

**COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
CASE NO.: 2020-00310**

Electronically Filed

In the Matter of:

THE APPLICATION OF NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC,
A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
D/B/A AT&T MOBILITY
AND UNITI TOWERS LLC, A DELAWARE
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
FOR ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO CONSTRUCT
A WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT
IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
IN THE COUNTY OF PULASKI

SITE NAME: HAPPY RIDGE RELO

**SBA COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION'S
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

Comes SBA Communications Corporation (“SBA”), whose full name and mailing address is SBA Communications Corporation, 8051 Congress Avenue, Boca Raton, FL 33487-1307, vweidenthaler@sbsite.com,¹ and hereby requests, pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001 Section 4(11), to intervene in this matter. SBA has a special interest in this case, which, if denied permission to intervene, will not be adequately represented. Further, intervention by SBA, will allow it to present issues and develop facts that will assist the Commission in considering the matter without unduly complicating or disrupting the proceedings. In support its Motion, SBA attaches its Memorandum of Law.

¹ SBA is providing Ms. Weidenthaler’s contact information pursuant to 807 KAR Section 4(11)(a). All official, case-related correspondence should still be directed to undersigned counsel.

FREEMAN MATHIS & GARY, LLP

s/ Tia J. Combs

Casey C. Stansbury
Tia J. Combs
2525 Harrodsburg Road, Suite 500
Lexington, KY 40504
Telephone: (859) 410.7854
cstansbury@fmglaw.com
tcombs@fmglaw.com
Counsel for SBA Communications, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 29, 2020, the foregoing document was served via first class USPS, postage prepaid, upon the following:

David A. Pike, Esq.
Pike Legal Group, PLLC
1578 Highway 44 East, Suite 6
P.O. Box 369
Shepherdsville, KY 40165-0369
Counsel for the Applicant

s/ Tia J. Combs

Counsel for SBA

**COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
CASE NO.: 2020-00310**

Electronically Filed

In the Matter of:

THE APPLICATION OF NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC,
A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
D/B/A AT&T MOBILITY
AND UNITI TOWERS LLC, A DELAWARE
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
FOR ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO CONSTRUCT
A WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY AT
IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
IN THE COUNTY OF PULASKI

SITE NAME: HAPPY RIDGE RELO

**SBA COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN
SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO INTERVENE**

Comes SBA Communications Corporation ("SBA"), pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001 Section 4(11), and for its Memorandum of Law in Support of its Amended Motion to Intervene, states as follows:

FACTS

On or about September 21, 2020, New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, d/b/a AT&T Mobility ("AT&T") AND Uniti Towers LLC (collectively AT&T and Uniti are referred to herein as the "Applicants"), filed their Application for a Certificate of Public convenience and Necessity for Construction of a Wireless Communications Facility in Pulaski County, Kentucky (the "Application"). In the Application, the Applicants state they request a certificate because the construction of the proposed wireless communications facility (the "Proposed Tower") will:

Bring or improve the AT&T Mobility's services to an area currently not served or not adequately served by AT&T Mobility by increasing coverage or capacity and thereby enhancing the public's access to wireless communication services. The

WCF will provide a necessary link in AT&T's network that is designed to meet the increasing demands for wireless services in Kentucky's wireless communications service area.¹

However, the Applicants' claims as to the necessity of the Proposed Tower are wholly unsubstantiated. In the Application, the Applicants generically state that there are "no reasonably available opportunities to co-locate AT&T Mobility's antennas on an existing structure."² AT&T further states that the reason for the need for a new tower is that "no other suitable or available co-location site was found to be located in the vicinity of the site." Thus, while the parties, SBA and AT&T, have argued about tower rental rates in previous cases, AT&T seems to be arguing that the issue in this case is that there are physically no other towers. AT&T does not mention rental rates in its Application.³

Contrary to the assertions made by the Applicants, there is already an existing tower less than *a tenth of a mile* from the Proposed Tower. AT&T is currently a tenant on this tower which is owned and operated by SBA (the "SBA Tower"). The SBA Tower is so close that it can be seen on the map the Applicants have provided at Exhibit B.⁴ From its place on the SBA Tower, AT&T can and already does broadcast its wireless signal to the surrounding area in nearly exactly the same manner, and providing essentially the same coverage, as it would broadcast off the Proposed Tower. This fact is, and can be, substantiated by SBA, through Coverage Plot Analysis, which has been performed by a Radio Frequency Engineer proving this fact. Exhibit 1. As such, despite AT&T's claims in its Application, the Proposed Tower cannot possibly meet the prerequisite of

¹ *Application for Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for Construction of a Wireless Communications Facility*, Case No. 2020-00310 (KY PSC September 21, 2020) at ¶ 7.

² *Id.* at ¶ 12.

³ *Application for Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for Construction of a Wireless Communications Facility*, Case No. 2020-00310 (KY PSC September 21, 2020).

⁴ *Id.* at Exhibit B.

necessity required in order for AT&T to be given a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity by the Commission.

Because SBA has an interest in this matter which not now being adequately represented and SBA has can present issues and develop facts that will assist the Commission in fully considering this matter, SBA now requests to intervene in this matter so that it may present the evidence it has already collected concerning the inaccuracies the Application and present additional information that may be of use to the Commission.

ARGUMENT

Pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001 Section 4(11):

(a) A person who wishes to become a party to a case before the commission may, by timely motion, request leave to intervene.

1. The motion shall include the movant's full name, mailing address, and electronic mail address and shall state his or her interest in the case and now intervention is likely to present issues or develop facts that will assist the commission in fully considering the matter without unduly complicating or disrupting the proceedings.

...

(b) The commission shall grant a person leave to intervene if the commission finds that he or she has made a timely motion for intervention and that he or she has a special interest in the case that is not otherwise adequately represented or that his or her intervention is likely to present issues or to develop facts that assist the commission in fully considering the matter without unduly complicating or disrupting the proceedings.

807 KAR 5:001 Section 4(11).

Pursuant to this section, SBA is required to prove only that it has either a special interest which is not adequately represented *or* that it can present issues or develop facts assisting the commission in fully considering the matter, however, SBA believes that it can prove it meets both of these requirements. As such, the PSC should allow SBA to intervene and fully participate in this case.

1) SBA has a special interest in this matter that is not otherwise adequately represented.

SBA is mindful that the PSC has previously stated that SBA's interest in owning a tower in the immediate vicinity of the Proposed Tower is not a proper special interest under 807 KAR 5:001 Section 4(11).⁵ With due regard to that holding, and while SBA does not abandon those arguments and incorporates them here as if fully rewritten,⁶ SBA will not reiterate those arguments here.

2) If allowed to intervene, SBA can present issues and develop facts that will assist the commission in fully considering this matter.

In its past orders, the PSC has never addressed the fact that SBA could intervene for the purposes of providing the PSC with additional information which would be relevant to its determination of whether an applicant has a public convenience or necessity. The PSC is required to give "proper consideration to the essential elements that enter into the matter of convenience and necessity." *Ky. Utils. Co. v. Pub. Serv. Com.*, 252 S.W.2d 885, 889 (Ky. 1952). The Court of Appeals of Kentucky has stated:

The manifest purpose of a public service commission is to require fair and uniform rates, prevent unjust discrimination and unnecessary duplication of plants, facilities and service and to prevent ruinous competition. The courts generally deny the right of utilities to duplicate service.

Olive Hill v. Pub. Serv. Com., 203 S.W.2d 68, 71 (1947).

Many facts which are needed for the Commission to fully develop these elements are not listed in the Application. SBA can assist the Commission in the process of finding and evaluating these facts and therefore seeks to intervene in this matter.

⁵ *Order*, Case No. 2019-00176 (KY PSC October 1, 2019).

⁶ *SBA Communications Corporation's Motion to Intervene*, Case No. 2019-00176 (KY PSC June 25, 2019) and *SBA Communications Corporation's Reply to New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company d/b/a AT&T Mobility's Response to SBA Communication Corporation's Motion to Intervene*, Case No. 2019-00176 (KY PSC July 8, 2019).

a) The Application does not specifically detail how an additional tower will benefit consumers.

In the past, the Commission has denied SBA intervention because the one purpose of both the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and KRS § 278.040 are to promote market-based competition that benefits consumers. However, it is unclear from the Application how the Proposed Tower will benefit consumers at all.

Additionally, the Applicants' argument that the Proposed Tower will in some way benefit local consumers is directly contradicted by the fact that all public comments of record show strong and unequivocal opposition to the Proposed Tower. The local residents living in the area in which the Proposed Tower would be located have been clear in their desire to not have a tower obstruct their view during the day and night.⁷ In their Public Comment, the local residents of this area express a preference for co-location. They state that many of them fielded requests for towers to be built on their land and declined. The issues that the local residents bring are legitimate and illustrate the contradiction in the Application when they claim the new tower will benefit the consumers in some vague way. Intervention would cure the lack of facts presented to determine the possibility of any actual increase in services or innovation.

The Application states that the Proposed Tower is necessary because it will improve services "by increasing coverage or capacity and thereby enhancing the public's access to innovative and competitive wireless communications services."⁸ Other than restating language from KRS § 278.546(4), the Application is devoid of any facts or exhibits that lend themselves to this nebulous claim that a new tower constructed in such close proximity to the SBA Tower will

⁷ *Doug Rogers Public Comment*, Case No. 2020-00310 (KY PSC October 5, 2020). This Public Comment is also signed by a large group of additional residents.

⁸ *Application for Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for Construction of a Wireless Communications Facility*, Case No. 2020-00310 (KY PSC September 21, 2020).

have any benefit to consumers. Despite unsubstantiated claims of “necessity” and an “integral link,” the Applicants do not offer any insight into how the new tower will provide more economical services nor do they make any mention of innovation to existing technology and services.⁹ The Application is similarly void of reasoning to support the claim that the area is “currently not served or not adequately served.”¹⁰

AT&T consistently references the Proposed Tower as being “necessary to AT&T,” but fails entirely to offer facts that show any increase in services and rates to the consumer as required under KRS § 278.020. These facts and issues related to unsubstantiated claims of benefit to consumers elucidate the import of intervention as SBA is uniquely situated to “present issues or develop facts that will assist the commission in fully considering the matter.” 807 KAR 5:001 Section 4(11).

Even if any practical innovation or increase in services to the consumer can be inferred from the Application, it is nevertheless devoid of any evidence or expert opinion of the alleged benefits of the Proposed Tower. In fact, it is not apparent from the face of the Application if there is any possible or technical way in which the new tower in such proximity will bring about any increase in services or benefits to the consumer. While it is the onus of the Applicants to show necessity and a benefit to consumers, SBA’s intervention is appropriate and necessary here in order to present issues and develop facts that illustrate the absence of a benefit to the rates of services.

b) SBA has special knowledge of the service that can be had from the SBA Tower and Proposed Tower.

In this case, SBA has already commissioned a study concerning the radio frequency coverage that can be broadcast from both the SBA Tower and the Proposed Tower. Exhibit 1. As

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.*

shown in that study, there is little or no additional coverage to be gained by building the Proposed Tower. If a wireless operator had an antenna on the SBA Tower and then installed on the Proposed Tower, this would be duplicative and considered an “overbuild.” Exhibit 1. If SBA is allowed to intervene in this matter, it would be glad to bring its engineer to testify before the Commission to further explain his findings and the similarity of the radio frequency broadcasts from the SBA Tower and the Proposed Tower.

c) SBA has information concerning AT&T’s attempts to co-locate.

When requesting to build a new wireless tower, AT&T is required, by KRS § 278.020 and 807 KAR 5:063 Section 1(s), to present evidence concerning attempts to co-locate on existing structures, such as the SBA Tower. AT&T addresses this issue in the Application at ¶ 12. However, AT&T does not even bother to mention that is currently co-locating on the SBA Tower *which is less than a half mile away*. From its spot on the SBA Tower, AT&T already broadcasts its radio frequency in exactly the same manner as it will be able to broadcast from the Proposed Tower. As SBA is the owner of the tower on which AT&T is required to consider co-locating, SBA has unique information concerning this issue and others which, as of yet, are wholly unaddressed in these proceedings.

For example, SBA has not been contacted by AT&T specifically concerning any deficiency with the SBA Tower which would make it unsuitable for co-location. There has been no contact that the SBA Tower is not suitable for AT&T’s physical needs as to placement of its equipment. AT&T has not asked SBA to modify the SBA Tower to better accommodate the equipment AT&T wishes to place on it now or in the future. AT&T has not contacted SBA specifically concerning the rents on the SBA Tower.¹¹

¹¹ SBA does admit that it received a bulk request from AT&T to lower rents and make changes to lease agreements across the country, but this was not a specific request concerning the specific rents or conditions of lease on the SBA

d) SBA’s special knowledge concerns “service” pursuant to KRS § 278.040.

The PSC has previously relied on KRS § 278.040 and *Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, and a Site Compatibility Certificate, for the Construction of a 278 MW (nominal) Circulating Fluidized Bed Coal-Fired Unit in Mason County, Kentucky*, Case No. 2004-00423, (KY PSC Apr. 18, 2005) to deny SBA intervention because SBA did not have an interest in “rates and service.”¹² However, the information SBA can provide does concern service as defined in this statute.

The term “service,” as used in KRS § 278.040, is defined by KRS § 278.010(13):

“Service” includes any practice or requirement in any way relating to the service of any utility, including the voltage of electricity, the heat units and pressure of gas, the purity, pressure, and quantity of water, and in general the quality, quantity, and pressure of any commodity or product used or to be used for or in connection with the business of any utility, but does not include Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) service;

Thus, the signal AT&T or any other broadcasts is “service.” As shown above, SBA’s intent is to provide the PSC with information relating to this service.

e) Allowing SBA’s intervention will not unduly complicate or disrupt these proceedings.

As noted above and seen in Exhibit 1, SBA has already commissioned a report from an expert who can testify as to the lack of necessity for the Proposed Tower. SBA’s staff is similarly ready to testify concerning AT&T’s alleged attempt to continue co-locating on the SBA Tower. As SBA is already ready to present its evidence, its intervention in this matter will not delay this matter in any way. Furthermore, SBA is happy to tailor its involvement in this matter to the PSC’s

Tower. It was merely a non-specific request that rents be reduced (without any specific dollar amounts referenced) and that AT&T be granted other “fair” rights without reference to specific terms.

¹² *Order*, Case No. 2019-00176 (KY PSC October 1, 2019).

wishes and provide information, to the extent not proprietary or confidential, as the PSC requests or deems helpful.

CONCLUSION

SBA has an interest in this matter which not now being adequately represented. Moreover, SBA has and can present issues and develop facts that will assist the commission in fully considering this matter. In particular, SBA can provide technical engineering information concerning the radio frequency that can be broadcast from the Proposed Tower (which is nearly identical to what can be broadcast from the existing SBA Tower) and information concerning AT&T's attempts at co-location. As such, SBA now requests that it be allowed to intervene in this matter so that it may present the evidence it has already collected concerning the inaccuracies in the Application.

FREEMAN MATHIS & GARY, LLP

s/ Tia J. Combs

Casey C. Stansbury

Tia J. Combs

2525 Harrodsburg Road, Suite 500

Lexington, KY 40504

Telephone: (859) 410.7854

cstansbury@fmglaw.com

tcombs@fmglaw.com

Counsel for SBA Communications, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 29, 2020, the foregoing document was served via first class

USPS, postage prepaid, upon the following:

David A. Pike, Esq.
Pike Legal Group, PLLC
1578 Highway 44 East, Suite 6
P.O. Box 369
Shepherdsville, KY 40165-0369
Counsel for the Applicant

s/ Tia J. Combs

Counsel for SBA

TO: SBA

Subject: RF Coverage Plot Analysis: Pulaski County, KY

Date: October 14, 2020

1. **METHODOLOGY.** The attached plots depict broadcast radio frequency (RF) coverage from the existing site to Pulaski County, KY and a proposed site approximately 0.1188 miles to the southeast. At each location, cellular industry typical LTE operating parameters were considered for omnidirectional antennas mounted at 300 feet above ground level at the existing site, and at 300 feet above ground level for the proposed site. Ground elevations are 1104 and 1115 feet above mean sea level, respectively. 5G Broadcast RF coverage was not reviewed since it is not operational as of this date.


Plots for both locations were generated for 700, 850, 1900 and 2100 MHz operations. The signal levels depicted are associated with LTE service reliability where the strong coverage levels in green and blue occur near the towers and decrease with distance from the sites and intervening terrain obstructions. Signal levels greater than -70 dBm shown as blue are associated with feasible coverage within buildings. Marginal coverage is provided in the regions depicted in yellow between -90 dBm and -80 dBm and signal levels between -100 dBm and -90 dBm shown as red represent poor coverage associated with call failures.

A comparison of coverage performance for each site is based on low band (700 and 850 MHz) and high band (1900 and 2100 MHz) prediction results. Radiowave propagation conditions between these bands differ because of terrain and ground clutter (e.g. vegetation) effects at different frequencies. Generally, low band operations provide greater area coverage. Therefore, high band operations provide additional customer traffic capacity closer to the cellular site.

2. **COMPARISON.** The sites considered in these coverage plots provide service to the depicted locations and roads leading to Pulaski County, KY. For low band operations, the existing site provides strong coverage approximately 0.3 miles in all directions and to non-contiguous areas to 3.0 miles from the site. This includes 2.0 miles of Cumberland Parkway. The proposed site provides similar strong coverage 0.3 miles in all directions and to non-contiguous areas to 3.0 miles. This includes 2.0 miles of the same portion of Cumberland Parkway.

For high band operations, both sites provide strong coverage to non-contiguous areas 2.0 miles in all directions.

3. **CONCLUSION.** Based on the coverage comparison presented above, the proposed site provides comparable coverage to Pulaski County, KY due to its close proximity to the existing site. For wireless operators with antennas mounted on the existing site, the installation of additional antennas on the proposed site would be considered to be an "overbuild" or impractical given the coverage overlap.




Existing Site
700 MHz Coverage

Site Name: KY13168-A
 Latitude: 37.101028N
 Longitude: 84.77875W

Antenna: 15.15 dBi Omni
 Alpha Rad Center (ft): 300
 Azimuth (Deg): 0
 ERP per RS (W): 2.0





Proposed Site
700 MHz Coverage

Site Name: Proposed
 Latitude: 37.100222N
 Longitude: 84.776778W

Antenna: 15.15 dBi Omni
 Alpha Rad Center (ft): 300
 Azimuth (Deg): 0
 ERP per RS (W): 2.0






Existing Site
850 MHz Coverage

Site Name: KY13168-A
 Latitude: 37.101028N
 Longitude: 84.77875W

Antenna: 15.15 dBi Omni
 Alpha Rad Center (ft): 300
 Azimuth (Deg): 0
 ERP per RS (W): 2.0







Proposed Site
850 MHz Coverage

Site Name: Proposed
 Latitude: 37.100222N
 Longitude: 84.776778W

Antenna: 15.15 dBi Omni
 Alpha Rad Center (ft): 300
 Azimuth (Deg): 0
 ERP per RS (W): 2.0






Existing Site
1900 MHz Coverage

Site Name: KY13168-A
 Latitude: 37.101028N
 Longitude: 84.77875W

Antenna: 17.15 dBi Omni
 Alpha Rad Center (ft): 300
 Azimuth (Deg): 0
 ERP per RS (W): 4.7






Proposed Site
1900 MHz Coverage

Site Name: Proposed
 Latitude: 37.100222N
 Longitude: 84.776778W

Antenna: 17.15 dBi Omni
 Alpha Rad Center (ft): 300
 Azimuth (Deg): 0
 ERP per RS (W): 4.7







Existing Site
2100 MHz Coverage

Site Name: KY13168-A
 Latitude: 37.101028N
 Longitude: 84.77875W

Antenna: 17.15 dBi Omni
 Alpha Rad Center (ft): 300
 Azimuth (Deg): 0
 ERP per RS (W): 4.7





Proposed Site
2100 MHz Coverage

Site Name: Proposed
 Latitude: 37.100222N
 Longitude: 84.776778W

Antenna: 17.15 dBi Omni
 Alpha Rad Center (ft): 300
 Azimuth (Deg): 0
 ERP per RS (W): 4.7

