

**From:** [Mchugh, Eileen \(BOS\)](#)  
**To:** [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Strongly OPPOSING Budget and Finance Committee Agenda Items #10 - 14 Master License Agreements for Wireless Companies GTE Mobilnet/Verizon Wireless, Mobilitie, ExteNet, Crown Castle, New Cingular Wireless/AT&T (Files 230620 - 230624)  
**Date:** Tuesday, July 11, 2023 3:21:25 PM

---

For the File

---

**From:** aeboken <aeboken@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 11, 2023 1:40 PM  
**To:** BOS-Supervisors <bos-supervisors@sfgov.org>; BOS-Legislative Aides <bos-legislative\_aides@sfgov.org>  
**Subject:** Strongly OPPOSING Budget and Finance Committee Agenda Items #10 - 14 Master License Agreements for Wireless Companies GTE Mobilnet/Verizon Wireless, Mobilitie, ExteNet, Crown Castle, New Cingular Wireless/AT&T (Files 230620 - 230624)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

**TO: Budget and Finance Committee members**

**Board of Supervisors members**

Strongly OPPOSING these contracts as an egregious form of corporate welfare.

The wireless companies got a decision from an industry-friendly FCC that pole siting license fees should be only at cost.

The SFPUC appealed that decision and lost.

The SFPUC (and SFMTA) are now willing to enter into longterm 12 (twelve) year contracts claiming they have no choice as the wireless companies won the appeal and are now insisting on longterm contracts.

There is a choice.

The SFPUC (and SFMTA) can let the current contracts expire and let the wireless companies site their antennas elsewhere.

This was stated at public comment when these items were heard at the SFPUC Commission.

The SFPUC response is that this could interrupt wireless service.

And?

This is the rationale being used to justify enabling corporate welfare?

Eileen Boken,  
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods\*

\* For identification purposes only.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone