

**DISSENTING STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL J. COPPS**

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 (MB Docket No. 05-311)

I think that all of my colleagues and I can agree on the central importance of encouraging video competition. It is abundantly clear that cable rates are rising faster than inflation and that wireline cable competition can be helpful in bringing those rates down. Consumers deserve rules that will bring such competition to their doorsteps because consumers are not being well-served by the lack of competition today.

I think my colleagues and I can also agree on the central importance of broadband deployment. As I have often pointed out, our nation is falling behind in the international broadband race. Encouraging new entrants into the video market could at least assist in the challenge of building out broadband infrastructure, although it doesn't represent anything near the totality of what a real broadband strategy would look like.

But agreeing on the many benefits of video competition is hardly the same thing as coming up with rules that will actually encourage honest-to-goodness competition within the framework of the statutes that Congress has given us. The item before us today doesn't get us there and I cannot support it as written.

In recent days we had discussions attempting to craft an item with which I would feel more comfortable. Chairman Martin engaged in those discussions in good faith and I thank him for that. My goal was to encourage an item that preserves a local authority's statutory right to seek specific and far-reaching build-out requirements, protects each community's ability to negotiate for PEG and I-NET facilities, and maintains truly meaningful local ability to deal with the huge companies that are coming into our cities and towns to build important infrastructure.

Throughout the consideration of this item and even as we discussed ways to improve it in recent days, I have been troubled at the lack of a granular record that would demonstrate that the present franchising system is irretrievably broken and that traditional federal-state-local relationships have to be so thoroughly upended. If we are going to preempt and upend the balances inherent in long-standing federal-state-local jurisdictional authorities, we should have a record clearly demonstrating that those local authorities are not up to the task of handling this infrastructure build-out and that competition can be introduced only by preempting and upsetting these long-standing principles of federalism. My colleagues may recall that when we launched the NPRM on this item, I made it very clear how important the compilation of a compelling granular record would be in my consideration of this proceeding. I do not believe that either today's item or the record behind it makes such a showing. The various examples of "unreasonable" franchise requirements that the item enumerates are not closely or carefully supported by the record and often fail to rise beyond isolated episodes or anecdotal evidence.

Many people questioned, and continue to question, the Commission's legal authority to do what it is doing today. It is clear that those questions remain and that the Commission has been asked by those with oversight powers to more conclusively demonstrate our authority to undertake the actions we initiate today. I believe it is the better course of wisdom in so far-reaching a proceeding, in light of the concern being expressed by those with oversight responsibilities of this Commission, to thoroughly answer those questions, to lay out the basis of our claimed legal authority, and to explain what legal risks this action entails before taking action. Under the circumstances, proceeding on such a controversial decision today

does not put an end to this issue. It only invites more delay, more confusion, and more possibility of legal challenge.

As we face the challenge of providing ubiquitous high-speed broadband to all our citizens, we need the certainty of a national strategy to get the job done. Right now this nation is hobbled because it has no such strategy, no plan for the infrastructure build-out our people need to be productive and competitive citizens of the world. The United States is ranked number twenty-one in the International Telecommunications Union's Digital Opportunity Index. It is difficult to take much comfort from being twenty-first in the Twenty-first century. The kind of broadband strategy I am talking about demands a level of consensus and national buy-in by the many diverse interests and entities that would be responsible for implementing it. While I have never equated franchise reform as anything remotely equivalent to a national broadband strategy, I do believe a properly-crafted and legally-certain franchising reform could facilitate some level of broadband build-out. That is what I attempted to work toward here. But if our decision is only going to increase concern, increase the questions and increase the risk, then I think we should pause, take a deep breath, answer the questions and reach out for more consensus. I don't say unanimity, of course, but at least a level of comfort that builds an environment wherein the next few years can see the job actually getting done rather than spent in contentious debate or court challenge because our reasoning was deemed inadequate.

So I thank my colleagues, and especially the Chairman, for the discussions we have had—discussions that were both in good faith and substantive—but in light of the concerns I have just discussed, I cannot support this afternoon's outcome. Unlike so many other proceedings coming before the Commission, I was nowhere near certain as I came to work this morning how the vote on this item would go. I actually thought that perhaps we would take the short time needed, answer the questions that had been posed, and then reassess where we were as to proceeding with an item. That was my preference. Instead it appears a majority will proceed to approve an item that, as drafted right now, is without important enhancements I have been advocating and without sufficient buy-in from the world beyond the FCC to assure its effectiveness. I must therefore respectfully dissent.