**CITY LETTER HEAD**

**Date**, 2017

The Honorable Ben Hueso

State Capitol, Room 4035

Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: SB 649 (Hueso) Wireless telecommunications facilities. – OPPOSE AS AMENDED**

Dear Senator Hueso:

The **[insert your CITY here]** would like to express its opposition to the proposed legislation, Senate Bill 649 (Hueso). The bill would establish a streamlined permitting process for small cell wireless facilities, and limit the fees that local governments may charge for placement of small cells on city or county owned infrastructure. This is concerning to cities in Orange County and throughout the State, because it severely restricts the ability for cities to make necessary discretionary decisions related to the aesthetic and safety of small cell and wireless infrastructure within their jurisdictions.

Currently, telecommunications service providers must receive a permit from a city or county to build for their infrastructure deployment. Where equipment is being added to an already existing structure providers must request approval to collocate on those facilities. Cities and counties cannot hinder additions to pole attachment in the public right-of way, but can oversee when those projects are taking place to ensure public safety, and that day-to-day city business is not disrupted. SB 649 aims to change the permitting process for small cell sites by redefining small cells and removing discretionary permitting authority from cities and counties. This measure considers small cell technology as equipment with all antennas on the structure (excluding associated equipment) that totals no more than six cubic feet in volume, associated equipment on pole structures not to exceed 21 cubic feet, and specified micro wireless facilities. This small cell definition would require a local government to provide streamlined permitted use if it’s located in a public right-of-way in any zone or in any zone that includes a commercial or industrial use. Additionally, this bill would mandate that a city or county make its vertical infrastructure available for the placement of small cells, and require automatic renewal of permits for telecommunications facilities. Removing these important land use zoning decisions from local governments, and usurping the public input processes through the adoption of ministerial designations is detrimental to the overall community.

Further circumventing the jurisdiction of local governments is the restructure of facility use revenue collection. Right now, local entities are authorized to charge an annual fee for use of a pole structure, and can negotiate lease rates for small cell attachments on other publicly owned vertical infrastructure. **[Option to discuss CITY’s use of pole fee and lease rate proceeds, here]**. This process is built on negotiations and years of relationship building between the city and the provider for a mutually beneficial cost-benefit. SB 649 would mandate cities to adopt a flat rate or tiered system between $100 to $850 per small cell, per year – significantly reducing the fees that a city or county may charge for the installation of a small cell telecommunications facilities. The measure would also eliminate the collection of any escrow or similar deposit for removal of such a facility. The revenue that **[insert your CITY here]** had been formally reliant on could change the level of services and prioritization of community projects that had been offered based on this income. Ultimately, reducing the ability for cities and counties to negotiate for a productive and fair public benefit through lease, rent, and maintenance agreements removes yet another economic development tool for our municipalities. Given the circumstances, our membership organization, the Assocaition of Californai Cities – Orange County, would advocate for an amendment that would change the fee structure to reflect a fair market value price for wireless installation, escrow, maintenance, removal, and attachment. This would maintain the goal of the bill to standardize pricing through a measurable determination, and also allow cities and counties the flexibility in financing options while retaining local infrastructure control.

**[Option to discuss your CITY’S telecommunications facility issues and community concerns, here.]**

Cities require full discretionary review of small cell implementation and the deployment process. Public benefits negotiated through an already existing fair and reasonable development structure makes this bill unnecessary and punitive towards cities. The **[insert your CITY here]** is committed to finding fair solutions to challenges that affect our communities. For this and the reasons described above, the **[insert your CITY here]** opposes SB 649.

Should you have any questions about our positon or about **[Insert your CITY’S name here]**, please contact **[insert contact name, here],** **[insert contact’s job title, here]**, **[insert contact phone number, here]** or at **[insert contact e-mail address here]**.

Sincerely,

**[Insert contact name, here]**

**[Insert contact’s job title, here]**

**[Insert your City name here]**

cc:

Association of California Cities – Orange County (ACC-OC)