



Before the Federal Communications Commission

In the Matter of A National Broadband Plan for Our Future

GN Docket No. 09-51

June 7, 2009

REACT is a coalition of Southern California communities from the Los Angeles and San Fernando Valley areas, Orange County and San Diego, which is also part of a fast-growing national coalition, CLOUT (*Coalition for Local Oversight of Utility Technologies* - www.cloutnow.org). Each was formed as a result of a tremendous backlash against the unchecked proliferation of wireless facilities now targeting residential areas and schools, as wireless companies seek to market new wireless services. Our Coalitions' efforts have led to the recent passage of resolutions by the Los Angeles City School Board and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. (Details can be found on the cloutnow.org website.)

As we move forward with plans to provide broadband internet for all Americans, we ask that universal wireless broadband and broadband over power lines not be considered but, instead, broadband access using only communication cables and fiber optics.

Please consider the following list of questions and concerns raised by citizens related to the deployment of wireless infrastructure and loss of local control:

- 1. Is it in the best interest of the public to spend federal stimulus dollars to fund an infrastructure that has limited capacity, major security flaws, and serious public health risks and is angering citizens nationwide when there are options available, *i.e.*, fiber optic broadband, that will best serve the public in the long term, not just the wireless industry in the short term?**
2. Didn't the consumers and public already pay for fiber optic infrastructure? What happened to the \$200 billion the industry received in rate hikes and tax cuts and are the consumers really benefitting from the "competition?" See: <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/broadbandgrants/comments/61BF.pdf>
3. National security: Do we want the bulk of our communications technology deployed via wireless infrastructure when securing wireless transmissions is far more difficult and costly than securing information transmitted via fiber optic and traditional wireline networks?

4. When Congress passed the Telecommunications Act in 1996, did it anticipate that wireless companies would be using this federal law to preempt local control to deliver new wireless services, *e.g.*, broadband internet, video, "home phone," etc., that in most cases are delivered more reliably and effectively via fiber optic, cable, DSL and traditional phone lines?
5. Is it wise to promote redundant services with each company required to build out their own networks? How many antennas are too many and why is there no regulation to monitor the cumulative effect of so many wireless facilities to accommodate a number of competing companies? *Residents resent that companies have been allowed to turn our neighborhoods into corporate battlegrounds at the expense of our property values, views and risk to our health.*
6. Should for-profit companies control our communications infrastructure or is this something, like roads, best managed by the public for the benefit of the public? *Many residents deeply resent that these for-profit companies enjoy privileges as "public utilities" and want to know why this is allowed.*
7. Does the market model work for our communications infrastructure? Or is this spawning "dumb" growth, based on "dumb" competition and putting the public at risk and with inferior technology? We drive cars (which are true market commodities) on public roads. Shouldn't we use our communication devices to plug into our public broadband?
8. The cell phone market is already near saturation; why are so many permits approved for cell towers and other wireless facilities where good cell phone coverage already exists?
9. What are the true public safety benefits? *For example, residents have discovered that wireless 911 is not an issue because even cell phones without an existing contract will reach 911 when dialed, yet cell phone companies continue to cite it as a justification for permit approvals.* How does commercial wireless 911 compare to landline 911 or pay phones and which is most consistent and reliable during emergencies and disasters?
10. Is it wise to market wireless to children?
11. Will Congress reexamine current FCC regulations and standards and update them based on the latest studies and independent research with the most merit? Will Congress call on the industry to release the studies that they have or will we have to wait 30 years to find out the risks, as we did with the tobacco industry and so many other things that we have since learned have caused great harm?
12. Is it constitutional to limit the rights of citizens in favor of corporate profits? Like second-hand smoke, we have no individual control over our exposure to wireless infrastructure.
13. Should the Congress conduct a public study session and poll to find out what citizens want once they have ALL the information and understand ALL the risks, tradeoffs and alternatives to wireless technology?

As more communities come face to face with the ugly realities of wireless infrastructure, the large majority of fully informed citizens find they prefer responsible deployment of fiber optic broadband technology, which is superior to wireless technology in speed, reliability, security, durability, energy efficiency, and protections it affords people and the environment from potential hazards of low-intensity radiofrequency radiation. As an

example of fiber optic technology as the superior "future-proof" and "green" technology, here is an excerpt from a letter to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) from the Director and Chief Technology Officer of Seattle's Department of Information Technology:

As an example, take my appearance before the FCC today. I drove to SeaTac airport near Seattle, took a flight across the country, and drove to the FCC. This journey consumed many gallons of precious fossil fuels, thereby increasing our nation's dependence upon foreign oil. The journey put many pounds of carbon into the air, contributing to global warming. If the nation had a high-speed, symmetric broadband network capable of two-way high-definition video, I could have made this appearance without these adverse affects, including the significant loss of time and productivity associated with travelling.

Only fiber networks - not copper or wireless - offer the high speed, symmetric (two-way) capability to support such an application.

<http://www.chiefseattlegeek.com/CityofSeattle-FCC-Broadband-Summary-04-02-09.pdf>

Thank you for directing your attention to these important concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sally Hampton", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Sally Hampton