



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Amy Klobuchar
United States Senate
425 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Klobuchar:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Amy Klobuchar

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "A".

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Benjamin L. Cardin
United States Senate
509 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Cardin:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Benjamin L. Cardin

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "A".

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Bernard Sanders
United States Senate
332 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Sanders:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Bernard Sanders

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "A" and a long tail on the "i".

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Chris Van Hollen
United States Senate
110 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Van Hollen:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Chris Van Hollen

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Christopher S. Murphy
United States Senate
136 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Murphy:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Christopher S. Murphy

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Elizabeth Warren
United States Senate
317 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Warren:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Elizabeth Warren

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "A". Below the handwritten signature, the name "Ajit V. Pai" is printed in a smaller, sans-serif font.

Attachment



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen
United States Senate
506 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Shaheen:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Maggie Hassan
United States Senate
330 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Hassan:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Maggie Hassan

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Mazie K. Hirono
United States Senate
730 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Hirono:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Mazie K. Hirono

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Patrick J. Leahy
United States Senate
437 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Leahy:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Patrick J. Leahy

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Richard Blumenthal
United States Senate
706 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Blumenthal:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Richard Blumenthal

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,


Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Ron Wyden
United States Senate
221 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Wyden:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Ron Wyden

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Tammy Baldwin
United States Senate
709 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Baldwin:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Tammy Baldwin

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the left of the printed name.

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

July 31, 2019

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

The Honorable Tina Smith
United States Senate
720 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Smith:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Tina Smith

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "A".

Ajit V. Pai

Attachment



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

July 31, 2019

The Honorable Edward J. Markey
United States Senate
255 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Markey:

Thank you for your letter regarding the impact that the statutory cap on franchise fees has on funding for public, educational, or governmental (PEG) channels. The Commission recently released the attached draft *Third Report and Order*, which the Commission plans to consider during its upcoming August meeting. While this draft may change in response to further input from stakeholders and Commissioners, you will see that it addresses in detail each of the concerns raised in your letter.

As you know, the Communications Act limits franchise fees to five percent of cable revenues and defines “franchise fee” to include “any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such.” 47 U.S.C. § 542(g)(1). In *Montgomery County, Md. et al. v. FCC*, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit held that the terms “tax” and “assessment” were broad enough to encompass nonmonetary exactions—such as cable-related, in-kind contributions. 863 F.3d 485, 490-91 (6th Cir. 2017). But the court held that just because the statutory definition of “franchise fee” *could* include such nonmonetary contributions did not necessarily mean that it *did* include them, and it remanded the issue to the Commission for further consideration. *See id.* at 491-92.

In response to this remand, the Commission unanimously issued its *Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to consider the scope of the congressionally-mandated statutory limit on franchise fees. The Commission developed a voluminous record in response to this notice, including numerous submissions from local franchising authorities, providers of PEG programming, and cable operators.

The draft order is the product of our careful consideration of this record. The result, we believe, is both consistent with the Act and responsive to your concerns regarding PEG programming. Among other things, the Commission observed that Congress broadly defined franchise fees; indeed, with respect to PEG channels, it only excluded support payments with respect to franchises granted prior to October 30, 1984 as well as certain capital costs required by franchises granted after that date. 47 U.S.C. §§ 542(g)(2)(B) & (C). The draft order therefore concludes that cable-related, in-kind contributions—including PEG-related contributions—are “franchise fees” subject to the Act’s five-percent cap unless otherwise expressly excluded.


At the same time, the order defers ruling on the complex issues raised by PEG channel capacity and concludes that the costs of providing PEG channel capacity should not be offset against the franchise fee cap until the Commission can address the issue on a more complete record.

Page 2—The Honorable Edward J. Markey

The draft order also broadens the Commission's interpretation of an exclusion for certain PEG-related capital costs. These latter two conclusions directly address the concerns raised in your letter concerning the order's potential impact on PEG programming.

Again, thank you for your letter. Your views have been entered into the record of the proceeding and have been considered as part of the Commission's review. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,


Ajit V. Pai

Attachment