**STATEMENT OF  
COMMISSIONER JESSICA ROSENWORCEL  
APPROVING IN PART, DISSENTING IN PART**

Re: *Accelerating Wireline Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment*, WC Docket No. 17-84.

Broadband is more than a technology. It’s a platform for opportunity. Every choice this agency makes should further that opportunity for all of us. That is how I believe we build a more powerful future.

That might be a lofty sentiment—but I also think it’s our duty under the law. This is a duty that I believe the FCC should take seriously. But here, in this proceeding purportedly about accelerating wireline broadband deployment, the FCC fails this test. Too little of what is before us will extend the reach of broadband opportunity while a whole host of it will increase the number of consumers cut off from communications service without fair warning.

Let me explain: This proceeding is fundamentally about notice. As a result of the actions the FCC takes today, households and businesses in communities across the country may find their service altered without advance warning and no guarantee of an equivalent replacement. Recognize that rural areas are at special risk—because the economics favor removing facilities without putting in place truly comparable service.

I know that networks need to be updated. I understand the need to swap out old services and replace them with new infrastructure. But it defies logic to suggest that this can be done without working with the customers and communities where network change occurs. To those who are affected by change—consumers, businesses, state officials, tribal authorities, and first responders—the FCC says tough, figure it out, you’re on your own. Because I think this is cold and cruel comfort for the millions who rely on these services today and are unlikely to see better broadband in the future, I dissent.

At the risk of being technocratic, I want to approve one aspect of today’s decision. I believe the order accurately restates the law with respect to the exclusion of capital expenses recovered from non-recurring pole attachment make ready costs. It also clarifies timelines for resolution of pole attachment complaints. I believe this clarity can help facilitate broadband deployment in a manner that is consumer friendly. So this discrete aspect of today’s decision has my support.