITY ALLIANCE; RAINIER COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, California; COUNTY OF MARIN, California; CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, California;

No. 19-70339

TOWN OF CORTE MADERA, California; CITY OF WESTMINSTER, Maryland,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

CITY OF AUSTIN, Texas; CITY OF ANN ARBOR, Michigan; COUNTY OF ANNE ARUNDEL, Maryland; CITY OF ATLANTA, Georgia; CITY OF BOSTON, Massachusetts; CITY OF CHICAGO, Illinois; CLARK COUNTY, Nevada; CITY OF COLLEGE PARK, Maryland; CITY OF DALLAS, Texas; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; CITY OF GAITHERSBURG, Maryland; HOWARD COUNTY, Maryland; CITY OF LINCOLN, Nebraska; MONTGOMERY COUNTY, Maryland; CITY OF MYRTLE BEACH, South Carolina; CITY OF OMAHA, Nebraska; CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, Pennsylvania; CITY OF RYE, New York; CITY OF SCARSDALE, New York; CITY OF SEAT PLEASANT, Maryland; CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, Maryland; TEXAS COALITION OF CITIES FOR UTILITY ISSUES; MERIDIAN TOWNSHIP, Michigan; BLOOMFIELD TOWNSHIP, Michigan; MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION; MICHIGAN COALITION TO PROTECT PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY,

Petitioners,

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, New Mexico; NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES; CITY OF BROOKHAVEN, Georgia; CITY OF BALTIMORE, Maryland; CITY OF DUBUQUE, Iowa; TOWN OF OCEAN CITY, Maryland; CITY OF

No. 19-70341

EMERYVILLE, California; MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE; TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH, California; CITY OF LA VISTA, Nebraska; CITY OF MEDINA, Washington; CITY OF PAPILLION, Nebraska; CITY OF PLANO, Texas; CITY OF ROCKVILLE, Maryland; CITY OF SAN BRUNO, California; CITY OF SANTA MONICA, California; CITY OF SUGARLAND, Texas; LEAGUE OF NEBRASKA MUNICIPALITIES; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS; CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, California; CITY OF FRESNO, California; CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES, California; CITY OF COCONUT CREEK, Florida; CITY OF LACEY, Washington; CITY OF OLYMPIA, Washington; CITY OF TUMWATER, Washington; TOWN OF YARROW POINT, Washington; THURSTON COUNTY, Washington; COLORADO COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITY ALLIANCE; RAINIER COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, California; COUNTY OF MARIN, California; CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, California; TOWN OF CORTE MADERA, California; CITY OF WESTMINSTER, Maryland,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

CITY OF EUGENE, OREGON; CITY OF HUNTSVILLE,
ALABAMA; CITY OF BOWIE, MARYLAND,

Petitioners,

No. 19-70344

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, New Mexico; NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES; CITY OF BROOKHAVEN, Georgia; CITY OF BALTIMORE, Maryland; CITY OF DUBUQUE, Iowa; TOWN OF OCEAN CITY, Maryland; CITY OF EMERYVILLE, California; MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE; TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH, California; CITY OF LA VISTA, Nebraska; CITY OF MEDINA, Washington; CITY OF PAPILLION, Nebraska; CITY OF PLANO, Texas; CITY OF ROCKVILLE, Maryland; CITY OF SAN BRUNO, California; CITY OF SANTA MONICA, California; CITY OF SUGARLAND, Texas; LEAGUE OF NEBRASKA MUNICIPALITIES; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS; CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, California; CITY OF FRESNO, California; CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES, California; CITY OF COCONUT CREEK, Florida; CITY OF LACEY, Washington; CITY OF OLYMPIA, Washington; CITY OF TUMWATER, Washington; TOWN OF YARROW POINT, Washington; THURSTON COUNTY, Washington; COLORADO COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITY ALLIANCE; RAINIER COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, California; COUNTY OF MARIN, California; CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, California; TOWN OF CORTE MADERA, California; CITY OF WESTMINSTER, Maryland,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

On Petitions for Review of an Order of
the Federal Communications Commission

**RESPONDENT FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION'S
MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE RELATED CASES, ABATE
PROCEEDINGS PENDING AGENCY RECONSIDERATION, AND
DEFER FILING OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD**

Respondent Federal Communications Commission (FCC or Commission) respectfully moves (1) to consolidate these thirteen related cases, (2) to abate proceedings in this Court pending the Commission's disposition of a petition for administrative reconsideration that raises substantially the same issues presented in the petitions for review here, and (3) to defer filing of the administrative record.*

* Pursuant to Ninth Circuit Rule 27-1(5), counsel for the Commission have sought to confer with opposing counsel. The petitioners in Nos. 19-70123, 19-70124, 19-70125, and 19-70326 consent to this motion in full, as do intervenors CTIA—The Wireless Association, Competitive Carriers Association, and Wireless Infrastructure Association, and respondent United States of America. The petitioners in Nos. 19-70144 and 19-70341, and intervenors represented by the same counsel, consent to consolidation but not to abeyance—yet they also reserve the right to seek further consolidation of these cases with *City of Portland v. FCC*, No. 18-72689, which this Court has already placed in abeyance in relevant part. Intervenors National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA) and City of New York take the same position. The petitioners in Nos. 19-70136 (and intervenors represented by the same counsel), 19-70145, 19-70147, 19-70148, 19-70339, 19-70344 also consent to consolidation but not to abeyance. The petitioner in No. 19-70146, the City of Huntington Beach, did not respond before the filing of this motion.

In support of this motion, the Commission states as follows:

1. The petitions for review filed in the thirteen above-captioned cases all seek review of the FCC’s Declaratory Ruling and Third Report & Order, *Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, 33 FCC Rcd. 9088 (2018) (*Order*). Reaffirming the Commission’s twenty-year-old *California Payphone* standard, the *Order* explains that state and local measures impermissibly “prohibit or have the effect of prohibiting” wireless services—and are therefore preempted under 47 U.S.C. §§ 253(a) and 332(c)(7)(B)(i)(II)—when those measures “materially inhibit[] or limit[] the ability of any competitor or potential competitor to compete in a fair and balanced legal and regulatory environment.” *Id.* ¶¶ 16, 37-42 (quoting *Cal. Payphone Ass’n*, 12 FCC Rcd. 14191, 14206 ¶ 31 (1997)). The *Order* then discusses how that standard applies in three specific contexts: fees and charges assessed by state and local governments, *id.* ¶¶ 43–80; aesthetic requirements and related issues, *id.* ¶¶ 81–91; and timelines for state and local authorizations, *id.* ¶¶ 103–147.

The petitioners here generally fall into two groups. The local government petitioners challenge the Commission’s interpretation of Sections 253 and 332(c)(7) to preempt state and local measures that the

Commission found to prohibit or to have the effect of prohibiting wireless services. *See* Nos. 19-70136, 19-70144, 19-70145, 19-70146, 19-70147, 19-70148, 19-70339, 19-70341, and 19-70344. The wireless carrier petitioners, by contrast, argue that the Commission should have interpreted these provisions to preempt a broader range of practices or should have mandated more stringent remedies if a state or local government violates these provisions. *See* Nos. 19-70123, 19-70124, 19-70125, and 19-70326.

Separate petitions for review of the *Order* were filed in various circuits across the country. A judicial lottery was then held under 28 U.S.C. § 2112(a)(1)–(3), and the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation randomly selected the Tenth Circuit as the initial forum for all challenges to the *Order*. Nine petitions were filed in or transferred to the Tenth Circuit, and the Commission moved to transfer the four other petitions (which were originally filed in the D.C. Circuit) to the Tenth Circuit.

Several local government petitioners moved in the Tenth Circuit to stay the *Order* pending review. The Commission opposed any stay because the petitioners have not shown that they are likely to prevail on the merits, because they cannot show that they will suffer imminent and irreparable harm without a stay, and because a stay would harm wireless

consumers and carriers and contravene the public interest. *See* Resp. FCC's Opp. to Mot. for Stay Pending Review, *City of San Jose v. FCC*, No. 18-9568 (10th Cir. filed Jan. 2, 2019). The wireless carrier petitioners and intervenors also opposed a stay. "After reviewing all the parties' submissions," the Tenth Circuit denied the request for a stay, explaining that "petitioners have failed to meet their burden of showing irreparable harm if a stay is not granted." Order, *City of San Jose v. FCC*, No. 18-9568 (10th Cir. Jan. 10, 2019).

Some petitioners also moved in the Tenth Circuit for the petitions to be further transferred to this Circuit under 28 U.S.C. § 2112(a)(5). The four petitions filed in the D.C. Circuit were held pending the Tenth Circuit's disposition of the transfer motion. On January 10, after denying the motion for a stay pending review, the Tenth Circuit granted the transfer motion and directed that the petitions pending before it be transferred to this Circuit. The D.C. Circuit transferred the remaining petitions to this Circuit soon after. The nine petitions transferred from the Tenth Circuit were docketed in this Court on January 14 and 15, and the four petitions transferred from the D.C. Circuit were docketed on February 6 and 8.

On January 25, the local government petitioners moved for this Court to hold a formal case management conference. When petitioners' counsel contacted the Commission to seek its position on that request, undersigned counsel asked petitioners to inform the Court that the Commission was unable to respond to the motion because petitioners sought to file it when the agency was shut down due to a lapse in federal government appropriations. The Court has not acted on that motion, and the Commission believes that the request for a formal case management conference—which is to be “held only in exceptional circumstances,” 9th Cir. R. 33-1 Note (b)—is premature and unnecessary, both because relevant agency proceedings are still ongoing in response to a timely petition for reconsideration (as we discuss in more detail below), and because the local government petitioners have not sought to informally confer on a briefing schedule or other issues with the Commission or other parties before asking the Court to expend its time and attention on these routine procedural matters.

2. The thirteen cases seeking review of the *Order*, which have now all been transferred to this Court, should be consolidated and treated as a single proceeding. *Cf.* Fed. R. App. P. 3(b)(2). Each of the thirteen

petitions seeks review of the same *Order*, and there is substantial overlap in the issues raised and relief sought in each case.

Consolidating these cases for purposes of briefing and argument will promote the timely and efficient disposition of these cases by allowing the court to prescribe a consolidated briefing schedule with a single set of briefs and argument for each set of parties whose interests are substantially aligned. It will likewise conserve the Court's and the parties' resources by limiting the amount of duplicative or overlapping briefing and argument. *Cf.* Fed. R. App. P. 28(i).

Consolidating these cases thus will best ensure that all issues and arguments are thoroughly and thoughtfully presented for the Court's consideration. In addition, given the substantial overlap in these cases and the likelihood that arguments raised in any one case will be closely intertwined with arguments raised in other cases, consolidation will allow all the petitions for review to be addressed in a single decision and thereby mitigate any risk of inconsistent rulings.

3. The Commission also respectfully moves to place these cases in abeyance pending the agency's disposition of a petition for reconsideration that raises substantially the same issues raised by the local government petitioners in their petitions for review here.

a. On November 14, a coalition of local government entities from Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and Virginia timely filed a petition for administrative reconsideration of the *Order*. See *Pet. for Recon. of City of New Orleans et al.*, WT Docket No. 17-79 (filed Nov. 14, 2018) (attached as Exhibit A). The Commission has published notice of the filing of that petition in the Federal Register and has solicited public comment on the petition. See Public Notice, *Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Establishes Uniform Deadlines for Oppositions and Replies Regarding a Petition for Reconsideration of the Wireless Infrastructure Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order*, DA 18-1303, WT Docket No. 17-79 (Dec. 26, 2018) (attached as Exhibit B); Public Notice, *Petition for Reconsideration of Action in Proceeding*, Report No. 3109 (FCC Jan. 2, 2019) (attached as Exhibit C); *Petition for Reconsideration of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding*, 84 Fed. Reg. 2485 (Feb. 7, 2019) (attached as Exhibit D). The pleading cycle is scheduled to close on March 4, 2019.

The petition for reconsideration raises substantially the same issues as those raised in the nine petitions for review filed by the local government petitioners. Like those petitioners, the petition for reconsideration seeks review of the *Order's* determinations regarding

state and local fees and charges, Pet. for Recon. at 16–19; timelines for state and local authorizations, *id.* at 20–22; and the effective prohibition standard generally, *id.* at 20. And the local government entities seeking agency reconsideration are likewise similarly situated—and in many cases identically situated—to the local government entities seeking review here.

b. When petitions for judicial review of an FCC order and petitions for agency reconsideration of the same order are each filed by separate parties, it is common practice for the reviewing court, upon request by the agency or by other parties, to hold judicial proceedings in abeyance pending resolution of the administrative petitions. *See Wrather-Alvarez Broad., Inc. v. FCC*, 248 F.2d 646, 649 (D.C. Cir. 1957); *see also Teledesic LLC v. FCC*, 275 F.3d 75, 83 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (recognizing that the D.C. Circuit will “often hold a petition for review in abeyance pending the FCC’s further proceedings” on petitions for reconsideration from other parties). Such exercise of “judicial self-restraint” helps avoid any “unseemly conflict” that might otherwise arise when both the agency and the Court have jurisdiction with respect to the same proceeding. *Wrather-Alvarez*, 248 F.2d at 649. When placing a case in abeyance under this approach, a court may “keep[] the record open for

supplementation to reflect [the ongoing administrative] proceedings.”

Ibid.

The common practice of placing cases in abeyance in these circumstances has been recognized and approved of by the Supreme Court. *See United States v. Benmar Transp. & Leasing Corp.*, 444 U.S. 4, 5–7 (1979) (per curiam). This Court, too, has recognized—in distinct but related circumstances—that “it would waste scarce government resources to undertake parallel judicial review” when “an initial agency action may be modified or reversed during administrative reconsideration.” *Puget Sound Energy, Inc. v. United States*, 310 F.3d 613, 625 (9th Cir. 2002).

Under the principles articulated in these cases, and in light of the circumstances here, the Court should place this case in abeyance and leave the record open for supplementation. Given the substantial overlap between the local government entities’ petition for reconsideration and the petitions for review filed by other local governments, the FCC’s proceedings on reconsideration may simplify judicial review—either by resolving issues that the Court would otherwise need to address, or by providing additional analysis on issues that ultimately remain in dispute. Equally important, because the agency’s disposition of a petition

for reconsideration may give parties a new opportunity to challenge the *Order*, either in this Court or in another court of appeals where venue lies, allowing the agency to address the petition for reconsideration before these cases proceed would mitigate the possibility of piecemeal (and possibly inconsistent) judicial review.

Since the wireless carriers' petitions are essentially the converse of the local governments' petitions, seeking broader preemption and more stringent remedies, review of those petitions should likewise be abated pending disposition of the petition for reconsideration. We understand that the wireless carrier petitioners do not oppose having their petitions held in abeyance.

c. The Tenth Circuit's orders earlier in this proceeding provide further support for abeyance here. The Tenth Circuit concluded that transfer was warranted because it believed, as several local government petitioners here urged, that the *Order* under review is effectively "the same order" as an earlier FCC decision pending before this Court in *City of Portland v. FCC*, No. 18-72689. See *Order, Sprint Corp. v. FCC*, No. 18-9563 (10th Cir. Jan. 10, 2019). In *Portland*, as here, the FCC moved for abeyance because the petition for review substantially overlapped with a pending petition for reconsideration, and this Court granted

abeyance in relevant part. *See Order, City of Portland v. FCC*, No. 18-72689 (9th Cir. Dec. 20, 2018). If the *Order* in this case and the order in *Portland* are substantially interrelated, as the Tenth Circuit appears to have concluded (although the FCC disagreed), then this case should be held in abeyance as well, and the Court can then consider what further case management measures are appropriate once all proceedings on reconsideration have been completed.

The Tenth Circuit also specifically found, in denying the local government petitioners' motion for a stay pending review, that the "petitioners have failed [to] show[] irreparable harm if a stay is not granted." *Order, City of San Jose v. FCC*, No. 18-9568 (10th Cir. Jan. 10, 2019). There is thus no reason for the Court to proceed immediately with this case—and to incur the risk that review will be complicated or disrupted by further developments on reconsideration—when the sounder course is to await the completion of all pending agency proceedings.

d. If the Court decides to hold this case in abeyance, the Commission proposes to advise the Court and the parties at 60-day intervals of the status of proceedings concerning the petition for

reconsideration, and to notify the Court and all parties promptly when those reconsideration proceedings are concluded.

4. Finally, the Commission respectfully moves to defer any deadline for filing the administrative record. Unless a court orders otherwise, an agency ordinarily is required to file the administrative record—or, in lieu of the full record, a certified list of items in the record—within 40 days after being served with a petition for review. Fed. R. App. P. 17(a), (b)(1)(B). It is not clear whether or how that provision applies here, however, because the Tenth Circuit expressly vacated the deadline for filing the administrative record, *see Preliminary Order Regarding Consolidation, Sprint Corp. v. FCC*, No. 18-9563 (10th Cir. Nov. 5, 2018), and the D.C. Circuit likewise did not require the agency to file the record while the agency's motion to transfer the cases in that circuit was pending.

If the Court were to instead require the agency to file the administrative record within 40 days after the date the petitions were docketed in this Circuit, the record potentially could be due on February 25 (based on when the first petition was docketed). Thus, out of an abundance of caution, the FCC respectfully moves for an order formally deferring the filing of the agency record until 40 days after any abeyance

has concluded (or, if the request for abeyance is denied, until 40 days after the date of denial).

A deferment or extension of time to file the administrative record is also necessary because of the size and scope of the record in this proceeding. Based on a preliminary review, the record appears to contain more than 3,500 separate filings totaling more than 26,000 pages. It will therefore require substantial time and resources for agency staff to compile, review, and prepare the record (or a complete list of items in the record) for filing in this Court.

Moreover, should any further petitions for review be filed after the agency completes proceedings on the petition for reconsideration, the administrative record would need to be supplemented to include additional submissions. The better course, we respectfully submit, is to abate this proceeding pending disposition of the petition for administrative reconsideration and to defer filing of the administrative record until after abeyance has concluded.

* * *

Accordingly, the FCC respectfully requests that the Court enter an order (1) consolidating these thirteen related cases, (2) abating proceedings in this Court pending the Commission's disposition of the petition for administrative reconsideration, and (3) deferring filing of the administrative record.

Dated: February 25, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Scott M. Noveck

Thomas M. Johnson, Jr.
General Counsel

David M. Gossett
Deputy General Counsel

Jacob M. Lewis
Associate General Counsel

Scott M. Noveck
Counsel

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
(202) 418-1740
fcclitigation@fcc.gov

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMITCertificate of Compliance With Type-Volume Limitation,
Typeface Requirements and Type Style Requirements

1. This document complies with the word limit of Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2) because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f):
 - this document contains 2,689 words, *or*
 - this document uses a monospaced typeface and contains _____ lines of text.

2. This document complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because:
 - this document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2016 in 14-point Century Schoolbook, *or*
 - this document has been prepared in a monospaced spaced typeface using _____ with _____.

/s/ Scott M. Noveck

Scott M. Noveck
Counsel for Respondent
Federal Communications Commission

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 25, 2019, I caused the foregoing Motion to Consolidate Related Cases, Abate Proceedings Pending Agency Reconsideration, and Defer Filing of the Administrative Record to be filed with the Clerk of Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit using the electronic CM/ECF system. I further certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and will be served electronically by the CM/ECF system.

/s/ Scott M. Noveck

Scott M. Noveck
Counsel for Respondent
Federal Communications Commission

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by)	WT Docket No. 17-79
Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment)	
)	
Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by)	WT Docket No. 17-84
Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment)	

PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION
OF
THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
KENTUCKY LEAGUE OF CITIES
MISSISSIPPI MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
PENNSYLVANIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
ALABAMA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES
ARKANSAS MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
NEVADA LEAGUE OF CITIES AND MUNICIPALITIES
TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG, VIRGINIA
JEFFERSON PARISH, LOUISIANA
GOVERNMENT WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY & COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION

By: Alan S. Tilles, Esquire

Shulman Rogers Gandal Pordy & Ecker, P.A.
12505 Park Potomac Ave., Sixth Floor
Potomac, Maryland 20854
(301) 230-5200

Date: November 14, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY ii

I. BACKGROUND iii

 A. The Virginia Municipal League 2

 B. Kentucky League Of Cities 3

 C. Jefferson Parish, Louisiana 4

 D. Mississippi League Of Cities 5

 E. Pennsylvania Municipal League 7

 F. Alabama League Of Municipalities 7

 G. Arkansas Municipal League 9

 H. Nevada League Of Cities And Municipalities 10

 I. New Orleans, Louisiana 10

 J. Town Of Middleburg, Virginia 11

 K. Government Wireless Technology And Communications Association 12

 L. Prior Comments 12

II. PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION 13

 A. The “Race” To 5G 13

 B. The FCC’s Decision Is Inconsistent With Its Deregulatory Agenda 15

 C. The Commission Fails To Account For True Cost Recovery 16

 D. Municipalities And Businesses Should Not Be Competitors 19

 E. The Definition Of “Effective Prohibition” Is Overly Broad 20

 F. The Revised Shot Clock Pose Numerous Problems 20

 G. Undergrounding Of Utilities Should Not Be Inhibited 22

 H. Minimum Spacing Requirements Should Be Further Defined 23

III. CONCLUSION 24

SUMMARY

The Joint Petitioners request that the Commission reconsider its decision its Wireless Deployment *Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order* in the above-captioned rulemaking. As discussed herein, the Commission's decision fails to take into account legitimate municipal costs, legitimate municipal concerns or legitimate municipal manpower limitations. The Commission has manufactured a massive shift of corporate costs from carriers to municipal governments by exaggerating the number of abuses by a limited number of municipalities, while at the same time ignoring abuses by wireless providers.

The end result of the Commission's unsupported decision is not the envisioned speedier deployment of wireless facilities. Rather, endless litigation (which has already begun) will only delay deployments. The decision creates an environment where municipalities are forced to lease facilities at rates that do not recover costs, and instead forces such entities to undercut the facility siting costs of the municipality's businesses. Further, lack of specificity in the Commission's *Report and Order* creates uncertainty regarding current agreements for deployments, further delaying real relief.

The Joint Petitioners support the reduction of unnecessary regulation inhibiting the deployment of advanced telecommunications facilities. However, the Commission's decision fails to accomplish its goal. On this basis, the Joint Petitioners request that the Commission eliminate the maximum fees imposed in the *Report and Order*, eliminate the ill-conceived changes to the Shot Clock, and permit municipalities which have made significant efforts to reach agreements with telecommunications companies to deploy facilities to make decisions on truly local issues.

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by)	WT Docket No. 17-79
Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment)	
)	
Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by)	WT Docket No. 17-84
Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment)	

**PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION
OF
THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
KENTUCKY LEAGUE OF CITIES
MISSISSIPPI MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
PENNSYLVANIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
ALABAMA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES
ARKANSAS MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
NEVADA LEAGUE OF CITIES AND MUNICIPALITIES
TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG, VIRGINIA
JEFFERSON PARISH, LOUISIANA
GOVERNMENT WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY & COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION**

The City of New Orleans, Louisiana (“New Orleans”), the Virginia Municipal League (“VML”), the Kentucky League of Cities (“KLC”), the Mississippi Municipal League (“MML”), the Pennsylvania Municipal League (“PML”), the Alabama League of Municipalities (“ALM”), the Arkansas Municipal League (“ARML”), the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities (“NLC”), the Town of Middleburg, Virginia (“Middleburg”) and the Government Wireless Technology & Communications Association (“GWTCA”)(hereinafter the “Joint Petitioners”), through counsel and pursuant to Section 1.429 of the Commission’s Rules, 47 C.F.R. §1.429,

hereby respectfully submits the following Petition for Reconsideration of the Commission's Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order in the above-captioned proceeding.¹

I. BACKGROUND

A. The Virginia Municipal League

The Virginia Municipal League (“VML”) is an association of political subdivisions of the Commonwealth of Virginia, currently consisting of 39 cities, 156 towns and 10 counties. VML was formed in 1905 and maintained pursuant to Va. Code §15.2-1303 for the purpose of promoting the interest and welfare of its members as may be necessary or beneficial.

VML has worked diligently with Verizon, AT&T, Sprint and others (“the industry”) on legislation in Virginia for the last two General Assembly sessions in an effort to create responsible legislation that takes into account the need for faster deployment of 5G technology and the ability of localities to maintain their unique characteristics. VML, along with other local government groups, and the industry met on numerous occasions and discussed how to create a balance in the legislation that Virginia saw fit to pass. In 2017, SB835 dealing with co-location of small cells on existing structures passed the General Assembly and a workgroup was created with Senator Ryan T. McDougle and Delegate Terry G. Kilgore presiding. This group met over the summer of 2017 in addition to other meetings that local governments and industry held. In 2018, SB405 and SB823 were enacted into law after the Governor offered amendments to which the industry did not object. These bills dealt with right-of-way fees and zoning of all new structures and the Governor provided some helpful amendments to local governments.

¹ *Report and Order*, WT Docket No. 17-79, 83 FR 51867 (October 15, 2018).

B. Kentucky League of Cities

The Kentucky League of Cities is a membership organization representing three hundred seventy-one (371) city governments throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky. KLC's mission is to "serve as the united voice of cities by supporting community innovation, effective leadership, and quality governance." KLC achieves these goals by providing legislative advocacy, legal advocacy and services, community consulting, training, policy development, research and offer robust insurance services to local governments.

KLC was created in 1927 when twelve cities banded together to form a unified front on legislative issues and to combine bargaining power for contracting. In 1987, KLC developed a member-owned insurance pool, Kentucky League of Cities Insurance Services, to answer a crisis facing Kentucky cities in that most national companies were refusing to provide insurance coverage. In the intervening years KLC has continued to grow as its member cities needs grow. KLC remains committed to advocating for its member cities by all means at its disposal.

The Legislative and Legal advocacy programs are services offered by KLC to benefit its cities. These programs focus on preserving home rule for cities throughout Kentucky as well as securing federal and state constitutional and statutory municipal powers. Franchise rights to city rights-of-way in Kentucky are reserved exclusively to cities through the Kentucky Constitution. Section 163 of the Kentucky Constitution is entitled "Public utilities must obtain a franchise to use streets." This section expressly preserves the power to regulate and permit the use of a city's right-of-ways to the cities. Section 164 of the Kentucky Constitution grants cities the power to charge a franchise fee to utilities seeking to use a city right-of-way.

KRS 136.660 (1) (a-c) usurped the franchise rights of cities by making the state a collector of a telecommunications "tax," pooling what tax it would allow and distributing funds back to

local governments. Obviously attempting to circumvent the Constitution, the statute recognized city rights under Section 163 of the Kentucky Constitution to enter into agreements for the use of city rights-of-way. However, the Kentucky General Assembly believed it could prohibit cities from charging franchise fees and instead collect a tax and distribute funds to cities based upon various complex calculations determined by state statute. KLC joined with several Kentucky cities and challenged the statute as an unconstitutional infringement upon city power, after countless attempts to address the problem legislatively failed. On June 15, 2017, the Kentucky Supreme Court agreed. In *Kentucky CATV Association Inc. v. City of Florence*, 520 S.W.3d 355 (Ky. 2017), the Court recognized the constitutional powers to franchise and charge franchise fees granted to cities in Sections 163 and 164 of the Kentucky Constitution. KLC won that battle and continues to advocate on behalf of cities to preserve the constitutional authority to control city rights-of-way through franchise agreements and the imposition of franchise fees.

C. Jefferson Parish, Louisiana

The Parish of Jefferson is the second most populous parish in the State of Louisiana with more than 430,000 residents. Together with its surrounding parishes, Jefferson Parish is part of the Greater New Orleans Region. Jefferson Parish was founded in 1825. The Jefferson Parish Council is the legislative body of the Parish. The Parish is governed by a President who serves as the chief administrative officer of the Parish and carries out the policies adopted by the Parish Council. Pursuant to Louisiana Constitution and the home rule Charter of Jefferson Parish, the Parish has the authority to grant franchises to use the public rights-of-way to provide wireless services.

Jefferson Parish has worked diligently with AT&T, Sprint, T-Mobile, Verizon, Cox Communications, Mobilitie, Crown Castle, Uniti and others in a collaborative effort to craft local

legislation that both: (a) facilitates the deployment of wireless facilities in the public rights-of-way to increase access for the citizens of Jefferson Parish to advanced 5G technology and information, and (b) protects and safeguards the health, safety, and welfare of the public, ensures that the public receives fair and reasonable compensation for use of the public rights-of-way, and preserves community character and aesthetic quality. As recently as September 19, 2018, the Parish Council was scheduled to consider approval of a proposed local ordinance to accomplish these goals. Consideration of the proposed ordinance was deferred at the request of wireless industry representatives, plainly in anticipation of the Commission's September 26, 2018 Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order in this matter.

Jefferson Parish is currently engaged in a beautification effort, especially along its transportation corridors. The Parish's zoning ordinance implements these beautification goals and includes several zoning districts dedicated to improving aesthetics in signage, landscaping, and design. The Parish is also currently engaged in an effort to beautify its public rights-of-way, including the installation of commissioned works of art in selected locations.

While Jefferson Parish fully supports the goal of bringing 5G technology to its residents, the Parish does not believe that the deployment of the numerous physical facilities associated with such technology should be accomplished at the expense of the citizens' rights to be fairly compensated for the use of their public rights-of-way or to protect the aesthetic qualities of their communities.

D. Mississippi Municipal League

The Mississippi Municipal League is a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Mississippi to advance the interest and general welfare of its member municipalities through education of their officials and advocating on their behalf. The MML's 292 members

consist of substantially all of the municipalities in the state of Mississippi. The issues before the Commission are of broad public importance to Mississippi municipalities because they question the authority of municipalities and, more importantly, their citizens, to regulate activities within their borders.

While the rural nature of the Mississippi and the municipalities therein make the expansion of 5G particularly attractive, such expansion should be not be accomplished at the expense of the citizens' rights to be fairly compensated for the use of their public rights of way. Instead, municipal officials need flexibility to negotiate with wireless network providers to obtain a fair and reasonable agreement that allows wireless expansion while taking into consideration each municipality's unique circumstances. Streets and highways, built and maintained at public expense, belong to the public, and no private individual or corporation has a right to use them for commercial purposes for private gain without consent of the state or municipality involved.² Accordingly, "municipalities shall have the power to grant the right for the erection of telegraph, electric light, or telephone poles, posts and wires along and upon any of the streets, alleys, or ways of the municipality, and change, modify, and regulate the same."³ Hence, pursuant to Section 21-27-3 of the Mississippi Code of 1972, as amended, when granting a franchise "[n]o municipality shall grant, renew, or extend any such franchise, privilege or right, *without compensation* or for any longer period than twenty-five years." (emphasis added). And, finally, while the leasing or permitting of space on municipal light poles or other municipally-owned structures is not the granting of a franchise in Mississippi, it would be the leasing of space from which the fair market value for such lease would be required so as to not be considered an impermissible donation under

² See, *Payne v. Jackson City Lines, Inc.*, 220 Miss. 180, 70 So. 2d 520 (Miss. 1954).

³ Miss. Code Ann. § 21-27-3.

Mississippi's constitution.⁴ Further, in 2008 the MML successfully negotiated a statewide agreement with AT&T on behalf of its members, as did other leagues in other states, regarding the expansion of broadband service, the use of rights of way, and franchise fees, thus proving that agreements can be negotiated.

E. Pennsylvania Municipal League

The Pennsylvania Municipal League is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization established in 1900 as an advocate for Pennsylvania's 3rd class cities. Today, The League represents participating Pennsylvania cities, boroughs, townships, home rule communities and towns that all share the League's municipal policy interests. PML's Board of Directors oversees the administration of a wide array of municipal services including legislative advocacy (on both the state and federal levels), publications designed to educate and inform, education and training certification programs, membership research and inquiries, consulting-based programs, and group insurance trusts.

PML is continually monitoring the needs of its members and it is committed to providing the Commonwealth's municipalities with cost-effective programs and services required to meet the distinct needs of their communities.

F. Alabama League Of Municipalities

The Alabama League of Municipalities ("ALM") is a voluntary association of which approximately 450 cities and towns of the State of Alabama are currently members. Since 1935, the League has worked to strengthen municipal government through advocacy, training and the advancement of local leadership. In addition, the League advises and educates municipal officials across the State on all aspects of municipal law.

⁴ See, Miss. Att'y Gen. Op. No. 2006-00242, 2006 WL 2385507 (June 30, 2006); Miss. Const. art. 4, § 66.

Section 220 of the Alabama Constitution, 1901, provides that “No person, firm, association, or corporation shall be authorized or permitted to use the streets, avenues, alleys, or public places of any city, town or village for the construction or operation of any public utility or private enterprise, without first obtaining the consent of the proper authorities of such city, town, or village.” The Supreme Court of Alabama has labeled this grant of authority as “an essential and sovereign power in local authorities... in the nature of a bill of rights ... [that] recognize certain fixed, constitutional rights which shall not be invaded.”⁵

In construing this section, the Alabama Supreme Court has held that the power of a city to grant a franchise is by virtue of legislative authority, and Section 220 is not a grant of such power but the reservation of a restriction on legislative authority.⁶ Section 11-49-1, Code of Alabama 1975, provides the legislative authority by providing that “No person, firm, association, or corporation shall be authorized to use the streets, avenues, alleys, and other public places of cities or towns for the construction or operation of any public utility or private enterprise without first obtaining the consent of the proper authorities of the city or town.”

Like many of its sister Leagues, over the past several legislative sessions ALM has worked diligently and met repeatedly with industry stakeholders to discuss possible practical and legislative solutions for expansion of wireless networks including the offer to work towards a suggested model franchise agreement which takes into account the needs of Alabama’s municipalities and the needs of industry to proceed in a consistent and timely fashion with expansion. Several years ago, the ALM worked with AT&T on a recommended model franchise agreement to implement an integrated Internet Protocol enabled platform of voice, data, and video services. The suggestion to work towards a similar model agreement, while met with initial

⁵ *Birmingham Electric Co. v. Allen*, 177 So. 199, 202 (1928) (internal citations omitted).

⁶ *Phenix City v. Alabama Power Co.*, 195 So. 894 (Ala. 1940).

interest, has not been pursued by the wireless industry. ALM remains willing to work towards that goal so long as it does not infringe on the essential and sovereign powers of Alabama's municipalities to regulate their rights of ways and public spaces.

G. Arkansas Municipal League

The Arkansas Municipal League was founded in 1934 and exists to act as the official representative of the 500 Arkansas cities and towns, to provide a clearinghouse for information, and to offer a forum for discussion and sharing of mutual concerns faced by Arkansas's cities and towns. The League's mission is to build better local government and, consequently, better cities and towns for all Arkansans. Better local government and better cities and towns begins with allowing local control of local issues.

AML believes that the implementation of 5G technology is best left to local governments and wireless providers at the local level because those working at the *local level* know the best way to implement this technology at the *local level*. With that in mind, cities and towns of Arkansas have already begun to work with wireless providers at the local level to implement this much needed technology. As an example of this commitment, three of the State's largest cities – Little Rock, North Little Rock, and Conway – have already worked to negotiate fair and mutually beneficial agreements with wireless providers. Again, local issues require local solutions, and the cities and towns of Arkansas have already demonstrated their dedication to this concept, and AML is committed to ensuring the Arkansas communities continuing to do so.

AML is aware of the Comments submitted by the Arkansas Municipal Power Association (“AMPA”) submitted to the Commission in this proceeding on September 25, 2018. AML supports the AMPA comment, and incorporates AMPA's positions into AML's own positions.

H. Nevada League Of Cities And Municipalities

The Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities is a professional association that serves as the state's primary champion of local government. As a statewide vehicle for collaboration, the League promotes positive and continuous community development through public policy formulation, advocacy, shared data and timely communication. Through analysis, education, planning and influential legislative representation, the League provides a potent central voice for all communities as they build a vibrant, sustainable and exceptional future for the citizens of Nevada.

Over the next decade, the state of Nevada will experience economic, social and cultural challenges that can only be met with insight, collaboration, optimism and deep commitment to every community. Through its dedicated members, the Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities will become Nevada's most influential and potent catalyst for economic development, social change and the legislative progress necessary to create a future characterized by leadership, vitality, vision and prosperity.

I. New Orleans, Louisiana

As discussed in its original Comments in this proceeding, New Orleans is the largest city and metropolitan area in the State of Louisiana. With over 1.1 million residents in the greater New Orleans Metropolitan area, it is the 46th largest in the United States. New Orleans is also a major United States port.

There are several aspects of New Orleans which make the city unique and therefore important to the Commission's consideration of changes to broadband deployment policies. New Orleans is world-famous for its abundance of unique architectural styles, which reflect the city's historic roots and multicultural heritage. Twenty National Register Historic Districts have been

established, along with fourteen local historic districts. Thirteen of the local historic districts are administered by the New Orleans Historic District Landmarks Commission (“HDLC”), with one (the famous “French Quarter”) administered by the Vieux Carre Commission. In addition, the National Park Service, via the National Register of Historic Places, and the HDLC have landmarked individual buildings. These unique architectural aspects of New Orleans make the City one of the Top 10 most-visited cities in the United States. In 2004 alone, there were over 10.1 million visitors to the city. As a result, preservation of these historic landmarks and architectural styles mandate careful consideration of any proposal, which could alter these landmarks, or the character of these neighborhoods.

At the same time, the sheer number of visitors in the City at any one time mean that the City’s use of wireless communications is significantly higher than might otherwise be experienced by a City of the same size. Therefore, maximization of access to communications is also a vital interest to the City. The careful balancing of these competing interests gives New Orleans a unique background in matters of wireless deployment, and the Commission should carefully consider the City’s interests in attempting any rewrite of the Commission’s Rules.

J. Town Of Middleburg, Virginia

The Town of Middleburg, established in 1787, is a small village located in Loudoun County, Virginia. It is one of the oldest and most carefully preserved towns in the state. Much of its identity is rooted in its natural beauty and historic character of the town. Like New Orleans, Middleburg has carefully cultivated and worked hard to protect this character, which is essential to its tourism economy. Thus, issues such as the deployment of small cells are of particular concern to the Town, which must at all times be conserved with maintaining the character which is the Town’s defining attribute.

K. Government Wireless Technology And Communications Association

The Government Wireless Technology & Communications Association (“GWTCA”) is a non-profit trade association created to advocate on behalf of government and non-government users of wireless technology and communications in the public service industries, such as public transit.⁷ GWTCA’s membership includes government agencies, manufacturers, engineers and consultants working on a variety of issues impacting represented users. GWTCA’s Board of Directors includes representatives from Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties in California, Motorola Solutions and Cisco.

L. Prior Comments

The City of New Orleans submitted Comments in this proceeding on June 15, 2017.⁸ GWTCA submitted Comments in WT Docket No. 16-421 (Streamlining Deployment of Small Cell Infrastructure) on May 8, 2017.⁹ The Town of Middleburg submitted a letter to the Commission in this proceeding on September 21, 2018.¹⁰ Thus, the backgrounds and interests of each of these Joint Petitioners are already on the record in this proceeding. In addition, KLC submitted a letter in this proceeding on September 14, 2018.¹¹ Both Kentucky and the Virginia Municipal League were part of a joint filing in WT Docket No. 16-421 on April 7, 2017.¹²

⁷ www.gwtca.org.

⁸ <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filing/106160986116674>.

⁹ <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filing/103082609813389>.

¹⁰ <https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/1092166849166/FCC-WT%20DOCKET%20NO.%2017-84%20AND%2017-79.pdf>.

Middleburg also submitted Comments in WC Docket No. 11-59 (Acceleration of Broadband Deployment Expanding the Reach and Reducing the Cost of Broadband Deployment by Improving Policies Regarding Public Rights of Way and Wireless Facilities Siting) on July 15, 2011. <https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/7021692388.pdf>.

¹¹ <https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/1091406763815/20180913SmallCellCommentsFinal.pdf>.

¹² <https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/10407758005427/NLC%20SML%20FCC%20WT%2016%20421%20reply%20comments.pdf>.

It is the concern of the Joint Petitioners that the Commission's *Report and Order* ignores the interests of municipalities nationwide, in an effort to serve the economic needs of wireless carriers. On this basis, the Joint Petitioners request reconsideration of the Commission's decision.

II. PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

A. The "Race" To 5G

The purported genesis of this proceeding is the perceived need for the United States to be the first country to implement 5G technology. The purported need has been expressed by wireless carriers,¹³ wireless consultants,¹⁴ the FCC¹⁵ and the White House.¹⁶ The rationale given for this driving need to be first has been variously couched as: (1) the "winning" country will set standards;¹⁷ (2) economic benefits that accrue only to the winner;¹⁸ and (3) 5G will provide high speed access to unserved rural areas.¹⁹

Unfortunately, these claims are inconsistent with reality. While initial deployments of wireless technologies might have benefitted in the creation of standards in prior generations, where there were multiple technological standards (for example, when both TDMA and CDMA technologies existed side-by-side), today there will not be multiple final 5G marketplace standards.

¹³ <https://www.ctia.org/the-wireless-industry/the-race-to-5g>.

¹⁴ <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-telecoms-5g/united-states-falling-behind-china-in-race-to-5g-wireless-deloitte-report-idUSKBN1KSOBE>.

¹⁵ <https://www.inverse.com/article/48228-why-china-is-winning-the-race-with-the-us-to-5g-internet>.

¹⁶ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/america-will-win-global-race-5g/>.

¹⁷ "Billions of dollars are potentially at stake for the country that leads in 5G and sets global standards, as the United States did with the implementation of 4G." <https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-tech/2018/09/20/the-race-to-5g-345764>.

¹⁸ "We've seen with prior generations, whether it was moving from 2G, 3G, or 4G, that there is a big economic advantage to be the first mover as a country and a region in terms of the technology being deployed in your country first." <https://www.inverse.com/article/48228-why-china-is-winning-the-race-with-the-us-to-5g-internet>. "The first countries to adopt the next generation of wireless communications will experience 'disproportionate gains,' as 5G brings and 'era of untapped economic potential.'" <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-telecoms-5g/united-states-falling-behind-china-in-race-to-5g-wireless-deloitte-report-idUSKBN1KSOBE>.

¹⁹ <https://www.meritalk.com/articles/is-5g-the-magic-bullet-for-rural-internet-access/>.

One wireless carrier is even critical of another for deploying pre-standard 5G systems.²⁰ Further, the standard is set by a committee consisting of companies, not countries.²¹ Thus, the standard will be set regardless of where pre-standard 5G systems have been deployed. While such deployments may assist in evaluating performance in the field of various configurations, the knowledge gained will be acquired without regard to where the pre-standard system has been deployed.

The Joint Petitioners agree that the deployment of 5G technology represents a significant economic boom to the United States, both in terms of workers engaging in the deployment as well as the economic benefits of system usage. However, such benefits accrue regardless of whether the United States is first to deploy, or second. Finally, given the more intensive infrastructure necessary for 5G deployment, particularly in the area of backhaul, it is impossible to believe that 5G deployments will be made in areas where wireless carriers have elected not to build 4G systems for economic reasons.

The skepticism of the Joint Petitioners in the need for speed should not be taken to indicate a lack of interest in 5G technology. Rather, the Joint Petitioners are excited about the prospect of 5G deployment. In particular, 5G is an enabling technology for a smart city. Laying the foundation for the technological infrastructure for connected building, vehicles, streets and more is a potential that should be encouraged and, to the extent possible, given every reasonable regulatory advantage. However, such deployments should be in cooperation with municipalities, and not in a manner which sets municipalities and carriers as opposing forces.

²⁰ "I can't believe that I have to say this, but yes, industry standards matter. Verizon's ignoring them in their rush to fixed 5G this year, but that just means that they're building a bridge to nowhere. 5G should be built with interoperability and scalability in mind... and that means respecting industry standards." <https://www.t-mobile.com/news/5g-ces-wrap-up>.

²¹ <http://www.3gpp.org/about-3gpp/partners>.

B. The FCC's Decision Is Inconsistent With Its Deregulatory Agenda

The current Commission (and Administration in general) has expressed the desire to deregulate whenever and wherever possible, applying “light touch” regulation instead.²² However, the *Report & Order* represents an extreme overreach into issues that infringe on the sovereignty of states without any real justification. While the Joint Petitioners can appreciate the much-touted examples of municipal overreach in the antenna siting process, the Commission treats these situations as the norm, and not as outliers.

However, as discussed above, the norm is states, cities and counties working with carriers to enable and encourage bringing wireless services to citizens. These negotiations have been on a bipartisan basis, which have taken into account the unique geographic, economic, cultural and historic situations in each case. The Commission's *Report & Order* treats the entire country as homogenous, ignoring very differences which have made the country the most desirable place to implement 5G technologies.

At the same time, the Joint Petitioners are sensitive to the deployment difficulties that may ensue with differing regulatory schemes from one mile to the next. However, the Joint Petitioners are confident that the Commission, together with carriers and municipalities, can develop a true regulatory regime that can address the outlier municipalities that seek to truly prohibit the implementation of technological advances through limited, targeted rules. The Joint Petitioners recognize that this was the goal of the Commission's Broadband Deployment Advisory Committee (“BDAC”). Unfortunately, the BDAC was never able to fulfill its mission, as the imbalance between carrier and municipality representation prohibited a consensus result. At the end, the broad-reaching, intrusive *Report & Order* does not accomplish the goal of speeding broadband

²² <https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/eAgendaMain>.

deployments. Instead, it creates an environment where endless litigation will ensure the failure of the Commission's stated goals.

The following represents specific areas of concern to the Joint Petitioners.

C. The Commission Fails To Account For True Cost Recovery

The proposed recurring fee structure is an unreasonable overreach that will harm local policy and has the potential to discriminate against other industries. "Fair and reasonable compensation" as meaning approximately \$270 per small cell site is not reasonable. Local governments have worked to negotiate fair deals with wireless providers which may exceed that number or provide additional benefits to the community.²³ In addition, to mandate a fee for one industry has the potential to discriminate against another industry which may use the same asset.

The Commission seeks to substitute its judgment of "reasonable fees" for those municipalities that have reached agreements with wireless providers. However, the Commission has no specific expertise as to the costs of implementation in, for example, the City of Philadelphia, that is greater than the City's knowledge. Yet the City was able to successfully reach agreements with Verizon, Mobilitie, Crown Castle and AT&T.²⁴

As an example of costs that must be attributable to site applications, in New Orleans there are several levels of application review by different departments. There is review by the New Orleans City Council Utilities Regulatory Office, City Attorney's Office and the New Orleans Finance Department. Site review, vital for safety and permitting, is performed by Information Technology and Innovation (ITI), Department of Public Works (DPW), the Department of Safety

²³ See, for example, Letter to FCC from the City of Upper Arlington, Ohio, dated September 19, 2018; Letter from Fort Pierce, Florida dated October 1, 2018;

²⁴ <https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/103154366759/MOTON%20FOR%20STAY.pdf>.

and Permits, Historic District Landmarks Commission (HDLC) and Vieux Carre' Commission (VCC). Enforcement is provided by Safety and Permits, Finance, and the City Attorney's Office.

Middleburg utilizes similar procedures, as discussed in its July 15, 2011 Comments. Like New Orleans, the Town's "... economic success is largely dependent upon maintaining its existing historical character..."²⁵ In both situations, the municipalities have carefully crafted procedures to retain their character, while at the same time ensuring that their services are allowed to advance.

It is clear that a flat fee of \$270 per site does not provide cost recovery of these services. The Commission fails to recognize even the cost of routine maintenance around such sites, functions as routine as trash pick-up or lawn maintenance. Similarly, there's no recognition of the costs for when poles fall, where costs can include police, fire and EMS. Instead, the Commission would have such costs recoverable from municipal citizens through increased taxes, requiring citizens to subsidize the profits of wireless carriers. Further, the Commission negates the ability of municipalities to fairly spread such costs over all of the users of rights of way, potentially setting up the prospect of litigation over discriminatory treatment of such users.

In addition, municipalities are not mere landlords of municipal rights of way in the development of 5G services. Rather, municipalities represent the connectivity between carriers and users that are needed by wireless providers to make enhanced services successful. Smart cities and buildings do not happen without municipal involvement. Unfortunately, the Commission's *Report & Order* reduces, if not totally eliminates, the budgetary ability of municipalities to ensure that these advanced services become reality.

Lower fees that are limited to "cost recovery," limits localities' ability to capitalize on the new technology addressed by the order and the ability to make the necessary upgrades to

²⁵ Town of Middleburg July 15, 2011 Comments at 5.

technology systems, including: Advanced Metering Infrastructure/Smart Meters; Sensors; Emergency Management; and Grid Modernization. Thus, the very services which the Commission seeks to encourage, with the potential for greater usage fees by carriers, are pre-empted from implementation. By focusing on the supposedly limited capital budgets of wireless carriers (who appear to have an unlimited budgetary ability to bid on spectrum at auction), the Commission ignore the very real budget and resource availabilities of municipalities. Viewed another way, the Commission's action seems to be a massive reallocation of money from cities and counties to the federal budget, as the Commission's *Report & Order* frees up capital for wireless carriers to bid at auction, while depriving municipalities of needed capital to operate.

It has been claimed by the Commission that the *Report & Order* will save \$2 billion in deployment costs.²⁶ However, the real impact is that the *Report & Order* results in a massive shift of costs from carriers to the public, as municipalities will now have to recover costs from its citizens. In essence, the Commission has created a massive tax bill for consumers, to the economic benefit of for-profit corporations. However, even the FCC's Tax Bill doesn't yield faster 5G build-outs, according to the very carriers that the Commission seeks to benefit.²⁷ Indeed, the carriers have indicated that they won't be devoting more money to infrastructure build-outs as a result of the *Report & Order*, despite the FCC's stated intention.²⁸

The Joint Petitioners are aware of the Letter sent by a number of members of the United States Congress dated September 25, 2018.²⁹ The Joint Petitioners agree that the FCC should set "guardrails" for small cell review. However, the Commission has failed to ensure that

²⁶ <https://www.theverge.com/2018/9/26/17905620/fcc-5g-deployment-shot-clock-vote>.

²⁷ <https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2018/10/fccs-2-billion-giveaway-to-carriers-wont-speed-up-verizons-5g-deployment/>.

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ <https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/filing/1092585347000>.

municipalities “... are fully compensated for their costs in issuing permits, overseeing deployment, and where necessary, managing the rights of way for use by communications providers.”³⁰

The Commission seeks to bring uniformity to a country with diverse geography, history and development. The Commission’s goal of enabling faster deployment of wireless facilities will not be met by the imposition of unreasonable maximum fees has the exact opposite effect. Instead of rapid deployments and reduced litigation, the industry is now guaranteed litigation over the Commission’s rules itself, as well as multiple municipalities entering into individual litigation to demonstrate that their fees over the Commission’s minimum are reasonable. The Joint Petitioners cannot see this as a desirable outcome for anyone.

D. MUNICIPALITIES AND BUSINESSES SHOULD NOT BE COMPETITORS

Another consequence of the Commission’s *Report & Order* is that municipalities will now be in competition with the businesses that serve their cities and counties. Specifically, by not allowing market rates to prevail, municipalities are now priced less than the private buildings and private land owned within the municipality. Through this lens, it is clear that one of the reasons that carriers are driving the Commission to this result is to reduce their costs for providing any service.

The Commission should not be artificially reducing carrier costs by arbitrarily regulating the real estate marketplace. This is not a proper function for the Commission. Rather, the Commission should be enabling a competitive marketplace between the telecommunications carriers which it is charged to regulate.

³⁰ *Id.*

E. THE DEFINITION OF “EFFECTIVE PROHIBITION” IS OVERLY BROAD

The definition of “effective prohibition” invites challenges to long-standing locally owned rights of way requirements unless they meet a subjective and unclear set of guidelines. This definition opens local governments to the likelihood of more, not less, conflict and litigation over requirements for aesthetics, spacing, and undergrounding.

The Commission finds that fees can be an “insurmountable barrier” to providing service.³¹ However, the reality in the marketplace is that there regardless of how low fees are (even below the miniscule fees set in the *Report & Order*), the real “insurmountable barrier” is the barrier to **obtaining** service in extremely underserved areas, even within urban areas. Despite the Commission’s Secondary Markets Initiative,³² it has been virtually impossible to encourage carriers to serve these areas. Rather, the focus has been on those areas with the greatest economic possibilities. By eliminating the ability of municipalities to create incentive to serve underserved areas through, for example, the creative initiatives by municipalities such as the City of San Jose, California,³³ the Commission’s *Report & Order* only deepens the digital divide which is decried by so many.³⁴

F. THE REVISED “SHOT CLOCK” POSES NUMEROUS PROBLEMS

The new expedited 60 day shot clock is problematic because it does not take into account a preexisting structures’ design or suitability for attaching wireless equipment. In addition, as these facilities are not subject to federal historical and environmental reviews this places an

³¹ *Report & Order* at para. 41-42.

³² <https://www.fcc.gov/wireless/bureau-divisions/technologies-systems-and-innovation-division/spectrum-leasing/secondary>.

³³ <https://www.fiercewireless.com/wireless/verizon-to-other-cities-don-t-use-san-jose-s-small-cell-deployment-model>.

³⁴ <https://www.axios.com/5g-digital-divide-19b70d34-4978-44df-a1cb-ae9222d113ef.html>;
http://www.bbcmag.com/2017mags/Mar_Apr/BBC_Mar17_5GNotAnswer.pdf.

unreasonable burden on local governments to prevent historic preservation, environmental or safety harms to the community. In this regard, any redefined shot clock could result in the need for additional staff to meet these time frames, personnel that otherwise would not be necessary. Thus, “reasonable costs” should specifically allow for the recovery of costs for such personnel.

The Joint Petitioners do not seek to impede reasonable development within jurisdictions, however there are several areas where the newly adopted provisions fall short of their goal. For example, to avoid “presumptive prohibition” and “expedited relief in court,” the Commission should articulate a cap to the number of applications submitted at one time as well as period of time between submissions.³⁵ The Commission has also failed to sufficiently articulate procedures when the shot clock is missed. For example, may a municipality reject specific sites after an Order has been issued?³⁶ Would a declared emergency (such as a hurricane) presumptively a reasonable delay and exception to a shot clock?³⁷ In this regard, the Joint Petitioners believe that it would be more appropriate for there to be a finding of bad faith for a permanent injunction to be issued.³⁸

In attempting to create a “one size fits all” environment, the Commission also fails to recognize (for example) issues such as the New Orleans Charter’s requirement of a three-week layover for franchise agreement. This dramatically impacts the City’s ability to meet a shot clock.

It is insufficient for the Commission to create a nationwide shot clock that mirrors the shot clocks adopted by several states without reviewing the totality of the rules adopted in each case.³⁹ Rather, other provisions adopted by these states, not similarly adopted by the Commission, make short shot clocks more palatable and are easier to achieve. If multiple carriers submitted

³⁵ See, *Report & Order* at para. 114.

³⁶ See, *Report & Order* at para. 116.

³⁷ See, *Report & Order* at para. 115.

³⁸ See, *Report & Order* at para. 117.

³⁹ See, *Report & Order* at para. 127.

applications for small cell approval of over 50 cells all on the same day to a City such as the City of Lexington, Virginia, where they outsource their planning department, it would be impossible to complete this timely review given their normal workflow.⁴⁰ Even for a large in-house planning departments, these small cell reviews should not be given preferred status over other types of planning review that were submitted before the particular small cell applications. Other localities have one person on staff who conduct these reviews and if that person were out of the office for medical reasons or vacation the locality would be adversely affected by this nationwide shot clock, merely because of their size.

G. UNDERGROUNDING OF UTILITIES SHOULD NOT BE INHIBITED

Local governments have worked hard to underground utilities at a substantial cost, but to the benefit of citizens. For example, Dominion Energy estimates that it has spent \$17,308,643.00 in undergrounding utilities at the request of localities. Dominion Energy has also invested in over 762 miles of underground projects from 2016-2018 at a cost of \$90,704,172.00 that Dominion identified. Dominion's total project will cost an estimated \$2 Billion.⁴¹ Thwarting that initiative with a requirement of collocation of up to three cubic feet of antenna and 28 cubic feet of additional equipment could destroy the aesthetics of these areas. Localities should have the ability to prescribe the location and aesthetics of these collocations.

This is not to suggest that small cell deployment should be prohibited in such areas. However, the Commission's statement in paragraph 90 that "... a requirement that materially inhibits wireless service, even if it does not go so far as requiring that all wireless facilities be deployed underground, also would be considered an effective prohibition of service" is troubling.

⁴⁰ See, for example, the Letter from Representatives Denise Provost, Christine Barber, Mike Connolly and Senator Pat Jehlen, dated October 16, 2018.

⁴¹ https://www.richmond.com/business/local/dominion-virginia-power-launching-billion-program-to-underground-outage-prone/article_008d25a4-a78c-5811-a336-e76554f8f494.html.

Such a vague standard as “materially inhibits” provides little guidance and will unquestionably lead to a significant amount of litigation. Again, the Commission’s action is directly contrary to its stated goal of speeding the construction of small cells. Rather, the *Report & Order* guarantees delays.⁴²

H. MINIMUM SPACING REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE FURTHER DEFINED

The Joint Petitioners are pleased that the Commission has not found that minimum spacing requirements from other facilities to, amongst other things, avoid excessive overhead “clutter” is not per se violative.⁴³ However, the Commission has not discussed the opposite issue, which is whether municipalities can **require** that new poles erected by carriers be capable of supporting more than one carrier.

The Joint Petitioners believe that aesthetic concerns are a proper consideration for municipalities. However, creating a de facto small cell monopoly by one or a few providers because of minimum spacing requirements should not be a necessary outcome. Thus, for newly installed (or replacement) facilities, municipalities should have the ability (but not the requirement) to require that such constructions be capable of accommodating more than one carrier (either through neutral hosting requirements or other space requirements). The Joint Petitioners urge the Commission to address this issue, and approve the proposal.

Additionally, the Commission has failed to adequately address the impact of the *Report & Order* on existing agreements between municipalities and communications providers. Thus, an

⁴² While in some circumstances it might be argued that initial cases will create the groundwork for what constitutes “material,” if indeed the Commission’s goal is 5G deployments on an expedited basis, later deployments (which will have the benefit of a negotiated or litigated standard) will have failed to meet the expedited goal.

⁴³ See, *Report & Order* at para. 91.

additional detriment to the Commission's action is to create uncertainty regarding deployments under construction, thereby delaying the deployments that the Commission sought to accelerate.⁴⁴

III. CONCLUSION

The FCC's *Report and Order* effectively discards agreements made at the local level in favor of painting the canvas with too broad a brush. In doing so, the FCC ignores what is obvious: local people know how best to handle local issues. The implementation of 5G technology is no different. The challenges facing Philadelphia, PA are very different than those facing Conway, AR. Because of these differences, both Philadelphia and Conway should have as much leeway as possible to work with wireless providers at the local level to determine the best way to implement this technology. The FCC, while perhaps well meaning, does not know the best way for the cities and towns of Arkansas – or any city or town in America – to effectively and efficiently implement this much needed technology.

While the Commission's goal in streamlining small cell deployments is laudable, the *Report & Order* does so in a manner which is extremely prejudicial to municipalities. This is not to say that the Joint Petitioners oppose 5G build-outs. In fact, quite the opposite. The Joint Petitioners believe that 5G services bring the promise of connected buildings and connected cities to reality. Similarly, the Joint Petitioners do not support those municipalities that needlessly delay application reviews, or seek to use the process to extort carriers. Rather, the Joint Petitioners believe that sensible legislation can be enacted which serves the interests of timely application review, fair recovery of all costs related to use of rights of way, and proper consideration of local concerns.

⁴⁴ For this, and many other reasons, the Joint Petitioners support the Motion for Stay submitted by a coalition of multiple entities on October 31, 2018. <https://ecfsapi.fcc.gov/file/103154366759/MOTON%20FOR%20STAY.pdf>.

The Joint Petitioners urge the Commission to revisit its decisions, as discussed above, and create a regulatory framework that actually balances legitimate concerns between carriers and municipalities, and does not create an endless future of litigation. In doing so, the Commission must not set maximum site fees, but rather recognize that different localities have different costs and different tax structures. Further, the Commission must revise the shot clock rules to recognize individual circumstances.

WHEREFORE, the premises considered, it respectfully requested that the Commission RECONSIDER its *Report & Order*, and act in accordance with the views expressed herein.

Respectfully submitted,

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA
VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
KENTUCKY LEAGUE OF CITIES
MISSISSIPPI MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
PENNSYLVANIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
ALABAMA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES
ARKANSAS MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
NEVADA LEAGUE OF CITIES
& MUNICIPALITIES
JEFFERSON PARISH, LOUISIANA
TOWN OF MIDDLEBURG, VIRGINIA
GOVERNMENT WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY
& COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION

By: Alan S. Tilles, Esquire

Shulman Rogers Gandal Pordy & Ecker, P.A.
12505 Park Potomac Ave., Sixth Floor
Potomac, Maryland 20854
(301) 230-5200

Date: November 14, 2018



PUBLIC NOTICE

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

News Media Information 202 / 418-0500
Internet: <https://www.fcc.gov>
TTY: 1-888-835-5322

DA 18-1303

Released: December 26, 2018

**WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS BUREAU ESTABLISHES UNIFORM
DEADLINES FOR OPPOSITIONS AND REPLIES REGARDING A PETITION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF THE
WIRELESS INFRASTRUCTURE DECLARATORY RULING AND
THIRD REPORT AND ORDER**

WT Docket No. 17-79 and WC Docket No. 17-84

**Opposition Date: 15 Days After Federal Register Publication of Notice of Petition for
Reconsideration**

**Reply Date: 10 Days After the Time for Filing Oppositions to Petition for
Reconsideration has Expired**

By this Public Notice, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Bureau) establishes a uniform deadline for oppositions to and replies to oppositions to a petition for reconsideration of the *Wireless Infrastructure Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order*.¹ Allan S. Tilles, on behalf of the City of New Orleans, Louisiana; Virginia Municipal League; Kentucky League of Cities; Mississippi Municipal League; Pennsylvania Municipal League; Alabama League of Municipalities; Arkansas Municipal League; Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities; Town of Middleburg, Virginia; Jefferson Parish, Louisiana; and the Government Wireless Technology & Communications Association filed a petition seeking reconsideration of the *Wireless Infrastructure Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order*.² This Petition asks the Commission to reconsider the recurring fee structure, the definition of “effective prohibition,” and undergrounding and minimum spacing issues in the *Declaratory Ruling*, and the presumptively reasonable periods of time for processing deployment applications in the *Third Report and Order*.³

¹ See *Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment; Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, WT Docket No. 17-79, WC Docket No. 17-84, Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order, FCC 18-133 (rel. Sept. 27, 2018).

² See Petition for Reconsideration of the City of New Orleans, Louisiana; Virginia Municipal League; Kentucky League of Cities; Mississippi Municipal League; Pennsylvania Municipal League; Alabama League of Municipalities; Arkansas Municipal League; Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities; Town of Middleburg, Virginia; Jefferson Parish, Louisiana; and the Government Wireless Technology & Communications Association., WT Docket No. 17-79, WC Docket No. 17-84 (filed Nov. 14, 2018) (“Petition”).

³ *Id.*

Oppositions to a petition for reconsideration of an order in a non-rulemaking proceeding are due within 10 days after the petition is filed.⁴ In contrast, oppositions to a petition for reconsideration of a final order in a rulemaking proceeding are due within 15 days after the Commission publishes notice in the Federal Register of the timely filed petitions for reconsideration.⁵ Similarly, the deadlines for replies to oppositions vary—seven days after oppositions are due in a non-rulemaking⁶ compared to 10 days for a final order in a rulemaking.⁷

For the convenience of all parties, to promote administrative efficiency, and to avoid unnecessary confusion from parties who may be uncertain about the deadlines for filing oppositions and replies to the Petition, the Bureau hereby adopts uniform deadlines for the filing of oppositions to the Petition, and for replies to such oppositions. The Bureau therefore harmonizes the opposition and reply cycle by setting the dates for oppositions to the Petition and any replies thereto using the timeline provided in the Commission's rules for responding to petitions for reconsideration of a final order in a rulemaking proceeding.

Oppositions to the Petition shall be filed within 15 days after the date that notice of the Petition is published in the Federal Register and replies to oppositions shall be filed within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.⁸ A separate Public Notice will be issued when notice of the Petition is published in the Federal Register.

Because the Commission received many comments in the *Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order* proceeding, and because the Bureau is releasing this Public Notice, the Bureau finds good cause to waive the service requirements in 47 CFR §§ 1.106(f)-(h) and 1.429(f)-(g).⁹ This Public Notice provides sufficient notice to interested stakeholders of the existence of the Petition and of parties' opportunity to respond to the Petition.

Action by the Deputy Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.

For further information, please contact Donald Johnson of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Competition and Infrastructure Policy Division, at (202) 418-7444 or Donald.Johnson@fcc.gov.

- FCC -

⁴ See 47 CFR § 1.106(g).

⁵ See 47 CFR § 1.429(f).

⁶ See 47 CFR § 1.106(h).

⁷ See 47 CFR § 1.429(g).

⁸ See 47 CFR § 1.429(f)-(g).

⁹ See 47 CFR §§ 1.106(f)-(h); 1.3, 1.429(f)-(g).



PUBLIC NOTICE

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

News Media Information 202 / 418-0500
Fax-On-Demand 202 / 418-2830
TTY 202 / 418-2555
Internet: <http://www.fcc.gov>
<ftp.fcc.gov>

Report No. 3109

January 2, 2019

PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ACTION IN PROCEEDING

A Petition for Reconsideration has been filed in the Commission's proceeding listed in this Public Notice and published pursuant to 47 CFR Section 1.429(e). The full text of this document is available for viewing and copying in the Reference and Information Center, Room CY-A257, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. Oppositions to the petition must be filed within 15 days of the date of publication of this public notice in the Federal Register. See Section 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rules (47 CFR § 1.4(b)(1)). Replies to an opposition must be filed within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.

Subject: - In the Matter of Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment (WT Docket No. 17-79 and WC Docket No. 17-84)

Filed By: - Alan S. Tilles, on behalf of the City of New Orleans, Louisiana; Virginia Municipal League; Kentucky League of Cities; Mississippi Municipal League Pennsylvania Municipal League; Alabama League of Municipalities; Arkansas Municipal League; Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities; Town of Middleburg, Virginia; Jefferson Parish, Louisiana; and Government Wireless Technology & Communications Association (Filed November 14, 2018)

FCC

considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the Web, cloud, or other file sharing system).

For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For additional information on this action, contact Rochelle Boyd, Sector Policies and Programs Division, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (D243-02), Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, NC 27711; telephone number: (919) 541-1390; and email address: boyd.rochelle@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: To allow for additional time for stakeholders to provide comments, the EPA has decided to reopen the public comment period until February 12, 2019.

Dated: February 1, 2019.

Panagiotis Tsirigotis,

Director, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards.

[FR Doc. 2019-01366 Filed 2-6-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 60

[EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495; FRL-9989-04-OAR]

RIN 2060-AT56

Review of Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Extension of public comment period.

SUMMARY: On December 6, 2018, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed a rule titled "Review of Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units." The EPA is extending the public comment period from February 19, 2019, until March 18, 2019, which is consistent with the requirement to keep the record open for at least 30 days after the public hearing, which is scheduled

for February 14, 2019, in Washington, DC. Information about the public hearing was posted online on January 30, 2019, and can be found at <https://www.epa.gov/stationary-sources-air-pollution/proposal-nsps-ghg-emissions-new-modified-and-reconstructed-egus>.

DATES: The public comment period for the proposed rule published in the **Federal Register** on December 20, 2018 is being extended. Written comments must be received on or before March 18, 2019.

ADDRESSES: *Comments.* Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495, at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from *Regulations.gov*. *Regulations.gov* is our preferred method of receiving comments. However, other submission methods are accepted:

- *Email:* a-and-r-docket@epa.gov.

Include Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495 in the subject line of the message.

- *Fax:* (202) 566-9744. Attention Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495.

- *Mail:* To ship or send mail via the United States Postal Service, use the following address: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA Docket Center, Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495, Mail Code 28221T, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20460.

- *Hand/Courier Delivery:* Use the following Docket Center address if you are using express mail, commercial delivery, hand delivery, or courier: EPA Docket Center, EPA WJC West Building, Room 3334, 1301 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20004. Delivery verification signatures will be available only during regular business hours.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For questions about this proposed action, contact Mr. Christian Fellner, Sector Policies and Programs Division (D205-01), Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711; telephone number: (919) 541-4003; fax number: (919) 541-4991; and email address: fellner.christian@epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: *Instructions.* Direct your comments to Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495. The EPA's policy is that all comments received will be included in the public docket without change and may be made available online at <https://www.regulations.gov>. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be Confidential Business

Information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. If you need to include CBI as part of your comment, send or deliver information identified as CBI only to the following address: OAQPS Document Control Officer (C404-02), OAQPS, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, Attention Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495.

The EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. The EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the Web, cloud, or other file sharing system).

For additional submission methods, the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <https://www.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

Dated: January 31, 2019.

Panagiotis Tsirigotis,

Director, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards.

[FR Doc. 2019-01365 Filed 2-6-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Parts 1 and 73

[WT Docket No. 17-79 and WC Docket No. 17-84; Report No. 3109]

Petition for Reconsideration of Action in Rulemaking Proceeding

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Petition for Reconsideration.

SUMMARY: A Petition for Reconsideration (Petition) has been filed in the Commission's proceeding by Alan S. Tilles, on behalf of The City of New Orleans, Louisiana; Virginia Municipal League; Kentucky League of Cities; Mississippi Municipal League; Pennsylvania Municipal League; Alabama League of Municipalities; Arkansas Municipal League; Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities; Town of Middleburg, Virginia; Jefferson Parish, Louisiana; and Government Wireless Technology & Communications Association.

2486

Federal Register / Vol. 84, No. 26 / Thursday, February 7, 2019 / Proposed Rules

DATES: Oppositions to the Petition must be filed on or before February 22, 2019. Replies to an opposition must be filed on or before March 4, 2019.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street SW, Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald Johnson, Competition and Infrastructure Policy Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, at (202) 418-7444, email: Donald.Johnson@fcc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's document, Report No. 3109, released

January 2, 2019. The full text of the Petition is available for viewing and copying at the FCC Reference Information Center, 445 12th Street SW, Room CY-A257, Washington, DC 20554. It also may be accessed online via the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System at: <http://apps.fcc.gov/ecfs/>. The Commission will not send a Congressional Review Act (CRA) submission to Congress or the Government Accountability Office pursuant to the CRA, 5.U.S.C. because no rules are being adopted by the Commission.

Subject: Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment, FCC 18-133, published at 83 FR 51867, October 15, 2018, in WT Docket No. 17-79; WC Docket No. 17-84. This document is being published pursuant to 47 CFR 1.429(e). *See also* 47 CFR 1.4(b)(1) and 1.429(f), (g).

Number of Petitions Filed: 1.

Federal Communications Commission.

Katura Jackson,

Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2019-01479 Filed 2-6-19; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712-01-P