

Testimony of Jonathan M. Campbell, Director of Government Affairs, PCIA—The Wireless Infrastructure Association Before the

Pennsylvania House of Representatives Consumer Affairs Committee

Hearing on House **Ell 2061** – Wireless Broadband Collocation Act

March 26,2012

Chairman Godshall, Democratic Chairman Preston, and members of the Committee,

On behalf of **PCIA**—The Wireless Infrastructure Association, thank you for the **opportunity** to participate in this hearing on House Bill 2061. PCIA applauds the sponsors of HB 2061 for their recognition of the benefits and necessity of wireless services, and for their action to ensure that **Pennsylvanians** have access to these services. Wireless service and **infrastructure** providers strive to **ensure** access to robust services across Pennsylvania and the United States. In light of recent federal law, PCIA urges the Committee to augment HB 2061 to work hand-in-hand with the new federal law and strengthen the consistency and predictability necessary for statewide deployment of advanced wireless networks.

In years past, wireless providers' work was **benchmarked** by coverage, as indicated by the now ubiquitous "service **bars**" on the displays of most handsets. However, the nature of wireless services, their use by consumers and public **safety**, and the industry's benchmarks for delivering these services continue to change rapidly. **Wireless** pmviders **are** currently undertaking a **multi-faceted** effort to delivery next-generation wireless services, such as 4G LTE. In addition, wireless providers are working to ensure that current and next-generation networks have the capacity to handle the drastic surge of **traffic** associated with the increasing adoption of **smartphones**, tablets and other data devices.

Wireless services, **from** basic voice communication to mobile broadband, enable **communication**, productivity, mobility, and public safety. Wirelesslinfrastructure is necessary for the effective provision of wireless services. The strategic deployment of wireless **infrastructure** improves the efficient use of limited spectrum resources, which in turn improves the **performance** of wireless services. **Wireless infrastructure** – inclung towers, **rooftop** facilities, **distributed** antenna systems ("**DAS**"), and more – is the backbone of wireless networks; without it, wireless **services** cannot be delivered to **users**. HB 2061 encourages the efficient use of existing, approved infrastructure to rapidly deploy the wireless facilities necessary to deliver

¹ PCIA is the national trade association representing the wireless telecommunications infrastructure industry PCIA's members, which include wireless carriers and infrastructure providers, develop, own, manage and operate more than 125,000 telecommunications towers and antenna structures upon which cell sites can be collocated. PCIA seeks to facilitate the widespread deployment of communications networks across the country, consistent with the mandate of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. PCIA and its members work with the federal government and partner with communities across the nation to affect solutions for wireless infrastructure deployment that are responsive to the unique sensitivities and concerns of states and localities. For more information, visit wWW.Dela.com.

these services by streamlining the review processes, which reduces both deployment costs and timelines.

Wireless networks and the infrastructure that supports them must adapt to growing capacity demands. In the last four years, traffic on wireless networks has increased 1.800 percent² with a projected growth of 18 times current levels of mobile data traffic in the next five vears. Mobile broadband users are projected to outnumber wireline broadband users by 2015, when a majority of Americans will utilize a wireless device as their primary Internet access tool? This will result in two billion networked mobile devices by 2015.5 With limited spectrum resources, wireless providers are leveraging a wide array of wireless facilities, such as DAS and small cell solutions, to address increased capacity demands in a variety of environments.

Furthermore, wireless networks and infrastructure must expand their vital role in facilitating public safety. In Pennsylvania, the number of adults and children living in wireless-only households has increased 83.3% and 116.6%, respectively, between December 2007 and June 2010. With more than 70 percent of all emergency calls placed with a wireless device, wireless capacity and coverage is essential to ensuring access to public safety agencies wherever citizens are, whenever they need it. Also, public safety agencies themselves will be able to take advantage of streamlined collocation and modification review processes as they **construct** and maintain their own telecommunications networks.

Collocating and modifying wireless facilities on existing structures is the most efficient and cost-effective method of **building** out a wireless network and providing necessary capacity. The infrastructure that supports current wireless **networks** has passed an extensive local **zoning** and permitting process. That existing infrastructure can be used to serve the same purposes for next-generation public safety and commercial wireless networks. The use of existing **infrastructure** improves speed to market and reduces capital expenditures, thereby facilitating deployment. **PCIA** members estimate that an average new site build costs approximately **\$250,000 - \$300,000**, while an average collocation costs **\$25,000 - \$30,000** to deploy. The math is simple—a carrier can deploy approximately ten collocations for the cost of a single new tower.

Yet despite the increasing importance and reliance on wireless services, local regulation of collocation and modification of wireless facilities remains a persistent barrier to the deployment of wireless services. Many local governments impose significant red-tape and burdens on wireless facility deployment and the efficient use of approved, existing infrastructure.

Mobile Future, 2011 Mobile Year In Review. available at

http://mobilefuture.org/content/pages/2011 mobile year in review (last accessed March 23, 2012).

Quentin Hardy, The Explosion of Mobile Video, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 14,2012, available at http://bits.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/02/14/the-explosion-of-mobile-video/.

Hayley Tsukayama, IDC: Mobile Internet users to outnumber wireline users by 2015, WASHINGTON POST, available at http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-tech/post/idc-mobile-internet-users-to-outnumber-wirelineusers-by-2015/2011/09-12/glOAkZP7MK blog.html?wprss=post-tech (last accessed December 5,2011).

Mobile Future, 2011 Mobile Year In Review, available at

http://mobilefuture.org/content/pages/2011 mobile vear in review (last accessed March 23.2012).

Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D., et al., Wireless Substitution: State-level Estimates Fmm the National Health Interview Survey, January 2007 – June 2010, National Health Statistics Reports Number 39, at Table I (April 20, 2011). FCC gov, Guide: Wireless 911 Services, http://www.fcc.gov/guides/wireless-911-services

Foremost among the burdens is the requirement of a de novo zoning review for a collocation and the requirement of a special or conditional use permit to collocate or modify facilities on an existing structure. When wireless infrastructure is initially permitted, it passes the jurisdiction's health, safety and welfare review with regards to its placement and its use for the provision of wireless services. The collocation of additional antennas that do not substantially change the size of the tower should not trigger a full zoning review because: radio frequency emissions must adhere to strict FCC guidelines; safety issues are addressed through an engineering report certified by a licensed engineer as part of a standard building permit; and aesthetics and related concerns are not an issue because the tower itself is essentially unchanged.

In recent years, numerous states have revised wireless siting laws and regulations to streamline the review process for siting of wireless facilities on existing infrastructure. For example, California, Florida, Georgia, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Tennessee passed legislation that **streamlines** the efficientuse of existing **infrastructure** through collocation and modification.'

More recently, Congress enacted a streamlined process for the collocation and modification of wireless facilities as part of the Middle Class **Tax** Relief and Job Creation Act of **2012.** This law requires *state* and **local** governments to approve applications for collocation, removal, or replacement of wireless facilities that will not substantially increase the physical dimensions of the underlying tower. In effect, this law removes discretionary local review of these applications. This new law works in conjunction with the Federal Communications Commission Wireless Facility Siting Shot Clock, which **requires** State and local governments to act on an application to **collocate** wireless facilities on existing structures **within** 90 days. ¹⁰

Though the regulatory landscape has changed with the enactment of the federal law, HB 2061 affords the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania an opportunity to strengthen the federal law and further speed the deployment of advanced wireless networks across the State. PCIA urges the Committee to streamline review processes for the efficient use of non-traditional vertical infrastructure, including utility poles and transmission towers. As coverage gaps and capacity constraints are often in urban centers and other areas where macro wireless towers may not be feasible or readily available, streamlining the review process for collocations on non-traditional vertical infrastructure will allow wireless service and infrastructure providers to utilize a diverse array of wireless facilities, such as DAS, to effectively address service demands and needs across Pennsylvania

^{\$} CAL. GOVT CODE § 65850.6(2006); FLA. STAT. 5 365.172 (2006); GA. CODE ANN. §§36-66B-1-4 (2010); NEV. REV. STAT. § 707.575 (2003); N.J. STAY. §40:55D-46.2 (2012); N.C. GEN. STAT. § 160A-400.53 (2007); TENN. CODE ANN. § 13-24-305 (2005).

⁹ Pub. L. No. 112-96, § 6409 (2012), available at <a href="http://www.gpo.gov/fdsvs/pkg/BILLS-112hr3630enr/pdf/BILLS-112hr3640enr/pdf/BILLS-112hr3640enr/pdf/BILLS-112hr3640enr/pdf/BILLS-112hr3640enr/pdf/BILLS-112hr3640enr/pdf/B

Petition for Declaratory Ruling To Clarify Provisions of Section 332(C)(7)(B) To Ensure Timely Siting Review ond To Preempt Uncler Section 253 State and Local Ordinances That Classify All Wireless Siting Proposals as Requiring a Variance, Declaratory Ruling, 24 FCC Rcd 13994, 14021 ¶ 71 (2009) ("Shot Clock Ruling"), recondenied, 25 FCC Rcd 11157 (2010), aff'd, City of Arlington, Tex., et al. v. FCC, 2012 U.S. App. LEXIS 1252 (5th Cir. 2012).

In conclusion, wireless networks, though subject to regulations at the local level, are intrinsically national. In order to construct robust and ubiquitous wireless networks, consistency and predictability are essential to build out plans, both now and in the future. PCIA urges the Committee to facilitate the deployment of advanced wireless services and their corresponding economic and social benefits. By recognizing the diverse array of wireless facility siting options and their efficient use of existing infrastructure. HB 2061 can help ensure that the citizens, businesses and first responders of Pennsylvania have access to advanced wireless services everywhere. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process.

Sincerely,

Jonathan M. Campbell

Director, Government Affairs

PCIA—The Wireless Infrastructure Association
901 N. Washington Street, Suite 600
Alexandria, VA 22314