Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
CTIA				
Sterling, Virginia	CTIA	Wireless operators continue to experience significant delays at the local level: an application for the construction of an 80-foot tower disguised as a bell tower on a church property just recently reached the local board for action this past June after two years of review by the county planning staff and the Planning Commission. (16)		
El Cerrito, California	CTIA	Wireless operators continue to experience significant delays at the local level: opponents forced the cancellation of plans to build a cell-phone tower disguised as a tree at a Boy Scout camp. (16)		
Albion, Maine	CTIA	Wireless operators continue to experience significant delays at the local level: It took more than a year to obtain clearance to construct a 190-foot tower; the main disagreement among the parties was whether the wireless operator had demonstrated a sufficient need for the site. (16)		
Village of Muttontown, New York	CTIA	Wireless operators continue to experience significant delays at the local level: litigation required after 3 years of waiting. (17)		
Town Ashland, Massachusetts	CTIA	Prohibits the placement of wireless facilities in districts zoned residential absent a special showing as to need. (18, 20)		
Prince George's County, Maryland	CTIA	Imposes significant setback requirements that typically increase depending on the height of the tower, thus limiting the placement of taller towers to large parcels that can accommodate the setback distance.		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
		(19)		
Mumford, Tennessee	CTIA	Imposes significant setback requirements that typically increase depending on the height of the tower, thus limiting the placement of taller towers to large parcels that can accommodate the setback distance. (19); prohibits certain structures (20)		
Hempstead, New York	CTIA	Prohibits the placement of wireless facilities near schools and churches. (19)		
Rio Arriba County, New Mexico	CTIA	Sets maximum height of towers at 70 feet, and lowers the maximum height to 36 feet if within one-half mile of a school, historic property, senior center, or other designated facilities. (19)		
Calabasas, California	CTIA	Imposes moratorium on issuance of permits of wireless communications facilities. (20)		
Mount Vernon, New York	CTIA	Complains that Ordinance requires dominant service area to be within jurisdiction. (20)		
PCIA				
City of Temecula, California	PCIA	Refuses to apply shot clock to DAS applications (alleges, but does not name other California communities) (13)		
PCIA names a number of communities in Exhibit B *(see list starting at page 18)*	PCIA Exhibit B			
VERIZON				

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
Colonie, New York	Verizon	Complains of consultant written ordinances, then discusses certain elements of such ordinances that its does not like. (6, 8)		
Stanford, New York	Verizon	Complains that minor additions must go through the same "rigorous" process (8)		
Village of Woodbury, New York	Verizon	Complains that minor additions must go through the same "rigorous" process (8)		
Richmond, California	Verizon	Complains that minor additions must go through the same "rigorous" process (8)		
Town of Hamilin, New York,	Verizon	Claims that it had to abandon project after Town declared project a substantial modification (9)		
North Roessleville, New York	Verizon	Claims that it began negotiating a lease with the Town in February 2008 to mount an antenna on an existing water tank with no height increase to the tank. To date, the consultant has exhausted almost all of the $8,500 escrow deposit and Verizon has not yet been able to file the zoning application. (9)		
Examples of laws adopting streamlined modification or collocation procedures	Verizon	North Carolina (2007 N.C. ALS 526; 2007 N.C. Sess. Laws 526; 2007 N.C. Ch. 526; 2007 N.C. SB 831); Tennessee (2005 Tenn. ALS 373; 2005 Tenn. Pub. Acts 373; 2005 Tenn. Pub. Ch. 373; 2005 Tenn. HB 2182) and Georgia, (Ga. Code Ann., Title 36, Chapter 66B) (10)		
Marin County, California	Verizon	Seventeen month delay over concerns about impact of radio frequency emissions (RFE) to the endangered Red Legged Frog. (12)		
Certain localities in Oklahoma and Washington	Verizon	Claims that rights-of-way fees are "routinely increasing – even in localities where they were not excessive to begin with. For example, since the beginning of 2011, have sought to increase their rights-of-way fees by *five* times: from $1 per		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
		foot to $5 per foot." (17)		
Locality in New Jersey	Verizon	Notes that providers must pay an application fee plus a per foot fee. (17)		
Locality in Oklahoma	Verizon	Claims that fees routinely increase post-installation, often under the guise of municipal activities that localities would have to do anyway and that are unrelated to the provider's presence, such as the fees for mowing grass and the removal of roadkill or litter. (18)		
City of Eugene, Oregon	Verizon	Imposes excessive right-of-way fees. (18) (24); Discriminatory fees. (21)		
Greensboro, North Carolina	Verizon	Imposes discriminatory fees. The ILEC does not pay for use of public rights–of-way for its local exchange networks, but competitive LECs must pay. (22)		
City of Portland, Oregon	Verizon	Requires in-kind donations. (23)		
Leesburg, Virginia	Verizon	Imposes discriminatory fees. The ILEC does not pay for use of public rights–of-way for its local exchange networks, but competitive LECs must pay. (25)		
Birmingham, Mobile, and Huntsville, Alabama	Verizon	Require or are proposing to require providers to enter into franchise agreements and pay a percentage of gross revenue as a fee for using the public rights-of-way. Such requirements would ostensibly only apply to competing providers – not to the incumbent that has a statewide franchise. (25)		
NEXTG				
County of San Diego,	Next G	Claims that application process is protracted, bureaucratic and replete with		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
California		hidden, circular and unreasonable requirements. (6)		
City and County of San Francisco, California	Next G	Describes as "an extraordinarily difficult place to install wireless facilities." NextG's experience has been consistent with this. (7)		
City of Laguna Beach, California	Next G	Notes that the application process requires a separate application for each node. Similar to San Diego County, the determination of completeness of an application takes several rounds of submittals with new information requirements raised each round. In order to obtain approval for a mere 8 nodes, NextG went before four Planning Commission hearings (8)		
County of Santa Barbara, California	Next G	Approvals for 27 of the 38 were approved in approximately 5 months, but complains that the additional 9 approvals took another 6 months and cost $194,000. (8)		
District of Columbia	Next G	Complains of number of jurisdictions (never really notes that they are seeking to place on different jurisdictions property.) "Timelines for navigating the various, sometime conflicting, processes can only be estimated in years, as consensus must be achieved amongst all jurisdictions, without favor to any one." (8-9)		
Orange County, Florida	Next G	Claims that it was forced to conduct informational community meetings. After significant organization and coordination, including spending $12,000 to contract with a local manpower service to place invitational door hangers on approximately 20,000 residences, few people turned out. (9)		
Chicago, Illinois	Next G	Provides history claiming that it took too long (4.5 years) to deploy and cost ten times the		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
		average for deploying its nodes. (9-10)		
Village of Northport, New York	Next G	Claims that the permitting application process is at best a convoluted maze of regulatory U-Turns" and now consultants have taken over process. (9-10)		
City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii	Next G	Claims that the City and County of Honolulu have a very long process to obtain access to the public right of way. As a result NextG has chosen not to deploy. NextG has been told that in order to secure the "easement" from city council, hiring a local lobbyist will be necessary. That adds additional expense to the network and makes the cost of entry prohibitive. (11)		
New York, New York	Next G	Claims that treatment of NextG and DAS deployment is an example of delay, discrimination, and municipal treatment of wireless deployment as a revenue center (11)		
San Mateo County, California	Next G	Charges a $10,325.70 permit fee per node, which is roughly half the cost of the equipment involved in the most basic node installation (13)		
Town of Hempstead, New York	Next G	Requires $8,500 in escrow fees per node during the application process (13)		
Town of Greenburgh, New York	Next G	Required NextG to place $105,000 into escrow in order to review the plan for a 21 node network (13)		
New York City, NY, Los Angeles County, CA, City of Carlsbad, CA, City of	Next G	NextG has been compelled to litigate against the following municipalities (13)		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
Compton, CA, City and County of San Francisco, CA (at least 3 times), City of Huntington Beach, CA, Lynn, MA, Everett, MA, Lansdowne, PA, City of Newport Beach, CA, Town of Brookhaven, NY, and the City of Scottsdale, AZ				
County of San Diego, California	Next G	Notes that County had indicated that NextG should expect the fees to process NextG's applications for 14 nodes to exceed $98,000 (14)		
Village of Scarsdale, New York	Next G	Claims that Village asserts that NextG is required to enter into a revenue sharing agreement with the Village (14)		
Oakland, California	Next G	Claims that City charges $26,000 a year in rent in order to attach wireless facilities to a streetlight in the public right of way (15)		
San Jose, California	Next G	Claims that City charges $26,000 a year in rent in order to attach wireless facilities to a streetlight in the public right of way (15)		
Newport Beach, CA	Next G	Claims that city ordinance prohibits installation of new poles in designated "underground districts" where utilities located in the public right of way must be placed underground. As a result, companies such as NextG are required to place their		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
		facilities on "City-owned light standards" within these underground districts, for which the cities then demand monopolistic rents. (15)		
Riverside, California	Next G	Claims that city ordinance prohibits installation of new poles in designated "underground districts" where utilities located in the public right of way must be placed underground. As a result, companies such as NextG are required to place their facilities on "City-owned light standards" within these underground districts, for which the cities then demand monopolistic rents. (15)		
Scottsdale, Arizona	Next G	Claims that the City demands $3,011 per node per year despite the fact that Arizona Revised Statute § 9-582 prohibits the City from imposing such fees on telecommunications corporations such as NextG. (15)		
Portland, Oregon	Next G	Claims that NextG has been advised by the City of annual franchise requirements (based on a percentage of total revenue or mile of fiber) in addition to fees applied to the use of right of way. The fees, beyond franchise, involve: (a) $10,000 annual use fee; (b) $3,000/pole/year (annual 4% adjustment); (c) $2,000 one time application fee/pole; and (d) an audit fee (grantee would pay some portion of the City's audit fees once every five years, not to exceed $5,000). Moreover, parties providing wireless services and deploying in the public way must also post a $10,000 perpetual bond plus a $10,000 construction bond. (16)		
Oakland, California	Next G	Claims that new utility poles with wireless attachments are characterized as "monopoles," and therefore are subject to macro-cell siting requirements such as		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
		setback, screening and landscaping, none of which are practically possible for antennas on utility poles in the public rights of way. Indeed, as discussed below, cities are imposing these requirements on DAS nodes despite the fact that none of the other equipment on the pole, or even the pole itself, was subject to the same review or requirements. (17)		
County of San Mateo, California	Next G	Claims that County Planning Department refused NextG's request and is requiring separate applications for each node. As a result, NextG's permit costs will jump from approximately $10,000 to nearly $50,000. This process is particularly burdensome and unreasonable because no other types of pole attachments are subject to similar requirements. Other types of pole attachments are processed administratively through the County's Department of Public Works, not the Planning Department. (18)		
City of Huntington Beach, California	Next G	Imposes only on NextG's wireless facilities a discretionary and burdensome zoning process that the City has not imposed on any of the other occupants of the same poles in the same public rights of way. (21)		
Mercer Island, Washington	Next G	Claims that City only allows wireless antennas on the utility pole lines along Island Crest Way despite there being poles throughout the island. (21)		
San Bernadino County, California: Apple Valley, Chino Hills, City of Rialto	Next G	Local permitting requirements may drastically differ in jurisdictions located in the same general geographic area. Cites differences between named jurisdictions. (22)		
City of Fountain	Next G	Claims it had to build a stretch of fiber because jurisdiction would not permit		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
Valley, California		NextG to install its fiber optic lines on existing utility poles in the public rights of way along a particular stretch of road. (23)		
City of Huntington Beach, California	Next G	Claims it had to build a stretch of fiber because jurisdiction would not permit NextG to install its fiber optic lines on existing utility poles in the public rights of way along a particular stretch of road. (23)		
Borough of Lansdowne, Pennsylvania	Next G	Even though there may not be an outright restriction, deployment is nonetheless effectively prohibited by limiting the locations for deployment to unsuitable areas. (23)		
Village of South Orange, New Jersey	Next G	Has passed an ordinance restricting any new telecommunications facilities to poles located in the back yard utility easements (23-24)		
City of Tampa, Florida	Next G	City would not allow the installation of antennas in the public right of way and would require any equipment box not otherwise mounted to a pole (unlikely in light of the statewide pole hardening mandate) be vaulted (*i.e.*, underground). These restrictions would effectively preclude NextG from offering its services within Tampa (24).		
City of Palos Verdes Estates, California	Next G	Local authorities have adopted requirements that effectively prohibit the deployment of wireless and DAS networks: demand for "irrelevant information." (25)		
City of Huntington Beach, California	Next G	Local authorities have adopted requirements that effectively prohibit the deployment of wireless and DAS networks: demand for "need for facilities." (25)		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
Town of Hempstead, New York	Next G	Discussing Town's fear of RF emissions (27)		
CenturyLink				
City of North Plains, Oregon	Century Link	Claims that charged excessive fees. (6)		
City of Santa Fe, New Mexico	Century Link	Claims that New Mexico cities have become more aggressive by demanding increases in both the percentages assessed and the base of revenue to which it applies. (7)		
Maryland National-Capital Park & Planning Commission	Century Link	Forced to sue over its threat to evict if company did not agree to an increase in its annual linear foot rate from $4.20 to $26.00.15. (7-8)		
New York, NY	Century Link	CenturyLink was forced to file a lawsuit against the City of New York when it threatened to evict CenturyLink for refusing to make a 5% franchise fee under circumstances where the incumbent enjoyed a perpetual grant of use. (8-9)		
AT&T				
California	AT&T	Access to rights of ways continues to be a significant challenge to AT&T (1)		
Connecticut	AT&T	Claims litigation was necessary to remove unwarranted legal barriers to wireless broadband providers obtaining access to rights of way (3-4)		
"some local authorities"	AT&T	Have imposed moratoria on new cell site applications, manipulated the time when the application is deemed to be complete (and thus delaying the time they contend the shot clock starts), required applications to be resubmitted based on technicalities (which they say triggers a restart of the shot clock), or arbitrarily		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
		rejected applications, forcing applicants to start over. Local officials may also demand that AT&T place sites on property owned by the locality (thereby attempting to generate rent income), even if that property is not ideally suited for the site or if there are much less costly locations, or that AT&T pay for totally unrelated municipal initiatives (*e.g.*, new parks). And in many cases AT&T is required to seek sequential approvals from multiple local authorities (which often have competing interests). (3-4)		
Los Angeles, California	AT&T	Claims that it took more than two and half years from the time AT&T initiated the search for the site to the time the site was full acquired with all approvals obtained. [Interestingly – AT&T does not identify the source of the delays] (6-7)		
San Francisco, California	AT&T	Claims that it took more than two and half years from the time AT&T initiated the search for the site to the time the site was full acquired with all approvals obtained. [Interestingly – AT&T does not identify the source of the delays] (6-7)		
Chicago, Illinois	AT&T	Claims that it took more than two and half years from the time AT&T initiated the search for the site to the time the site was full acquired with all approvals obtained. [Interestingly – AT&T does not identify the source of the delays] (6-7)		
New York	AT&T	Claims that it took more than two and half years from the time AT&T initiated the search for the site to the time the site was full acquired with all approvals obtained. [Interestingly – AT&T does not identify the source of the delays] (6-7)		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
Baltimore	AT&T	Claims that it took more than two and half years from the time AT&T initiated the search for the site to the time the site was full acquired with all approvals obtained. [Interestingly – AT&T does not identify the source of the delays] (6-7)		
Washington, D.C.	AT&T	Claims that it took more than two and half years from the time AT&T initiated the search for the site to the time the site was full acquired with all approvals obtained. [Interestingly – AT&T does not identify the source of the delays] (6-7)		
San Francisco, California	AT&T	Claims the City has not allowed the buildout of the facilities needed for AT&T's U-verse service (5) Claims the City requires additional coverage and capacity are residential areas, and most of these residential areas fall within zoning areas six and seven, which are the zones in which cell site approval is most difficult (if not impossible) to obtain (8-9)		
Connecticut	AT&T	Legal action was required when the state planned to require wireless providers to obtain a state Certificate of Public Convenience and Authority before being permitted to place facilities needed to expand wireless broadband coverage and facilities in public rights-of-way. (5)		
Wilmette, Illinois	AT&T	Local zoning rules that broadly restrict wireless installations, and any attempt to obtain a variance is typically hopeless. (9)		
Highland Park, Illinois	AT&T	Local zoning rules that broadly restrict wireless installations, and any attempt to obtain a variance is typically hopeless. (9)		
Lake Bluff, Illinois	AT&T	Local zoning rules that broadly restrict wireless installations, and any attempt to		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
		obtain a variance is typically hopeless. (9)		
Evanston, Illinois	AT&T	Local zoning rules that broadly restrict wireless installations, and any attempt to obtain a variance is typically hopeless. (9)		
Winnetka, Illinois	AT&T	Local zoning rules that broadly restrict wireless installations, and any attempt to obtain a variance is typically hopeless. (9)		
Glencoe, Illinois	AT&T	Local zoning rules that broadly restrict wireless installations, and any attempt to obtain a variance is typically hopeless. (9)		
New York, New York	AT&T	New fire code restrictions that can significantly limit the location of antennas and equipment on rooftops. (9)		
Chicago, Illinois	AT&T	Limitations on the height of an antenna site based on the number of collocated wireless carriers (75 feet for one, 100 feet for two, and 120 feet for three). AT&T cannot place a new facility on a rooftop unless it finds three other carriers to do so as well. AT&T's only alternative is to apply for a special use variance, which Chicago has been generally unwilling to grant. (9-10)		
Village of Park Ridge, Illinois	AT&T	Adopted ordnance that requires a "fall zone" to be constructed around any wireless telecommunications tower that is equal to one-hundred twenty-five percent (125%) of the height of the tower. (10)		
City of Mission Viejo, California	AT&T	Twelve-month delay in obtaining approval for a new site. (14, fn 17)		
Chino Hills, California	AT&T	AT&T has been working for 18 months to get a cell site approved near a scenic highway. The city has repeatedly rejected the various design plans offered by AT&T to minimize the visual impact (so far, AT&T has offered designs that look like a		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
		Cyprus tree, a telephone pole, and a water tank). (14, fn 17)		
Phoenix, Arizona	AT&T	Application was denied, and the only reason identified was that the proposed location is in a "special part of Phoenix" in that Route 51 leads into the Phoenix Mountain preserve (it is not actually in the preserve). (14, fn 17)		
Richmond, Virginia	AT&T	Moratorium against new wireless applications for two of the past three years while it passed more restrictive ordinances, and after discovering that these new more restrictive ordinances still did not block all of the sites the city council hoped, it voted in favor of a new moratorium. (15, fn 20)		
Talbot County, Maryland	AT&T	After a 20 month moratorium on new cell sites, has established a "telecom zone," and any application for a new site outside of that telecom zone – which AT&T needs to satisfy coverage and capacity requirements – requires as a pre-requisite to accepting the application that the applicant prove that a list of candidates within the telecom zone (provided by Talbot County) are not suitable. (15, fn 20)		
Washington, D.C./Baltimore area	AT&T	Jurisdictions covering two-thirds of AT&T's cell sites *always* submit a list of locations to AT&T and require AT&T to explain why those additional locations are insufficient before they will consider AT&T's application (15, fn. 21)		
City of Fairfax, Virginia	AT&T	City has stated that it does not want any more cell sites, and one of the main strategies it uses to delay and thwart applications is to provide applicants with a long list of alternative sites and requiring		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
		proof as to why each of those sites is not a valid alternative. To make matters worse, these lists almost always contain elementary school properties, and these school officials have repeatedly told AT&T that they will not permit a cell site to be place on school property. (15, fn. 21)		
Fairfax County, Virginia	AT&T	Despite AT&T sharing news that school board will not accept cell towers, county continues to list as alternative sites (15, fn. 21)		
Irvine, California	AT&T	AT&T recently filed an application to add a new site, but the city would not accept AT&T's application until AT&T proved that nine alternative rooftop locations were not viable alternatives, resulting in a lengthy delay. (15, fn. 21) AT&T was required to create a detailed mock-up of the site using the city's vendor, a project that took four months to complete and another six months for the city to approve. (16, fn 22)		
Baltimore County, MD	AT&T	Consultant used by requires applicants to review additional locations, which are often miles from the location where capacity or coverage is needed. (15, fn 21)		
Waltham, Massachusetts.	AT&T	Complains about the number of departments and time it takes for a project to receive approval. Claims it never takes less than a year to complete.(16, fn 23)		
Maryland Heights	AT&T	City sought to require AT&T to pay for part of the development of a private ballpark redevelopment program as a condition of obtaining approval for a cell site. After significant delay, AT&T ultimately negotiated paying to only repave the ballpark's parking lot. (16, fn 23)		

Community	Industry Party	Allegation	Contacted	Participation In Replies
Mountain View, California	AT&T	Has taken the position that AT&T cannot place antennas on a pole-top extension extending a few feet above existing utility poles. (17)		
Los Altos, California	AT&T	Has taken the position that AT&T cannot place antennas on a pole-top extension extending a few feet above existing utility poles. (17)		
Liberty, Missouri	AT&T	While a 100 ft tower was sited, AT&T complains it took a year and in the end the disguise is that of a gigantic pencil. (19)		
Sacred Wind				
McKinley County, New Mexico	Sacred Wind	SUGGESTED AS A MODEL ORDINANCE FOR ACCESS (13, fn 22)		

I. Legal, Nonconforming Towers Are Prohibited from Adding or Changing Antennas[1]

PCIA EXHIBIT B

Jurisdiction	State	Citation	Description
Scottsdale	AZ	N/A	While the code provides for administrative review of collocations under many different circumstances, most structure built prior to the code's adoption in 2003 are now legal non-conforming. As such any modification requires the entire site to be brought into compliance with the code.
Albany	CA	N/A	Even "like-for-like" replacements of antennas on existing legal non-conforming towers are prohibited, effectively limiting 4G rollout.

[1]PCIA claims: "'the most problematic development in recent years,'…[are that] some jurisdictions prohibit adding antennas to towers that are designated 'legal, non-conforming' status under the zoning process. A legal, non-conforming use is a use or structure which was legally established according to the applicable zoning and building laws of the time, but which does not meet current zoning and building regulations. A use or structure can become legal, non-conforming due to rezoning, annexation, or revisions to the zoning code."

Jurisdiction	State	Citation	Description
Irvine	CA	Zoning Ordinance 3-8-2 et seq.	Original plans called for 110-foot monopole, but after negotiations with the city reduced to 82-foot monopole with four planned RAD centers. AT some point later, before the entire site was built out, the City designated the site legal/non-conforming, and further build-out has been disallowed.
Torrence	CA	Code of Ordinances, 92.39.040 (b)	The city originally required company to construct a "stealth" tower in a residential area, but then later said it no longer wants any towers in such areas and will not allow additional build out on the original tower.
San Bernardino	CA	N/A	Collocations on existing wireless facilities are "by right," but most existing structures are nonconforming and therefore require a CUP.

Jurisdiction	State	Citation	Description
Jennings Co.	IN	N/A	New ordinance requires Institutional Zoning District for Telecommunications facilities. Until PCIA members rezone their facilities, they are considered legal, non-conforming and are unable to add new antennas, collocate or add any ground improvements.
Lafayette	IN	N/A	Wireless facilities in any district other than Agricultural or Industrial are nonconforming uses; collocations are considered an expansion of the use, which is prohibited under the code.
Tippecanoe Co.	IN	N/A	Wireless facilities in any district other than Agricultural or Industrial are nonconforming uses; collocations are considered an expansion of the use, which is prohibited under the code.

Jurisdiction	State	Citation	Description
Leawood	KS	Leawood Development Ordinances § 16-4-2	Restrictive tower design, height, and antenna flush-mounting requirements for all existing wireless facilities; in order to add a new collocation, the entire site must be brought into compliance.
Olmstead Falls	OH	N/A	Site originally zoned by Olmstead Twp. sits on land since annexed by the City of Berea and is now considered a legal non-conforming use. As such, the site cannot be expanded.
Pearland	TX	Unified Development Code § 2.5.5.	Onerous setback and screening requirements imposed on tower owners seeking to install new collocations.

Jurisdiction	State	Citation	Description
Mansfield	PA	Meredith Holford, T-Mobile Withdraws Cell Tower Plan, MANSFIELD NEWS (PA), Mar. 20, 2010.	Zoning variance was denied because, since the time that the permit was issued, the zoning rules had changed.

Table 2

Excessive Collocation Application Requirements Unnecessarily Delay Deployment[2]

PCIA EXHIBIT B

Jurisdiction	State	Citation	Description
Ardmore	AL	N/A	Consultant jurisdiction. Permitting process for collocation reported to be essentially the same as for new application, adding significantly to the cost.
Athens	AL	Zoning Ordinance § 78-44	City requires applicant to pay non-refundable fee of $7,500, plus place $2,500 in escrow to cover costs of expert consultation during the application process.
Decatur	AL	Zoning Ordinance § 7-314	Consultant jurisdiction. Nearly identical to Athens ordnance.
Gulf Shores	AL	Zoning Ordinance § 7-184	Consultant jurisdiction. Ordinance requires $7,500 application fee for new permits, $5,000 for colocations along with a $2,500 escrow account.
Hartselle	AL	Zoning Ordinance § 88-36	Consultant jurisdiction. Ordinance requires $8,500 application fee as well as $2,500 in escrow.
Madison	AL	Zoning Ordinance § 17.5-17	Consultant jurisdiction. Ordinance requires $8,500 application fee as well as $2,500 in escrow.

[2] PCIA claims "In many jurisdictions, the process to obtain a zoning permit to collocate antennas on a tower is as onerous as building a new tower. Often, this is because the community has an arrangement with a consultant who requires a significant escrow from the applicant for review of the application. The tower industry experience is that the application review will extend as long as the escrow has funding (and sometimes additional funds are required). The application process is usually extremely complex, requiring studies and engineering reports, not necessary for a straight collocation."

Opelika	AL	Zoning Ordinance § 5.5-314	Consultant jurisdiction. Requires $7,500 application fee and $2,500 escrow.
Pelham	AL	Zoning Ordinance, Art. 2 § 5.5 et seq.	Consultant jurisdiction. Applications fees range from $7,500 for new
Selma City	AL	Zoning Ordinance § 20 1/2-13	Consultant jurisdiction. Requires $8,500 application fee and $2,500
Tuscumbia	AL	Zoning Ordinance § 6.5-74	Consultant jurisdiction. Requires $7,500 application fee and $2,500
Aurora	IN	N/A	N/A
Dearborn	IN	Zoning Ordinance § 1530	Consultant jurisdiction. Requires $8,500 for application fee and $2,500
Lawrenceburg	IN	Zoning Ordinance § 154.41AN	Consultant jurisdiction. Requires $8,500 for application fee and $2,500
Eureka Springs	AZ	Becky Gillette, City Council Enacts Six-Month Moratorium on Cell Towers,	Six-month moratorium put in place, beginning April 2010.
Glendale	CA	Lara Cooper, Supervisors Approve Stricter Cell-Tower Ordinance, But Say No to	Moratorium put in place, 2009
Agoura Hills	CA	Lara Cooper, Supervisors Approve Stricter Cell-Tower Ordinance, But Say No to	Moratorium put in place, 2009
Spokane	WA	Pia Hansen, Cell Tower Scramble, INLANDER.COM.	Put in place a year long moratorium in 2001
Hamilton Twp.	PA	Adam McNaughton, Hamilton Cell Tower Hearings Enter Second Year,	Approval hearing process lasted over one year, beginning in April 2009.
Topsham	ME	Darcie Moore, Cell Tower Proposal Remains on Hold, THE TIMES RECORD	Approval process for 103-foot tower held up for almost a year.
Powel Co.	MT	Chelsi Moy, Cell Tower Rejected at Trixi's Antler Saloon, No Service for	Siting process took over two years. Company faced repeated denials
Glenwood	NJ	Jennifer Knocha, Cell Tower Proposal Irks Neighbor, STRAUS NEWS, Mar. 3,	Company had to get five separate variances in order to construct tower.

Lake Elmo	MN	James Warden, Lake Elmo OKs New Rules for Cell Towers, STILLWATER	Consultant jurisdiction, had moratorium on new construction from Jan -
Vernon	NJ	Jennifer Knocha, Cell Tower Won't Be Built, STRAUS NEWS, Feb. 23, 2010.	After a year of back and forth with the jurisdiction, company withdrew its
Aliso Viejo	CA	N/A	Moratorium in place since May, 2009
Richmond	CA	N/A	Moratorium in place since Feb. 2011
El Cerrito	CA	N/A	Moratorium in place for more than a year

Zoning Restrictions

PCIA EXHIBIT B

Jurisdiction	State	Citation
Madison	AL	Zoning Ordinance § 17.5-8(k)
Maricopa Co.	AZ	N/A
Chatham Co.	GA	Zoning Ordinance § 1202
Savannah	GA	Zoning Ordinance § 8-3195 (b)
Waltham	MA	Zoning Ordinance § 10.5
Harford Co.	MD	Zoning Ordinance § 267-95(F)(1)
Battle Creek	MI	Zoning Ordinance § 1297.055
Bedford Twp.	MI	Zoning Ordinance § 400.1918(2)
Buncombe Co.	NC	Zoning Ordinance § 78-641(a)
Morrisville	NC	N/A
Wilmington	NC	Zoning Ordinance § 18-259
New Castle	NY	Zoning Ordinance § 60-437.9E6.
Franklin	OH	Zoning Ordinance § 1109(k)(8)
West Rockhill	PA	Zoning Ordinance, Art. 26 § 1604(F)(4)(3)(i)
Charleston	SC	Zoning Ordinance § 54.207(c)(g)
Forest Acres	SC	Zoning Ordinance § 21.245.7
Greenville	SC	Zoning Ordinance § 19-4.3.2 (F)(1)(b)
Isle of Palms	SC	Zoning Ordinance § 5-4-20(a)(6)
Richland Co.	SC	Zoning Ordinance § 59

V. Problematic Consultants[3]

State	Jurisdiction
Alabama	Ardmore, City of
Alabama	Athens, City of
Alabama	Brundidge, Town of
Alabama	Camden, City of
Alabama	Decatur, City of
Alabama	Gulf Shores, City
Alabama	Hartselle, City of
Alabama	Hueytown, City of
Alabama	Killen, City of
Alabama	Madison, City
Alabama	Muscle Shoals, City
Alabama	Opelika, City
Alabama	Orange Beach
Alabama	Pelham, City of
Alabama	Rogersville, City of
Alabama	Sheffield
Alabama	Selma, City
Alabama	Talladega, City
Alabama	Trinity (Morgan County)
Alabama	Tuscumbia, City of
Alaska	Matanuska-Susitna, Borough of
Arizona	Apache County
Arizona	Paradise Valley, City of
Arizona	Scottsdale, City of
Arizona	Yavapai County
Arizona	Yuma City
California	Amador County
California	American Canyon, City of
California	Auburn, City of
California	Belvedere, City of
California	Benicia, City of
California	Calabasas, City of

[3] To make this list, all you need to have done is have hired a consultant that the industry did not like.

California	Calistoga, City of
California	Clearlake, City of
California	Cloverdale, City of
California	Colfax, City of
California	Corte Madera, City of
California	Cotati, City of
California	Daly City, City of
California	Dana Point, City of
California	Davis, City of
California	Fairfax, City of
California	Fairfield, City of
California	Fort Bragg, City of
California	Glendale, Cit of
California	Goleta, City of
California	Grass Valley, City of
California	Half Moon Bay, City of
California	Healdsburg, City of
California	Lake County
California	Lake Forest, City of
California	Lakeport, City of
California	Lincoln, City of
California	Loomis, City of
California	Marin County
California	Mendocino County
California	Mill Valley, City of
California	Modesto, County of
California	Napa County
California	Napa, City of
California	Nevada County
California	Novato, City of
California	Oakley, City of
California	Orinda, City of
California	Pacifica, City of
California	Pasadena, City of
California	Petaluma, City of
California	Pinole, City of
California	Placer County
California	Placerville, City of

California	Point Arena, City of
California	Portola, City of
California	Rio Vista, City of
California	Rohnert Park, City of
California	Ross, City of
California	San Rafael, City of
California	Santa Monica, City of
California	Santa Rosa, City of
California	Sausalito, City of
California	Sebastopol, City of
California	Solano County
California	Sonoma County
California	Sonoma, City of
California	St. Helena, City of
California	Suisun, City of
California	Temecula, City of
California	Thousand Oaks, City of
California	Tiburon, City of
California	Ukiah, City of
California	Vacaville, City of
California	Vallejo, City of
California	Walnut Creek
California	Willits, City of
California	Windsor, City of
California	Yolo County
California	Yountville, City of
California	Yuba City, City of
Connecticut	Branford, Town of
Connecticut	Derby
Connecticut	Marlborough, Town of
Connecticut	Southbury, Town of
Florida	Alachua County
Florida	Alamonte Springs, City of
Florida	Cedar Grove, City of
Florida	Davie, Town of
Florida	DeFuniak Springs, City of

Florida	Ebro, Town of
Florida	Indian River County
Florida	Kissimmee, City of
Florida	Lakeland, City of
Florida	Liberty, County of
Florida	Margate, City of
Florida	Neptune Beach, Town of
Florida	Oconee, City of
Florida	Palm Coast, City of
Florida	Quincy, City of
Florida	West Palm Beach, City of
Georgia	Clayton County
Georgia	Coweta County
Georgia	Decatur County
Georgia	Dublin, Town of
Georgia	Gwinnett, Couty of
Georgia	Habersham County
Georgia	Laurens County
Georgia	Liberty County
Georgia	Pulaski County
Georgia	Sandy Spring
Georgia	Savannah, City of/Chatham County
Georgia	Troup County
Illinois	Collinsville, City of
Illinois	Oak Brook, Village of
Illinois	Peoria, City of
Illinois	Winnetka, Village of
Indiana	Aurora, City of
Indiana	Dearborn County
Indiana	Lawrenceburg, City of
Iowa	Lemars, City of
Iowa	Sioux Center, City of
Kansas	Harvey County
Kansas	Johnson County
Kansas	Overland Park, City of
Kansas	Sedgwick County
Kansas	Witchita, City of

Maine	Lincolnville
Maine	Manchester, Town of
Maine	North Berwick, Town of
Maryland	Augusta County
Maryland	Baltimore County
Maryland	Carroll County
Maryland	Montgomery County
Maryland	Prince George's County
Maryland	Walkersville, Town of
Massachusetts	Acton, Town of
Massachusetts	Agawam
Massachusetts	Aquinnah
Massachusetts	Ashburnham
Massachusetts	Ashland, Town of
Massachusetts	Auburn, Town of
Massachusetts	Ayer, Town of
Massachusetts	Barnstable, Town of
Massachusetts	Belmont, Town of
Massachusetts	Billerica, Town of
Massachusetts	Blandford
Massachusetts	Boston
Massachusetts	Bourne, Town of
Massachusetts	Boxborough
Massachusetts	Boxford
Massachusetts	Braintree
Massachusetts	Brewster, Town of
Massachusetts	Brookfield, Town of
Massachusetts	Burlington
Massachusetts	Canton, Town of
Massachusetts	Cape Cod Commission
Massachusetts	Carlisle
Massachusetts	Charlemont, Town of
Massachusetts	Chatham, Town of
Massachusetts	Chilmark
Massachusetts	Concord, Town of
Massachusetts	Conway

Massachusetts	Cummington, Town of
Massachusetts	Dalton
Massachusetts	Dartmouth, Town of
Massachusetts	Dedham
Massachusetts	Dennis, Town of
Massachusetts	Dennisport
Massachusetts	Dighton, Town of
Massachusetts	Dover
Massachusetts	Dracut
Massachusetts	Duxbury
Massachusetts	Eastham, Town of
Massachusetts	Edgartown, Town of
Massachusetts	Falmouth
Massachusetts	Fitchburg, Town of
Massachusetts	Framingham
Massachusetts	Georgetown, Town of
Massachusetts	Gloucester, City of
Massachusetts	Grafton, Town of
Massachusetts	Granby
Massachusetts	Great Barrington, Town of
Massachusetts	Groton, Town of
Massachusetts	Hamilton, Town of
Massachusetts	Harvard
Massachusetts	Harwich, Town of
Massachusetts	Harwichport
Massachusetts	Hingham
Massachusetts	Hubbardston
Massachusetts	Ipswich
Massachusetts	Kingston
Massachusetts	Lancaster
Massachusetts	Lanesborough
Massachusetts	Lee
Massachusetts	Lenox
Massachusetts	Leyden
Massachusetts	Lincoln, Town of
Massachusetts	Lynnfield
Massachusetts	Manchester by the Sea
Massachusetts	Marblehead

Massachusetts	Marlborough
Massachusetts	Marston Mills, Town of
Massachusetts	Mashpee, Town of
Massachusetts	Mashpee/Sandwich
Massachusetts	Maynard
Massachusetts	Medfield, Town of
Massachusetts	Medford, Town of
Massachusetts	Methuen
Massachusetts	Middlefield, Town of
Massachusetts	Millis
Massachusetts	Milton, Town of
Massachusetts	Montgomery, Town of
Massachusetts	Nahant
Massachusetts	Natick
Massachusetts	Newbury, Town of
Massachusetts	Newton
Massachusetts	Norton
Massachusetts	Oakham, Town of
Massachusetts	Orleans, Town of
Massachusetts	Osterville
Massachusetts	Pepperell
Massachusetts	Plymouth
Massachusetts	Princeton, Town of
Massachusetts	Provincetown, Town of
Massachusetts	Raynham
Massachusetts	Rowley, Town of
Massachusetts	Salisbury
Massachusetts	Sandwich
Massachusetts	Scituate, Town of
Massachusetts	Sharon, Town of
Massachusetts	Sheffield
Massachusetts	Shelburne
Massachusetts	Somerville, Town of
Massachusetts	Stockbridge, Town of
Massachusetts	Stoneham
Massachusetts	Stoughton
Massachusetts	Stow, Town of

Massachusetts	Sturbridge
Massachusetts	Sudbury
Massachusetts	Sutton
Massachusetts	Swansea
Massachusetts	Templeton, Town of
Massachusetts	Tewksbury
Massachusetts	Topsfield
Massachusetts	Truro, Town of
Massachusetts	Tyngsborough
Massachusetts	Wales, Town of
Massachusetts	Wareham
Massachusetts	Watertown
Massachusetts	Wayland
Massachusetts	Wellesley
Massachusetts	Wellfleet, Town of
Massachusetts	Wendell, Town of
Massachusetts	Wenham
Massachusetts	West Dennis
Massachusetts	West Newbury, Town of
Massachusetts	West Springfield, Town of
Massachusetts	West Stockbridge
Massachusetts	West Tisbury
Massachusetts	Westfield, Town of
Massachusetts	Westminster
Massachusetts	Weston, Town of
Massachusetts	Westport
Massachusetts	Westwood
Massachusetts	Wilbraham, Town of
Massachusetts	Woburn
Massachusetts	Worthington, Town of
Michigan	Detroit, City of
Michigan	Fenton
Michigan	Grosse Point Woods, City of
Michigan	Harbor Beach, City of
Michigan	La Salle
Michigan	Lyon Township
Michigan	Oceola Township

Michigan	Orchard Lake, City of
Michigan	Tyrone Township
Minnesota	Duluth, City of
Minnesota	Friedly, City of
Mississippi	Jefferson County
Missouri	Camden County
Missouri	Camden, City of
Missouri	Florissant, City of
Missouri	Lake of the Ozarks
Missouri	New Haven, City of
Missouri	Osage Beach, City of
Missouri	St. Charles, City of
Missouri	St. Clair, City of
Missouri	St. Clair County
Missouri	St. Peters, City of
Missouri	Washington, City of
Missouri	Wentzville, City of
Nebraska	Doniphan, Village of
Nebraska	Douglas County
Nebraska	Sarpy County
Nebraska	Saunders County
New Hampshire	Alton
New Hampshire	Ashland
New Hampshire	Belmont, Town of
New Hampshire	Bow
New Hampshire	Brookline
New Hampshire	Candia
New Hampshire	Carroll
New Hampshire	Chester
New Hampshire	Concord
New Hampshire	Conway, Town of

New Hampshire	Dublin, Town of
New Hampshire	Durham, Town of
New Hampshire	Effingham
New Hampshire	Goffstown
New Hampshire	Hillsborough, Town of
New Hampshire	Hollis
New Hampshire	Hudson, Town of
New Hampshire	Kingston, Town of
New Hampshire	Nashua
New Hampshire	Pembroke
New Hampshire	Tufttonboro
New Jersey	Paramus
New Mexico	Cibola County
New Mexico	Edgewood
New Mexico	Guadalupe
New Mexico	Lincoln County
New Mexico	Luna County
New Mexico	McKinley County
New Mexico	Mora County
New Mexico	Rio Rancho, City of
New Mexico	Roswell, City of
New Mexico	Ruidoso
New Mexico	Sandoval County
New Mexico	Sierra County
New Mexico	Socorro County
New York	Airmont, Town of
New York	Amherst, Town of
New York	Bayville Village
New York	Beekmantown
New York	Bethlehem
New York	Binghamton

New York	Brewster Village
New York	Bronxville, Village of
New York	Brutus, Town of
New York	Buchanan, Village of
New York	Caroline
New York	Chazy
New York	Cheektowaga, Town of
New York	Chester, Village of
New York	Colesville, Town of
New York	Colonie, Town of
New York	Conklin
New York	Cortlandt
New York	Danby
New York	Decatur
New York	Durham
New York	East Greenbush
New York	Fort Ann
New York	Fort Edward
New York	Ghent
New York	Goshen
New York	Hamlin
New York	Hamptonburgh
New York	Hastings, Town of
New York	Hastings-on-Hudson
New York	Haverstraw
New York	Hempstead, Town of
New York	Irvington Village
New York	Kirkwood, Town of
New York	Lawrence Village
New York	Maine
New York	Mamaroneck Village
New York	Milan
New York	Montgomery
New York	Mt. Vernon, City of
New York	Nanticoke
New York	New Rochelle City
New York	Newark Valley Town
New York	Newark Valley Village

New York	Newburgh
New York	North Tonawanda, Town of
New York	Olean
New York	Olive
New York	Oneonta, Town of
New York	Orangetown
New York	Ossining, Town of
New York	Ossining, Village of
New York	Oswego City
New York	Peekskill
New York	Pelham Village
New York	Petersborough
New York	Philadelphia
New York	Phillipstown, Town of
New York	Plattsburgh
New York	Putnam Valley, Town of
New York	Ramapo
New York	Richfield
New York	Rosendale
New York	Sheffield
New York	St. Johnsville
New York	Stanford, Town of
New York	Tarrytown
New York	Thompson
New York	Wayne County
New York	Wesley Hills
New York	Wheatland, Town of
New York	Woodbury
New York	Yonkers, City of
North Carolina	Cabarrus County
North Carolina	Carteret County
North Carolina	Catawba County
North Carolina	Chowan County
North Carolina	Clayton, Town of

North Carolina	Durham County
North Carolina	Franklin County
North Carolina	Franklin, Town of
North Carolina	Granville County
North Carolina	Harnett County
North Carolina	Haywood County
North Carolina	Jackson County
North Carolina	Johnston County
North Carolina	Lee County (including cities)
North Carolina	Lillington, Town of
North Carolina	Maiden, Town of
North Carolina	Moore County
North Carolina	Morrisville, City of
North Carolina	Nash County
North Carolina	Orange County (new builds only)
North Carolina	Pasquotank County
North Carolina	Perquimans County
North Carolina	Person County
North Carolina	Reidsville, City of
North Carolina	Roanoke Rapids
North Carolina	Rockingham, City of
North Carolina	Rolesville, Town of
North Carolina	Rowan County

North Carolina	Stokes County
North Carolina	Topsail Beach, Town of
North Carolina	Walnut Cove, Town of
North Carolina	Wendell
Ohio	Avon Lake, City of
Ohio	Glendae, Village of
Ohio	Monroe, City of
Ohio	Silverton, City of
Ohio	Streetsboro, City of
Ohio	Springdale, City of
Ohio	Waite Hill, Village of
Pennsylvania	Jefferson Township (Mercer County)
Pennsylvania	LeBeouf Township
Pennsylvania	Liberty Township (Adams County)
Pennsylvania	Lower Merion Township (Neighborhood group)
Pennsylvania	Mill Valley, City of
Rhode Island	Burrillville, Town of
Rhode Island	Coventry
Rhode Island	Cranston
Rhode Island	Exeter
Rhode Island	Foster
Rhode Island	Glocester, Town of
Rhode Island	Little Compton, Town of
Rhode Island	Smithfield
South Carolina	Oconee County
South Carolina	Saluda County
South Dakota	Custer County
South Dakota	Yankton County
Tennessee	Williamson County
Texas	Irving, City of

Texas	West University Place, City of
Virginia	Albermarle County
Virginia	Augusta County
Virginia	Bedford County
Virginia	Campbell County
Virginia	Caroline County
Virginia	Fauquier County
Virginia	Fluvanna County
Virginia	Hanover County
Virginia	Henrico County
Virginia	James County
Virginia	James, City of
Virginia	Loudoun County
Virginia	Lunenberg County
Virginia	Page County
Virginia	Roanoke County
Virginia	Rockbridge County
Virginia	Warren County
Virginia	Williamsburg, City of
Virginia	Wythville, Town of
Virginia	York County
Washington	Bothell, City of
Washington	King County
Washington	Lacey, City of
Washington	Medina, City of
Washington	Port Townsend, City of
Washington	Puyallup, City of
Washington	San Juan County
Washington	Shoreline, City of
West Virginia	Wheeling, City of
Wisconsin	Delafield, Town of
Wisconsin	Delvan, City of
Wisconsin	Genesee, Town of
Wisconsin	Kohler, Village of
Wisconsin	La Grange, Town of
Wisconsin	Mukwonago, Town of
Wisconsin	Oconomowoc Lake, Village of

Wisconsin	Oneida County
Wisconsin	Ottawa, Town of
Wisconsin	Portage County
Wisconsin	Richfield, Village of
Wisconsin	Scandinavia, Village of
Wisconsin	Vernon, Town of
Wisconsin	Waukesha County

SUPPLEMENT (PCIA EXHIBIT B)

In some jurisdictions, an applicant must prove the need for the addition antennas in order to be granted permission for new towers and/or attachments. Examples of these jurisdictions include:

Jurisdiction	State
Annapolis	MD
Harford Co.	MD
Newcastle	NY
Tewksbury Township	NJ
West Rockhill Township	PA
Lunenburg Co.	VA
Kohler	WI
Omro	WI

II. Full Discretionary Zoning Hearings For Collocation:

Regardless of the status of the existing tower, collocation applications in certain jurisdictions must go through a full zoning review and hearing. One must obtain a variance or special use permit for each new collocation on a tower. Other jurisdictions where the industry has faced this issue include:

Jurisdiction	State
Flagstaff	AZ
Maricopa Co.	AZ
Mesa	AZ
Paradise Valley	AZ
Pima Co.	AZ
Scottsdale	AZ
Berkeley	CA
Burbank	CA
Carlsbad	CA
Chula Vista	CA
Davis	CA
Fontana	CA
Fresno	CA
Glendale	CA
Inglewood	CA
Irvine	CA
Lake Elsinore	CA
Long Beach	CA
Los Altos	CA
Los Angeles	CA
Moreno Valley	CA

Jurisdiction	State
Norwalk	CA
Oakland	CA
Oceanside	CA
Ontario	CA
Pacifica	CA
Pasadena	CA
Pomona	CA
Rialto	CA
Riverside County	CA
City of San Diego	CA
San Diego County	CA
San Dimas	CA
San Jose	CA
San Luis Obispo	CA
Simi Valley	CA
Temecula	CA
Thousand Oaks	CA
Torrance	CA
Ventura County	CA
Cobb Co.	GA
Huntley	IL

Jurisdiction	State
Cedar Lake	IL
Wilmette	IL
Highland Park	IL
Northbrook	IL
Hoffman Estates	IL
Winnetka	IL
Kenilworth	IL
Glenview	IL
Dearborn County	IN
Lawrenceberg	IN
Aurora	IN
Tippecanoe Co.	IN
Lafayette	IN
Allen County	IN
Ft. Wayne	IN
Lake County	IN
Concord	MA
Hopkinton	MA
Waltham	MA
Reno	NV
Epping	NH
Goffstown	NH
City of Albuquerque	NM
Monroe	OH
Silverton	OH

Jurisdiction	State
Strongsville	OH
Bend	OR
Portland	OR
Pine Township, Allegheny Co.	PA
Pawtucket	RI
Woonsocket	RI
Little Elm	TX
West Lake Hills	TX
Pharr	TX
Pearland	TX
Mission	TX
Alamo Heights	TX
Rollingwood	TX
South Lake	TX
Lucas	TX
League City	TX
Charlotte	VT
Leesburg	VA
Loudon Co.	VA
Vienna	VA
San Juan Co.	WA
Seattle	WA
Thurston Co.	WA
City of Issaquah	WA

Portland	OR	City of Portland, Binding City Policy UTL-1.03 (Exhibit A)	City Council requires tower companies to meet with the affected neighborhood 30 days before applying to install on public right of way.
Irving	CA	City of Irvine Regulations § 2-37.5-5	City requires conditional use permit for collocation.
San Francisco	CA	San Francisco Administrative Code § 11.9	Requires multi-agency review of the application and facing Sec. 253 preemption challenge.
Temecula	CA	N/A	Imposes a CUP process on DAS
Scottsdale	AZ	N/A	City requires full backing of local residents for a project to proceed
Paradise Valley	AZ	Paradise Valley, Zoning Ordinance Art. XII § 1204(3)	Requires 200-foot setback from any single-family residence.
West Jordan	UT	N/A	Prior to allowing the replacement of streetlights to accommodate antennas, a zoning text amendment to the City ordinance is required.
Salt Lake City	UT	Salt Lake City, Zoning Ordinances § 19.83.050	Denies access to telecom in the ROW if residential
Fairfax Co.	VA	Fairfax County Code § 2232	DAS attachments require full hearing.