


# H.R. 2289 - A Bill To Preempt Local Control Over Cell Towers & Eliminate Historic and Environmental Reviews

WHAT CITIES, COUNTIES, AND RESIDENTS MUST KNOW



*H.R. 2289, as amended on 11/18/2025, would pre-empt state and local authority over the siting, permitting and regulation of cell towers and wireless infrastructure nationwide.*

## HERE IS WHAT BILL H.R. 2289 WOULD DO IF PASSED:

---

### 1. Sweeping Preemption of Local Control

The bill would invalidate many local rules related to the authorization of cell towers and base station cell antennas.

### 2. Environmental and Historic Review Rollbacks

H.R. 2289 exempts many facilities from review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), such as when antennas are added, equipment is swapped out, or modifications are made to existing structures that fall within the bill's expanded "categorical exclusions." These exemptions will cover most collocations, small wireless facilities, and many cell tower replacements.

### 3. Short Deadlines With Automatic Approval Render Local Review a Rubber Stamp

H.R. 2289 would codify "shot clock" requirements into federal law, making them far more difficult to reverse or amend in the future. Short deadlines (shot clocks) for processing applications and automatic approvals ("deems granted") if a city or county misses them, means building, electrical, environmental, and zoning reviews all must be completed within the same short window.

### 4. Limits on Local Fees

H.R. 2289 would likely constrain local fees for cell tower and wireless facility applications, preventing cities and counties from recovering the full costs of review and shifting those expenses onto local taxpayers.

### 5. Expanded Preemption on RF Radiation Health

The bill bars localities from considering the environmental or health impacts of cell tower radiofrequency (RF) radiation as long as a facility meets the FCC's exposure limits.

Section 704 of the 1996 Telecom Act already prevents local governments from considering RF impacts when reviewing the placement, construction, or modification of facilities — but H.R. 2289 goes further by extending this preemption to the "operation" of wireless facilities as well.

FCC limits have not been updated since 1996, and the FCC has still not complied with a **federal court order** to explain how they protect children or account for long-term exposure.

# H.R. 2289 - A Bill To Preempt Local Control Over Cell Towers & Eliminate Historic and Environmental Reviews

WHAT CITIES, COUNTIES, AND RESIDENTS MUST KNOW



The National League of Cities • National Association of Counties • The United States Conference of Mayors • National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors

## [November 2025 Letter to the House Subcommittee](#)

“These bills represent an **unprecedented federal intrusion into established local decision-making processes**, favoring large broadband, telecommunications, wireless, and cable companies at the expense of residents and taxpayers. These bills strip local governments of the ability to effectively manage the infrastructure built on local streets and in neighborhoods, while imposing no reciprocal obligations on providers.”

“**Local governments are not barriers to broadband deployment.** Rather, they are indispensable partners. Local permitting offices around the nation work every day to coordinate construction in crowded and complex rights-of-way to ensure public safety, manage traffic, protect existing utilities and workers, and maintain fair competition. Congress itself affirmed the essential nature of this locally-driven process with Sections 224, 253, and 332 of the Telecommunications Act.”

## [April 16, 2026 Letter to House Leadership](#)

“H.R. 2289 creates a framework that **prioritizes communication companies’ shareholder value at the expense of the safety** and financial interests of the communities and the taxpayers they serve. Furthermore, by limiting cost-recovery mechanisms for application reviews, the bill effectively forces local taxpayers to subsidize private providers’ administrative expenses – a cost that falls entirely on the public.”

Letters in this PDF are hyperlinked. [Click to read them.](#)

## The Health and Safety Risks of Cell Towers

- Visual impacts - towers ruin the view
- Towers can be added and made taller with little public process
- Decrease property values by 5% - 20%
- Fire risk and hazardous materials
- Wireless radiation exposures that can increase each year

[Science and Facts on Cell Tower Risks](#)

# H.R. 2289 - A Bill To Preempt Local Control Over Cell Towers & Eliminate Historic and Environmental Reviews

WHAT CITIES, COUNTIES, AND RESIDENTS MUST KNOW

## Local Opposition to H.R. 2289

### [Virginia Blue Ridge Power Agency](#)

“Our members remain committed to supporting broadband deployment, but we do not believe the provisions in Section 102 of H.R. 2289 will advance that goal.”

### [California Municipal Utilities Association](#)

“As currently drafted, Section 102 of H.R. 2289 (H.R. 278) would expand federal control over public power utility infrastructure, creating serious safety concerns without any assurance that purported ‘savings’ would be passed on to customers.”

### [Indiana Municipal Power Agency](#)

“While public power utilities strongly support expanding broadband access, we do not believe this legislation will achieve that objective. As currently drafted, H.R. 278 [included in H.R. 2289] would expand federal control over public power utility infrastructure, undermining local authority and engineering safety without any assurance that purported ‘savings’ would be passed on to customers.”

### [City of Salem, Virginia, Electric Department](#)

“Our members remain committed to supporting broadband deployment, but we do not believe the provisions in Section 102 of H.R. 2289 will advance that goal... As currently drafted, H.R. 278 [in H.R. 2289] would expand federal control over public power utility infrastructure, creating serious safety concerns without any assurance that purported ‘savings’ would be passed on to customers. While public power utilities strongly support expanding broadband access, we do not believe this legislation will achieve that objective.”

### [Missouri River Energy Services](#)

“Imposing federally mandated timelines and deemed-granted provisions, as envisioned in H.R. 278 [included in H.R. 2289], would shift risk and cost to electric customers and undermine utilities’ ability to meet safety, engineering, and staffing requirements.”

“Our members remain committed to supporting broadband deployment, some partner directly with providers or operate broadband networks themselves, but we do not believe the provisions in Section 102 of H.R. 2289 will advance that goal. Instead, they would preempt local authority and reduce the tools public power utilities need to manage their systems responsibly.”

Letters in this PDF are hyperlinked. [Click to read them.](#)

[More on H.R. 2289 at EHSciences.org](https://www.ehsciences.org)

