



The Town of Barnstable

Office of Town Manager

367 Main Street, Hyannis, MA 02601

Office: 508.862.4610

Fax: 508.790.6226

www.townofbarnstable.us

Citizens' Resource Line: 508.862.4925



Mark S. Ells, Town Manager

mark.ells@town.barnstable.ma.us

M. Andrew Clyburn, Assistant Town Manager

andy.clyburn@town.barnstable.ma.us

November 14, 2018

Ajit Pai, Chairman
Michael O'Rielly, Commissioner
Brendan Carr, Commissioner
Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner
Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, District of Columbia 20554

RE: Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as Amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, MB Docket No. 05-311.

Dear Chairman Pai, Commissioners O'Rielly, Carr, and Rosenworcel, and Secretary Dortch,

On behalf of the Town of Barnstable, we appreciate the opportunity to file comments on the Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("FNPRM"). We are writing to formally express our grave concerns regarding the Federal Communication Commission's ("FCC") proposal which would upset the longstanding understanding of the meaning of franchise fee and strip power from local governments to control cable operators' use of the rights of way when providing non-cable services.

For decades, franchise fees have been understood to be limited to monetary payments and would thus not include any in-kind franchise requirements such as services, facilities or equipment related to the establishment or operation of a cable system. In-kind considerations can vary from municipality to municipality, but some examples include: institutional network ("I-Net") requirements, complementary cable service to government buildings, and public, educational and governmental ("PEG") channels.

The FCC's FNPRM purports to include all in-kind contributions, other than PEG capital costs and build out requirements, within the meaning of a franchise fee and subject to the 5% cap. This would allow cable operators to deduct from their cable franchise fee payments the "value" of franchise requirements such as PEG channel capacity. The FCC is further suggesting that this "value" should reflect the fair market value of these services. If this line of thinking is adopted, this would directly harm PEG access and the communities they serve.

PEG channels provide a variety of benefits to communities, including public access channels, educational access channels, and government access channels. Local franchise agreements commonly require cable operators to set aside capacity for PEG channels, which provide local residents with the ability to view their local governments in action and receive local educational

and school-related programming. In short, PEG programming is an irreplaceable source of local programming for the public that is not otherwise available through cable services.

The Town of Barnstable currently tapes over 40 board, committee, and commission meetings each month. In a community that has a number of “snowbirds” or residents who reside elsewhere in the country during the winter months, our programming is an opportunity for residents to stay connected to their community. It also provides an opportunity for elders who have difficulty driving at night or in inclement weather to view town government from the safety of their home. We also produce an award winning half hour news program “Barnstable Today” that runs Monday through Friday with the goings on in town government.

Barnstable Public Schools’ focus is on helping students with a career path that fosters a sense of creativity and develop skills that can help students attain their goals once they leave our school system. The school program (B2B TV) has grown. Our municipal channel has been using interns from B2B TV for a number of years to give students a larger audience for their work.

The fair market value assessments of these invaluable programs would lead to arbitrary deductions from franchise fees by cable operators, opening the door to legal challenges. Further, this loss of revenue and support would force municipalities to either divert resources away from core municipal and school services to maintain existing PEG programming, suffer a dramatic reduction in the scope of PEG channels, or lose them altogether. Additionally, some costs such as I-Net capacity costs and access channel costs are already passed along to subscribers by the cable operators. Allowing these companies to then deduct their fair market value from the franchise fee would create a windfall for these companies, essentially allowing them to double-recover.

Equally as concerning, this FNPRM would allow certain cable operators to construct and install facilities and equipment for non-cable services, such as small cells or other wireless deployments, in the rights of way without any local regulation or compensation. Most franchise agreements do not include provisions related to the installation of non-cable facilities, and consequently, under this FNPRM, local franchising authorities would be preempted from regulating these installations, raising aesthetic and public safety concerns. This preemption would also extend to fees for the use of the rights of way, meaning cable companies would not have to compensate local franchising authorities for the additional use of the rights of way. This would be not only be another unwarranted windfall to private cable companies, this time at the expense of the general public and local taxpayers, but could represent an unconstitutional taking of public property without compensation.

Compounding the effect of this preemption, the FCC’s recent Declaratory Ruling and Third Report and Order states that municipalities cannot impose fees or aesthetic requirements related to small wireless facilities that would exceed fees or aesthetics requirements for other wireless telecommunications infrastructure for the similar use of the right-of-way, essentially creating a federally-set race to the bottom between telecommunications providers and cable companies that provide wireless services. We strongly believe that this is not in the public interest.

For decades, the Town of Barnstable has worked with private businesses to successfully negotiate franchise agreements that are beneficial to both parties. The Town of Barnstable

Federal Communications Commission
MB Docket No. 05-311
November 14, 2018
Page 3

strongly opposes any efforts that would strip municipalities from receiving in-kind contributions outside of the 5% franchise fee cap and preempt local authority, especially in their rights-of-way. We strenuously oppose the FNPRM, and we urge you to reconsider and then reject these proposals. We ask you to safeguard the public interest by maintaining the current franchise fee structure and honoring the authority of cities and towns to control the public rights of way.

If you have additional questions or need further information on this matter, please do not hesitate to have your office contact me or Ruth Weil, Town Attorney, at 508-862-4620 at any time. The Town of Barnstable is prepared to work closely with you on this important issue.

Sincerely,


Mark S. Ellis
Town Manager

cc: The Honorable Elizabeth Warren
The Honorable Edward Markey
The Honorable Richard Neal
The Honorable James McGovern
The Honorable Niki Tsongas
The Honorable Joseph Kennedy III
The Honorable Katherine Clark
The Honorable Seth Moulton
The Honorable Michael Capuano
The Honorable Stephen Lynch
The Honorable William Keating