



## CA SB-556 Gives Telecom Uncontrolled Access to ANY Street Light, Traffic Signal Pole, Utility Pole, or Support Structure!

# Urgent! VOTE NO on SB-556 KEEP Local Control

### WHAT CA SB-556 WOULD DO:

**“SB 556 “Street Light Poles, Traffic Signal Poles, Utility Poles, and Support Structures: Attachments”** is an attempt by the telecommunications industry to undermine local authority while making no meaningful progress towards closing the digital divide in California’s unserved and underserved communities.”  
[Opposition by League of California Cities: Link](#)

**“To protect the public’s investment, the control of the public rights-of-way must remain local.”**

“This measure requires local governments to make space available to telecommunications providers without recognizing local authority to manage the public right-of-way preserved in federal law. FCC regulations explicitly enable local governments to ensure that such installations meet appearance and design standards, maintain traffic safety, protect historical resources’ integrity, and safeguard citizens’ quality of life.

**“SB 556 creates ambiguity [mandates restrictions] regarding fees local governments can charge for access to their infrastructure.”**

“Federal law explicitly outlines conditions for valid fees, limiting fees to a “reasonable approximation of the local government’s actual and direct costs,” including costs to maintain a structure within the right-of-way, process an application or permit, and review a siting application. SB 556, on the other hand, chooses not to incorporate these federal standards, further restricting fees to “actual cost” and “reasonable actual cost.” If the goal of SB 556 is to implement the existing FCC orders into state law, there should be no added ambiguity created by changes from what was already decided at the federal level.”

**From the Legislative text:** “This bill would require a local publicly owned electric utility to make available appropriate space and capacity for use by cable television corporations, video service providers, and telephone corporations on and in their street light poles, traffic signal poles, and supporting structures... By placing additional requirements upon local publicly owned electric utilities, utilities and local governments, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.” [Link](#)

### ACTION TO TAKE: BEFORE NOON, APRIL 14TH

SB-556 will be heard before the Senate Energy, Utilities and Communications Committee on April 19. POSITION LETTER DEADLINE FOR HEARINGS IS NOON, April 14th. Send comments through this [“Submit Position Letter” portal link](#). However if you are writing your own Senator it’s good to do both. [Contact your Senator: Link](#) Also contact your local city government. Send them a copy of the [opposition letter from the League of California Cities](#) so they can send their own official letter.

### POINTS TO MAKE ABOUT SB-556:

**Takes away local control:** Federal regulations explicitly give local governments control to ensure that such installations meet appearance and design standards, maintain traffic safety, protect historical resources’ integrity, and safeguard citizens’ quality of life. To protect the public’s investment, the control of the public rights of way must remain local.

**Reduces property values:** Research has shown that property value decreases when antennas are close to homes and this will require antennas every 500 feet.

### We need to support fiber to and through the Premises:

The current Federal infrastructure bill (the Moving Forward Plan) has funding for BroadBand and many Democratic leaders are supporting funding specifically for fiber optic wiring to and into the premises to “Build Back Better” because it’s faster and easier to upgrade, uses less energy, is more secure and reliable in wind, weather and with multiple users, and is the best way to eliminate the digital divide.

**Keep locally controlled income stream:** This bill will preclude municipalities from establishing fiber to the premises as a locally run and regulated utility that can be an income stream and can be used to subsidize internet services to underserved neighborhoods and rural areas.

**If you want to include safety:** Remember, we are not trying to convince them that Wireless is unsafe (even though we know the dangers). We want to convince them that CA State should support “fiber to the premises” and not take control of our local street-scapes! [Link to Safetech4santarosa.org](#)