From: Sandra Maurer
To: Mary Gourley
Subject: Additional info for Agenda item #11
Date: Monday, January 5, 2026 2:42:56 PM

Hi Mary, Below are additional comments filed by Cities, Counties and others. These were not yet available when the agenda was posted. Can these be sent to the Council?
Thank you.

Sandra Maurer
Vice Mayor of Sebastopol

Comments of the City and County of San Francisco:
https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/123193645668/1

Excerpt : "The City opposes the NPRM's proposals to restrict state and local government actions because doing so would be contrary to Sections 2532 and 332(c)(7)3 of the Communications Act and Section 6409(a) of the Spectrum Act,4 and because the proposals would undermine efforts to promote efficient deployment under clear rules. San Francisco urges the Commission to take no action on the NPRM. " p. 1

COMMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, AND THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS

https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/1231109325442/1

Excerpt: "As we stated in our comments in WC Docket No. 25-253, local government elected leaders and officials, being the leaders closest to the people, have worked hard
to collaborate creatively with federal, state, and private sector partners to bring high-speed, affordable broadband and telecommunications services to all communities.
Similar to the Commission's Wireline Notice of Inquiry, the Local Government Associations strenuously object to the Commission's depiction of local permitting as an
obstacle to the provision of wireless telecommunications services. The parties suggesting this seek to strip local governments of their ability to responsibly manage
public assets in the rights-of-way, while still expecting rights-of-way that are safe, well-planned, and conducive to technology-neutral competition." P 2

COMMENTS OF ARLINGTON, TX; BELLEVUE, WA; BOSTON, MA; BOWIE, MD; CARMEL-BY- THE-SEA, CA; COACHELLA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT; CULVER CITY, CA; DALLAS, TX; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; FONTANA, CA; GAITHERSBURG, MD; HENDERSON, NV; HILLSBOROUGH, CA; HOWARD COUNTY, MD; MARIN COUNTY, CA; MONTEREY, CA; MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MD; ONTARIO, CA; PALO ALTO, CA; PIEDMONT, CA; PISCATAWAY, NJ; PLANO, TX; TEXAS COALITION OF CITIES FOR UTILITY ISSUES; UPLAND, CA; ANN ARBOR, MI; MICHIGAN COALITION TO PROTECT PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY; MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE; AND MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION

https://www.fcc.gov/ecfs/document/123152282324/1
"Local government authority over land use is critical to protect the health and welfare of local communities and private property values. The local, democratically accountable, zoning framework ensures that wireless infrastructure is deployed efficiently while maintaining public safety and the unique aesthetic character

cherished by each community." p 2 para 3

"The Commission's proposed "rocket docket" would subvert the law. " p 3 para. 4

"Local Communities support new proceedings to thoroughly review the latest scientific data and update the Commission's current guidelines for exposure to RF radiation. Thirty-year-old
standards and a court remand that remains unaddressed by the Commission do little to quell public concerns about the issue." P 4 para 2

"The Telecommunications Act's legislative history confirms the plain text's broad preservation of local authority." P 12

"Local government land use authority is fundamental to protect economic interests and public safety." P 13