

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

SPRINT CORPORATION,

Petitioner,

CITY OF BOWIE, Maryland; CITY OF EUGENE, Oregon;
CITY OF HUNTSVILLE, Alabama; CITY OF WESTMINSTER,
Maryland; COUNTY OF MARIN, California; CITY OF
ARCADIA, California; CULVER CITY, California; CITY OF
BELLEVUE, California; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington;
CITY OF BURLINGAME, Washington; CITY OF GIG
HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington;
CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS,
Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF
MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California;
CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND,
Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN
JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF
YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California;
TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California; CITY OF NEW YORK,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,

Petitioner,

CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE,
California; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF

BURLINGAME, Washington; CITY OF GIG HARBOR,
Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF
KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada;

No. 19-70123

No. 19-70124

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CULVER CITY, California; CITY OF NEW YORK; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

PUERTO RICO TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC.,

Petitioner,

CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE, California; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF BURLINGAME, Washington; CITY OF GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California;

CULVER CITY, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California;
CITY OF NEW YORK,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

No. 19-70125

and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

CITY OF SEATTLE, Washington; CITY OF TACOMA, Washington; KING COUNTY, Washington; LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES; LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES; LEAGUE OF ARIZONA CITIES AND TOWNS,

Petitioners,

CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, California; CITY OF COCONUT CREEK, Florida; CITY OF LACEY, Washington; CITY OF OLYMPIA, Washington; CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES, California; CITY OF TUMWATER, Washington; COLORADO COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITY ALLIANCE; RAINIER COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; COUNTY OF THURSTON, Washington; CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE, Washington; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF BURLINGAME, California; CITY OF GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS

No. 19-70136

ANGELES, California; CULVER CITY, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California; CITY OF NEW YORK,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE, Washington; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF BURLINGAME, California; CULVER CITY, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California; CITY OF GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona,

Petitioners,

CTIA—THE WIRELESS ASSOCIATION; COMPETITIVE CARRIERS ASSOCIATION; SPRINT CORPORATION; VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.; CITY OF NEW YORK; WIRELESS INFRASTRUCTURE ASSOCIATION,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

No. 19-70144

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

No. 19-70145

CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH,

Petitioner,

CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE, Washington; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF BURLINGAME, California; CITY OF GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CULVER CITY, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California; CITY OF NEW YORK,

Intervenors,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND,

Petitioner,

v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

AT&T SERVICES, INC.,

Petitioner,

No. 19-70146

No. 19-70147

No. 19-70326

CITY OF BALTIMORE, Maryland; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, California; MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE; CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, New Mexico; NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES; CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, California; TOWN OF OCEAN CITY, Maryland; CITY OF BROOKHAVEN, Georgia; CITY OF COCONUT CREEK, Florida; CITY OF DUBUQUE, Iowa; CITY OF EMERYVILLE, California; CITY OF FRESNO, California; CITY OF LA VISTA, Nebraska; CITY OF LACEY, Washington; CITY OF MEDINA, Washington; CITY OF OLYMPIA, Washington; CITY OF PAPILLION, Nebraska; CITY OF PLANO, Texas; CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES, California; CITY OF ROCKVILLE, Maryland; CITY OF SAN BRUNO, California; CITY OF SANTA MONICA, California; CITY OF SUGARLAND, Texas; CITY OF TUMWATER, Washington; CITY OF WESTMINSTER, Maryland; COLORADO COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITY ALLIANCE; CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, California; COUNTY OF MARIN, California; INTERNATIONAL CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION; INTERNATIONAL MUNICIPAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION; LEAGUE OF NEBRASKA MUNICIPALITIES; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS; RAINIER COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; THURSTON COUNTY, Washington; TOWN OF CORTE MADERA, California; TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH, California; TOWN OF YARROW POINT, Washington; CITY OF ARCADIA, California; CITY OF BELLEVUE, Washington; CITY OF BURIEN, Washington; CITY OF BURLINGAME, California; CITY OF CULVER CITY, California; CITY OF GIG HARBOR, Washington; CITY OF ISSAQUAH, Washington; CITY OF KIRKLAND, Washington; CITY OF LAS VEGAS, Nevada; CITY OF LOS ANGELES, California; CITY OF MONTEREY, California; CITY OF ONTARIO, California; CITY OF PIEDMONT, California; CITY OF PORTLAND, Oregon; CITY OF SAN JACINTO, California; CITY OF SAN JOSE, California; CITY OF SHAFTER, California; CITY OF YUMA, Arizona; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, California; TOWN OF FAIRFAX, California,

Intervenors,

V.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION,

Petitioner,

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, New Mexico; NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES; CITY OF BROOKHAVEN, Georgia; CITY OF BALTIMORE, Maryland; CITY OF DUBUQUE, Iowa; TOWN OF OCEAN CITY, Maryland; CITY OF EMERYVILLE, California; MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE; TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH, California; CITY OF LA VISTA, Nebraska; CITY OF MEDINA, Washington; CITY OF PAPILLION, Nebraska; CITY OF PLANO, Texas; CITY OF ROCKVILLE, Maryland; CITY OF SAN BRUNO, California; CITY OF SANTA MONICA, California; CITY OF SUGARLAND, Texas; LEAGUE OF NEBRASKA MUNICIPALITIES; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS; CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, California; CITY OF FRESNO, California; CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES, California; CITY OF COCONUT CREEK, Florida; CITY OF LACEY, Washington; CITY OF OLYMPIA, Washington; CITY OF TUMWATER, Washington; TOWN OF YARROW POINT, Washington; THURSTON COUNTY, Washington; COLORADO COMMUNICATIONS AND UTILITY ALLIANCE; RAINIER COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, California; COUNTY OF MARIN, California; CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, California; TOWN OF CORTE MADERA, California; CITY OF WESTMINSTER, Maryland,

Intervenors,

V.

No. 19-70339

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondents.

CITY OF AUSTIN, Texas; CITY OF ANN ARBOR, Michigan;
COUNTY OF ANNE ARUNDEL, Maryland; CITY OF
ATLANTA, Georgia; CITY OF BOSTON, Massachusetts;
CITY OF CHICAGO, Illinois; CLARK COUNTY, Nevada;
CITY OF COLLEGE PARK, Maryland; CITY OF DALLAS,
Texas; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; CITY OF GAITHERSBURG,
Maryland; HOWARD COUNTY, Maryland; CITY OF
LINCOLN, Nebraska; MONTGOMERY COUNTY, Maryland;
CITY OF MYRTLE BEACH, South Carolina; CITY OF
OMAHA, Nebraska; CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
Pennsylvania; CITY OF RYE, New York; CITY OF
SCARSDALE, New York; CITY OF SEAT PLEASANT,
Maryland; CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, Maryland; TEXAS
COALITION OF CITIES FOR UTILITY ISSUES; MERIDIAN
TOWNSHIP, MICHIGAN; BLOOMFIELD TOWNSHIP,
MICHIGAN; MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION;
MICHIGAN COALITION TO PROTECT PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-
WAY,

Petitioners,

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, New Mexico; NATIONAL
LEAGUE OF CITIES; CITY OF BROOKHAVEN, Georgia;
CITY OF BALTIMORE, Maryland; CITY OF DUBUQUE,
Iowa; TOWN OF OCEAN CITY, Maryland; CITY OF
EMERYVILLE, California; MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE;
TOWN OF HILLSBOROUGH, California; CITY OF LA VISTA,
Nebraska; CITY OF MEDINA, Washington; CITY OF
PAPILLION, Nebraska; CITY OF PLANO, Texas; CITY OF
ROCKVILLE, Maryland; CITY OF SAN BRUNO, California;
CITY OF SANTA MONICA, California; CITY OF
SUGARLAND, Texas; LEAGUE OF NEBRASKA
MUNICIPALITIES; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS; CITY
OF BAKERSFIELD, California; CITY OF FRESNO,
California; CITY OF RANCHO PALOS VERDES, California;

No. 19-70341