

HOUSE BILL 310:

Wireless Communications Infrastructure Siting.

2017-2018 General Assembly

Committee: House Energy and Public Utilities. If Date: May 18, 2017

favorable, re-refer to Finance

Introduced by: Reps. Saine, Torbett, Wray

Prepared by: Jennifer McGinnis

Analysis of: PCS to First Edition Committee Counsel

H310-CSRIf-19

OVERVIEW: The Proposed Committee Substitute (PCS) to House Bill 310 would amend the laws relating to regulation by cities of wireless infrastructure siting with regard to the collocation of small wireless facilities on utility poles, city utility poles, and public rights-of-way.

[As introduced, this bill was identical to S377, as introduced by Sen. Hise, which is currently in Senate Rules and Operations of the Senate.]

The PCS would, among other things:

- Modify the definition for the term "collocation" to include *maintenance*, *modification*, *operation*, *or replacement* of wireless facilities on existing structures and utility poles, and to provide that the term does not include installation of new utility poles or wireless support structures.
- Modify language that would provide cities authority to assess fees on wireless providers for
 occupation of rights-of way to delete language that limited the city's authority to assess such a
 fee on a wireless provider only to circumstances in which a city charged other communications
 service providers or publicly, cooperatively, or municipally owned utilities for similar uses of the
 right-of-way.
- Modify language that provided that nothing in the act would be intended to authorize persons to collocate small wireless facilities on privately owned utility poles or other private property absent consent of the property owner, to include language concerning *maintenance*, *modification*, *operation*, *or replacement* of private poles or wireless support structures.
- Increase a fee that cities would be authorized to charge wireless providers for collocation of small wireless facilities on city utility poles from \$35 to \$50.
- Modify language in the section that would govern a wireless provider's access to utility poles, which language formerly provided that the section would not be construed to apply to municipal electric providers or membership corporations that own or control poles, ducts or conduits, to include cities that own or operate public enterprises consisting of electric power generation, transmission, and distribution systems.
- Add language in the applicability section of the act to provide that:

Karen Cochrane-Brown Director



Legislative Analysis Division 919-733-2578

This Bill Analysis reflects the contents of the bill as it was presented

in committee.

- Except as provided in the act, or otherwise specifically authorized the General Statutes, a city may not: (i) adopt or enforce any regulation on the placement or operation of communications facilities in the rights-of-way by a provider authorized by State law to operate in the rights-of-way and may not regulate any communications services; or (ii) impose or collect any tax, fee, or charge to provide a communications service over a communications facility in the right-of-way.
- The approval of the installation, placement, maintenance, or operation of a small wireless facility pursuant to the act would not authorize the provision of any communications services or the installation, placement, maintenance, or operation of any communications facility, including a wireline backhaul facility, other than a small wireless facility, in the right-of-way.

CURRENT LAW: Article 19 of Chapter 160A and Article 18 of Chapter 153A of the General Statutes provides for local government regulation of the equipment and network components necessary to provide wireless service and new or existing structures designed to support wireless facilities.

Part 3E of Article 19 of Chapter 160A currently provides for regulation by cities of the siting and modification of mobile broadband and wireless facilities. It also provides for the regulation of collocation of wireless facilities. Collocation is the installation of new wireless facilities on previously-approved structures.

BILL ANALYSIS:

Section 1 of the PCS would provide that the General Assembly finds that small wireless facilities, including facilities commonly referred to as small cells and distributed antenna systems, may be deployed most effectively in the public rights-of-way.

Section 2 of the PCS would amend Part 3E of Article 19 Chapter 160A to provide for the regulation of the siting and collocation of small wireless facilities by cities. The PCS defines "small wireless facilities" as a wireless facility with both of the following: (i) antenna within an enclosure of no more than 6 cubic feet in volume; and (2) other wireless equipment associated with the small wireless facility of no more than 28 cubic feet in volume. The PCS would:

Permitting of Small Wireless Facilities by Cities

G.S. 160A-400.54 would prohibit a city from establishing a moratorium on accepting applications, issuing permits, or otherwise regulating the collocation of small wireless facilities except as provided in this section.

A city would be authorized to require a permit for a wireless provider to collocate small wireless facilities within the city's jurisdiction. A city could require a permit for the collocation of small wireless facilities subject to the following conditions:

- A city may not require applicants to provide unrelated services such as reservation of fiber, conduit, or pole space for the city.
- The city has 30 days to deem an application complete; 45 days to approve or deny the completed application; 30 days for an applicant to revise a denied application; and 30 days for the city to approve or deny a revised application.

House PCS 310

Page 3

- Applicants may include up to 25 small wireless facilities into a single application for a permit. A
 city may remove one or more those facilities from the consolidated application under certain
 conditions.
- The permit may require the applicant to commence construction within 6 months of approval and operation no later than one year from approval.

A city may review the permit and deny it only on one of the following basis:

- Compliance with local codes or regulations that concern public safety.
- Objective design standards for decorative utility poles.
- Stealth and concealment, including screening and landscaping for ground-mounted equipment.
- Reasonable spacing requirements for poles and ground-mounted equipment.
- Compliance with local, State, and federal historic district laws and regulations.

A city may charge a permit fee of up to \$100 per small cell wireless facility for the first five facilities in an application and \$50 for each additional facility in the application. A city may also charge a consulting fee of up to \$500 per an application to hire a third party to complete the review and processing of applications.

The PCS would allow a city to require a wireless services provider to remove an abandoned wireless facility within 180 days of abandonment. Should the wireless services provider fail to timely remove the abandoned wireless facility, the city would be allowed to remove the facility and to recover the actual cost of such removal, including legal fees, if any, from the wireless services provider.

Use of the City Right-of-Way

G.S. 160A-400.55 would: (i) allow a wireless provider to collocate small wireless facilities in the city rights-of-way; and (ii) prohibit a city from entering into an exclusive arrangement with any person for the use of the city right-of-way for wireless facilities, wireless support structures, or the collocation of small wireless facilities.

If the wireless provider seeks to install or modify a utility pole associated with the collocation of a small cell wireless facility and it meets the following height restrictions, the facility would only be subject to the permitting requirements set forth above: (i) new or modified utility poles or city poles not to exceed 50 feet; and (ii) collocated small wireless facilities do not extend more than 10 feet off the top of the structure. The city may, however, allow wireless facilities that exceed those height restrictions at the city's discretion.

Applicants for use of the city right-of-way would have to comply with the city's undergrounding requirements.

A city may charge a wireless provider for the use of the right-of-way. The charge must be reasonable and nondiscriminatory and must not exceed the direct and actual cost of managing the rights-of-way and shall not be based on the wireless provider's revenue or customer counts. The charge must not exceed similar charges imposed on other users of the right-of-way, including publicly, cooperatively, or municipally owned utilities.

This section would allow a city to require a wireless provider to repair any damage to the city right-ofway caused while installing or maintaining wireless facilities or other associated facilities. If the

House PCS 310

Page 4

wireless provider fails to make those repairs, the city may charge the provider the reasonable cost of the repairs.

This section would not limit the enforcement of federal, State, or local historic preservation zoning requirements.

Access to City Utility Poles

G.S. 160A-400.56 would prohibit a city from entering into an exclusive arrangement with any person for the use of the city utility poles. A city must allow a wireless provider to collocate on utility poles at just, reasonable and non-discriminatory rates, not to exceed \$50 per a city utility pole per year. The wireless provider seeking to collocate must comply with all applicable safety requirements, including the National Electric Safety Code and rules and regulations of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Within 60 days of receiving an application to collocate on a city pole, the city would be required to provide an estimate of costs for make-ready work. Such work must be completed within 60 days of acceptance of the estimate by applicant.

The provisions of this section would not apply to: (i) a city that owns or operates a public enterprise consisting of an electric power generation, transmission, or distribution system; or (ii) an electric membership corporation that owns or controls poles, ducts or conduits, but which is exempt from regulation under section 224 of the Communications Act of 1934.

Applicability

G.S. 160A-400.56 would prohibit a city from regulating small wireless facilities within any stadium or athletic facility, unless the city owns the stadium or athletic facility. This section would also clarify that nothing in the act would amend, modify, or otherwise affect any private easement agreement. In addition, the section provides that:

- Except as provided in the act, or otherwise specifically authorized the General Statutes, a city may not: (i) adopt or enforce any regulation on the placement or operation of communications facilities in the rights-of-way by a provider authorized by State law to operate in the rights-of-way and may not regulate any communications services; or (ii) impose or collect any tax, fee, or charge to provide a communications service over a communications facility in the right-of-way.
- The approval of the installation, placement, maintenance, or operation of a small wireless facility pursuant to the act would not authorize the provision of any communications services or the installation, placement, maintenance, or operation of any communications facility, including a wireline backhaul facility, other than a small wireless facility, in the right-of-way.

Section 3 of the PCS concerns the regulation of wireless facilities in the State rights-of-way. This section would add the placement of wireless facilities to the list of allowable activities in the State rights-of-way and would authorize the Department of Transportation to issue permits for the collocation of wireless facilities in the rights-of-way of State-maintained highways. The Department would be required to approve or deny permits within a reasonable period of time of receiving an application.

The collocation of small wireless facilities in the State right-of-way would be subject to the following requirements:

House PCS 310

Page 5

- The facilities could not obstruct or hinder the usual travel or public safety on any rights-of-way of State-maintained highways or obstruct the legal use of such rights-of-way by other utilities.
- Each new or modified utility pole and wireless support structure installed in the right-of-way of State-maintained highways shall not exceed the greater of (i) 10 feet in height above the height of the tallest existing utility pole, in place as July 1, 2017, located within 500 feet of the new pole in the same rights-of-way, or (ii) 50 feet above ground level.
- Each new small wireless facility in the right-of-way shall not extend (i) more than 10 feet above an existing utility pole or wireless support structure in place as of July 1, 2017, or (ii) above the height permitted for a new utility pole or wireless support structure under this section.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The PCS would become effective when it becomes law.

Layla Cummings, counsel to House Energy and Public Utilities, substantially contributed to this summary.