

Municipal Service Commission
Gerald P. Cole
Robert K. Alderman
Bryan J. Hughes
Michael Sadowski
Leslie G. Lupo



Roderick J. Lesko
General Manager and Secretary
3200 Biddle Avenue, Suite 200
Wyandotte, MI. 48192-0658
Telephone: (734) 324-7100
Fax: (734) 324-7119

August 23, 2016

Chairman Tom Wheeler
Commissioner Mignon Clyburn
Commissioner Michael O’Rielly
Commissioner Ajit Pai
Commissioner Jessica Rosenworcel
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington DC, 20554

Dear Chairman Wheeler and Commissioners Clyburn, O’Rielly, Pai, and Rosenworcel:

Wyandotte Cable is a small multichannel video programming distributor (MVPD) providing digital services in Michigan. We are a Municipal Cable operator that began offering cable television service in 1982 and currently serve over 7,000 homes in our community. We have approximately 35 employees directly and indirectly involved in providing cable, internet and digital phone service to our citizens, who are the owners of our operations, and we serve our citizens with a local personal level of service at a quality and value they could never get from a big box provider. We are greatly concerned that the Federal Communications Commission’s (Commission) proposed Navigation Device rules (MB Docket No. 16-42/CS Docket No. 97-80) and other potential substitute rules would impose such substantial implementation costs that it would harm our company’s ability to serve our customers. Consequently, we urge you to provide relief for smaller MVPDs.

The pay-TV business is more challenging than ever for smaller MVPDs. We are caught between ever-increasing programming fees and obligations to carry unwanted programming on the one hand and significant competition both from much larger traditional pay-TV providers and from over-the-top services on the other. As a result, margins for our video business are small and getting smaller every year. Nonetheless, video services remain an important component of our overall customer offering, and consumers continue to respond positively to our efforts to provide innovative services at an affordable price, including offering some programming in an unencrypted ClearQAM format which our subscribers can access without any set top box at all. We have a demographic that loves us for that as this is all they desire and they know they can’t get that from the AT&Ts and Comcasts of the world. We also offer full service packages tailored to the needs of the citizens our local community because we are small enough to actually hear their voice and listen to what they want. We also offer better customer service, no commitment, custom installations and service package set ups, etc. - things that are lost in the big wheels of major providers that only local operations like ours can provide.

Because the Commission’s navigation device proposal is estimated to cost at least \$1

million per system,¹ our company cannot afford to comply with this proposal or any other proposal that incurs such substantial cost. Should the Commission mandate that small providers comply with such rules, we would be forced to divert resources from upgrading our broadband networks which are necessary to meet our customers' increasing demands for greater speeds. Compounding these problems, current lenders could consider such a costly obligation to be a material change in our business and impact our ability to borrow money in the future. We currently have no debt but are at that point which we are looking at a significant investment rebuilding our system within the next 2 years (this would be the 3rd generation plant we will be operating) in preparation for the next generation of IP technology, customer demands and desires. This proposal, if adopted, would likely result in a decision that would necessitate the need for us to drop video services. This would serve a great injustice to the citizens of our community that have relied on us as their video service provider for 35 years.

Just as with the cable industry's over two-decade long migration from analog to digital, smaller providers have incentives to seek out opportunities to continue to upgrade their network's video technology as we are doing to better serve customers and face the competition in the market. For example, as are we, many in the industry are evaluating how to offer their services in all-IP. Thus, the Commission should recognize that we have every reason to adopt affordable, market-ready solutions that enable us to offer service in a format, such as all-IP, that allows our customers to receive our service using third party devices.

Unfortunately, a viable path to implement the proposed Navigation Device rules or other unduly costly proposals does not exist, and due to our small size, we have no control over how and when the industry will develop solutions, let alone those that work within our resource constraints. For this reason, the Commission should not impose these proposals on smaller MVPDs. Even if the Commission were to delay compliance by a small provider, because no one knows if and when a sufficiently low cost solution will materialize, our company will need to start reserving money based on the cost incurred by larger operators and the impact will be felt by our customers immediately and for years to come.

For these reasons, the Commission should not apply any Navigation Device regulation to

¹ See Comments of the American Cable Association, MB Docket No. 16-42, CS Docket No. 97-90 at 40-54 (Apr. 22, 2016). As the American Cable Association has explained "the Commission's proposal is more a framework with many elements still to be defined and fleshed out. ACA, therefore, cannot determine all the costs of the Commission's proposal nor can it determine whether proposal is technologically feasible nor can it determine, should there be solutions, when they will be developed." Letter from Thomas Cohen, Counsel to the American Cable Association, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, MB Docket No. 16-42, CS Docket No. 97-90, at 2, n.4 (Aug. 12, 2016). Therefore, the \$ 1 million estimate includes only those costs that can be determined at present, and assumes that MVPDs will utilize the lowest cost technology available to meet those requirements that can be identified (*i.e.*, by deploying a gateway device in the customers' homes using third party devices). However, because many larger cable operators are transitioning to an all-IP format already, there is no guarantee that the gateway technology necessary to implement the Commission's proposal over a non-IP system will materialize in the marketplace. In that event, implementing the Commission's proposal could require small and mid-sized operators to make the same investments to transition to an all-IP format, which would significantly increase the cost of compliance.

small providers, and instead should work with us to facilitate the development of market solutions that allow us to offer our services in all-IP and enable our customers to attach third party devices. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Steve Timcoe

Steve Timcoe
Superintendent - CATV
Wyandotte Cable

Cc: Sen. Debbie Stabenow
Sen. Gary Peters
Rep. Debbie Dingell