

**STATEMENT OF  
COMMISSIONER DEBORAH TAYLOR TATE**

*Re: 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, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (MB Docket No. 05-311)*

Today's item, like most we address as an expert agency, is full of sophisticated technical, legal, and policy arguments. At a high level, however, I view this as a continuation down a path of deregulatory policies designed to encourage new market entry, innovation, and investment. Indeed, "encourag[ing] more robust competition in the video marketplace" by limiting franchising requirements has long been a stated goal of the Commission as well as a driving force behind statutory terms we interpret today.

Section 621(a)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Act"), states that franchising authorities ("LFAs") may not "unreasonably refuse to award" a competitive franchise to provide cable services. I agree with our conclusion that we have the jurisdictional authority to interpret this section of the Act and adopt rules to implement it. In amending Section 621(a)(1) to include the phrase "unreasonably refuse to award," Congress explicitly limited the authority of LFAs. However, if an LFA does not make a final decision for months on end, or perhaps even years as the record indicates, new entrants are given no recourse. Also, unreasonable demands, similar to long delays, serve as a further barrier to competitive entry. It is nonsensical to contend that, despite the limitation on LFA authority in the Act, LFAs remain the sole arbiters of whether their actions in the franchise approval process are reasonable. Since the section's judicial review provision applies only to final decisions by LFAs, absent Commission action to identify "unreasonable" terms and conditions, franchise applicants would have no avenue for redress. I conclude that our broad and well-recognized authority as the federal agency responsible for administering the Act, including Title VI, permits us to identify such terms and conditions, and I support our exercise of that authority.

As with most orders, we explored numerous ways to achieve our goals. I ultimately support today's item, because I believe that, by streamlining timeframes for action and providing practical guidelines for both LFAs and new entrants, the item encourages the development of competition in the video marketplace and speeds the deployment of broadband across the country in a platform-neutral manner. These beneficial policy results should not be underestimated. Our annual reports to Congress on cable prices, including the report we adopt today, consistently show that prices are lower where wireline competition is present. And, of course, broadband deployment enhances our ability to educate our children for the jobs of tomorrow and ensures that the United States remains competitive in this global communications age.

Additionally, I am pleased that we recognize – and do not preempt – the actions of those states that have reformed their franchise rules. Their efforts to streamline the process for competitive entry are laudable.

Finally, it is critical that as we advance pro-competitive policies, we ensure that our policies do not unreasonably create asymmetry in the marketplace. Accordingly, I am encouraged that we resolve to address open issues regarding existing franchise agreements on an expedited basis. I encourage all interested parties to use your energies toward assisting us as we seek a way to apply more broadly our conclusions across all companies.