

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking for Adoption  
of a General Order and Procedures to  
Implement the Franchise Renewal  
Provisions of the Digital Infrastructure and  
Video Competition Act of 2006.

R. \_\_\_\_\_

**RULEMAKING AMENDING GENERAL ORDER 169 TO IMPLEMENT THE  
FRANCHISE RENEWAL PROVISIONS OF THE DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE  
AND VIDEO COMPETITION ACT OF 2006**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
RULEMAKING AMENDING GENERAL ORDER 169 TO IMPLEMENT THE FRANCHISE RENEWAL PROVISIONS OF THE DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND VIDEO COMPETITION ACT OF 2006 .....	1
1. Summary .....	2
2. Legislative Background and Procedural History .....	3
3. DIVCA Provisions for Renewal of State Issued Video Franchises .....	4
3.1. Consistency of the streamlined renewal process identified in § 5850(b) with federal law governing cable television franchises .....	7
3.1.1. Summary of the federal formal and informal renewal processes..	7
3.1.2. The Commission’s authority under 47 U.S.C. § 546 to renew franchises.....	10
3.1.3. Consistency of the renewal process set forth in Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5850(b) with the federal informal process in 47 U.S.C. § 546(h) .....	11
3.1.4. Consistency of the renewal process set forth in § 5850(b) with the federal formal process set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g) .....	18
4. Preliminary Scoping Memo.....	30
4.1. Issues.....	31
4.2. Category of Proceeding and Need for Hearing.....	32
4.3. Schedule.....	33
5. Service List and Subscription Service .....	33
6. Public Advisor.....	35
7. Intervenor Compensation.....	36
8. <i>Ex Parte</i> Communications.....	36
 APPENDIX A      Proposed Amendments to General Order 169 Implementing Franchise Renewal Provisions for the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006	

**RULEMAKING AMENDING GENERAL ORDER 169  
TO IMPLEMENT THE FRANCHISE RENEWAL  
PROVISIONS OF THE DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE  
AND VIDEO COMPETITION ACT OF 2006**

**1. Summary**

The California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) initiates this rulemaking to amend General Order 169 and to establish procedures for implementing the franchise renewal provisions of the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006 (DIVCA), Assembly Bill 2987 (Ch. 700, Stats. 2006).<sup>1</sup> A copy of the proposed franchise renewal provisions for the renewal process is attached as Appendix A. Throughout this rulemaking we identify issue and advance proposals for which we seek comment. However, Parties need not limit their comments to our proposals on the specific issues we identify. Parties are free to advance their own proposal or raise issues which we may have overlooked with respect to the establishment of a video franchise renewal process. In their comments parties may raise objections, seek clarification, or offer alternative proposals. In other places in the rulemaking we specifically request comment on certain issues. However, parties need not limit their comments to our tentative conclusions and to the specific issues for which we request comment. Parties may also raise any issues which we may have overlooked with respect to the establishment of a video franchise renewal process.

---

<sup>1</sup> DIVCA is codified at Cal. Pub. Util. Code §§ 5800 *et seq.*

## 2. Legislative Background and Procedural History

To promote video service competition in California, the Legislature created a new state video franchising process under the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006 (DIVCA). In doing so, the Legislature found that “increasing competition for video and broadband services is a matter of statewide concern.”<sup>2</sup> The Legislature noted that video providers offer “numerous benefits to all Californians including access to a variety of news, public information, education, and entertainment programming.”<sup>3</sup> According to the Legislature, “competition for video service should increase opportunities for programming that appeal to California’s diverse population and many cultural communities.”<sup>4</sup> The Legislature added that increased video service competition “lowers prices, speeds the deployment of new communication and broadband technologies, creates jobs, and benefits the California economy.”<sup>5</sup>

On October 5, 2006, the Commission initiated Rulemaking (R.) 06-10-005 to adopt a general order and establish procedures for implementing DIVCA.<sup>6</sup> However, after three phases of the proceeding, the Commission had not implemented rules for the renewal process.<sup>7</sup> Because Public Utilities

---

<sup>2</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5810(a)(1).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at § 5810(a)(1)(A).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at § 5810(a)(1)(D).

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at § 5810(a)(1)(B).

<sup>6</sup> Decision Adopting a General Order and Procedures to Implement the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006 (2007) Cal. P.U.C. Dec No. 07-03-014 (Decision (D.) 07-03-014).

<sup>7</sup> See D.07-03-014; *Opinion Resolving Issues in Phase II* (2006) Cal. P.U.C. Dec No. 07-10-013 (D.07-10-013); *Decision Amending General Order 169* (2008) Cal. P.U.C. Dec No. 08-07-007 (D.08-07-007).

Code Section 1701.5 requires the Commission to conclude a rulemaking within 18 months, R.06-10-005 was closed before this final implementation task could be accomplished. This rulemaking is initiated to establish video franchise renewal procedures.

### **3. DIVCA Provisions for Renewal of State Issued Video Franchises**

The procedures and criteria for renewing a state-issued video franchise are set forth in Pub. Util. Code § 5850(a)-(d).<sup>8</sup>

Section 5850(b) states that “except as provided in this section, the criteria and process described in § 5840 shall apply to a renewal registration, and the commission shall not impose any additional or different criteria.” In other words, notwithstanding the phrase “except as provided in this section,” DIVCA envisions a streamlined renewal process analogous to the initial authorization for a state-issued franchise under § 5840.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Unless otherwise noted, statutory references are to the Cal. Pub. Util. Code.

<sup>9</sup> The process for obtaining a state-issued franchise is set forth in DIVCA § 5840(a)-(q). The specific rules implementing this section of DIVCA are included in the Commission’s General Order (GO) 169. An applicant may request a state-issued franchise by completing an application form that requires it to list its name, address, and telephone number of its principle place of business; the names and titles of the applicant’s principle officers; the legal name, address, and telephone number of the applicant’s parent company; a description of its video service area footprint; its expected date of deployment; information regarding the socioeconomic status of the residents within its video or telephone service area footprint; and if it is a telephone company, a description of the territory in which it provides telephone service.

In addition to completing the application form, the applicant is also required to submit an affidavit signed under penalty of perjury attesting to the following: that it has or will file all forms required by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) before offering video service; that it agrees to comply with all federal and state statutes, rules, and regulations, and that it agrees to comply with county or city regulations regarding

*Footnote continued on next page*

Section 5850(c) states that the renewal process must be consistent with federal laws and regulations. We interpret this to mean that the process for renewing existing franchises must be consistent with federal laws which govern the renewal of cable television franchises. Additionally, § 5850(d) states that the Commission shall not renew a franchise if the video service provider is in violation of any final nonappealable court order issued pursuant to this division.

When read together, we interpret §§ 5850(b) and (c) as follows: the process for renewing state issued franchises should be identical to the process set forth in § 5840(a)-(q) unless the requirements set forth in §§ 5850(c) and (d) necessitate that this process be modified. Moreover, to the extent we are required to modify this process at all, DIVCA appears to instruct us to make only the minimum modifications necessary to make the process consistent with §§ 5850(b) and (c). Accordingly, we propose a renewal procedure similar to that described in General Order 169 (and footnote 9 herein), but with some modifications as described below.

In the sections of this rulemaking that follow, we provide an analysis of federal law governing the renewal of existing cable television franchises and DIVCA's renewal provisions. As part of this analysis we also consider DIVCA's prohibition against renewing the state-issued franchise of any video service

---

time, place and manner of use of the public right-of-way. It is also required to agree to specific DIVCA requirements. Furthermore, the applicant is required to post a bond as demonstration that it possesses the legal, financial, and technical capabilities to construct and operate a system capable of providing video services. Upon filing the application, the applicant is required to pay a fee of \$2,000. If the application is complete and the applicant is deemed eligible to apply for state video franchise, the Executive Director of the Commission will issue state video franchise to the applicant.

provider who is in violation of a final nonappealable court order to determine whether any potential changes or modifications to the streamlined renewal process identified in § 5850(b) are necessary. Based on this analysis, it appears that the streamlined renewal process needs to be modified in light of §§ 5850(c) and (d) and propose modifications which reflect this conclusion.

We recognize that our effort to reconcile DIVCA with the federal laws governing cable franchise renewals may cause some video service providers to claim that they are not cable operators and, therefore, neither federal law nor the rules we propose to reconcile DIVCA's renewal process with federal law apply to them. However, we believe that both DIVCA and Commission precedent require us to apply our rules uniformly to all video service providers, irrespective of whether a video service provider is or is not a cable operator.<sup>10</sup> This is based upon the Legislature's assertion that the video franchising process should "create a fair and level playing field for all market competitors that does not disadvantage or advantage any one service provider or technology over another."<sup>11</sup> We have interpreted this provision to mean that the rules implementing DIVCA should be applied equally to all video service providers. For example, in D.07-03-014, we determined that, with respect to any intervenor compensation obligations associated with DIVCA proceedings, our rules should apply "uniformly to all state video franchise holders." That decision went on to say that we "[found] merit in Verizon's legal argument that state video franchise holders that are telephone companies should not be subject to intervenor

---

<sup>10</sup> In other words, the issue of whether or not a video service provider is a "cable operator" is not relevant to this proceeding and, therefore, we take no position on it at this time.

compensation obligations if other state video franchise holders are not subject to the same requirements.”<sup>12</sup> Verizon had cited § 5810(a)(2)(A) as the basis for its claim that parity should be applied with respect to rules applied to video service providers.<sup>13</sup>

### **3.1. Consistency of the streamlined renewal process identified in § 5850(b) with federal law governing cable television franchises**

#### **3.1.1. Summary of the federal formal and informal renewal processes**

The federal Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 (Cable Act) establishes federal video franchise renewal standards.<sup>14</sup> The Cable Act contains what is commonly referred to as a formal and informal process. The formal process is set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g) while the informal process is set forth in subsection (h).

The formal process is not mandatory, but may be invoked by either the franchise authority or the cable operator.<sup>15</sup> Once the process is invoked, the franchise authority must commence a proceeding to identify the future cable related needs of the community and review the cable operator’s performance

---

<sup>11</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5810(a)(2)(A).

<sup>12</sup> D.07-03-014, *mimeo* at 210.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* *mimeo* at 205; *See also*, Assem. Com. on Util. and Commerce Analysis of Assembly Bill (AB) 2987 (2005-2006 Reg. Sess., as amended Apr. 6, 2006, stating: “This bill is also aimed at creating a level playing field for all providers of video service by assuring that, in the future, all competitors are subject to the same set of regulatory requirements.”)

<sup>14</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(h).

<sup>15</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(a).



under the existing franchise.<sup>16</sup> The franchise authority must provide the public with notice of the proceeding and an adequate opportunity to participate.<sup>17</sup> After the proceeding, the franchise authority can require the cable operator to submit a renewal proposal and can specify its contents.<sup>18</sup> In the alternative, the cable operator may submit a proposal on its own initiative.<sup>19</sup> Within four months from the date the proposal is submitted, the franchising authority may grant renewal or decide on a preliminary basis not to renew the franchise.<sup>20</sup>

If it denies renewal, the franchise authority is required to conduct an administrative proceeding to consider whether: 1) the cable operator has substantially complied with the terms of the existing franchise and applicable law; 2) the quality of the operators service, including signal quality, response to consumer complaints, and billing practices, have been reasonable in light of community needs; 3) the operator has the financial, legal and technical ability to provide the services, facilities and equipment set forth in its proposal and; 4) the operator's proposal is reasonable to meet the future cable related needs of the community.<sup>21</sup> The cable operator must be given adequate notice of the proceeding and both it and the franchise authority must be given a fair opportunity to fully participate, including the right to evidentiary hearings.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at § 546(b).

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at § 546(c).

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

Following the proceeding, the franchise authority must issue a written decision granting or denying renewal.<sup>23</sup> The decision must be based on the record.<sup>24</sup> A failure to meet any of the four criteria mentioned above is a sufficient basis for denying renewal; however, the franchise authority cannot deny renewal based upon a failure to perform under the existing franchise unless it has provided the cable operator with notice and the opportunity to cure.<sup>25</sup> The cable operator may appeal a decision to deny renewal, either on procedural grounds or by claiming that the franchise authority's findings are not supported by a preponderance of the evidence.<sup>26</sup>

In contrast, the informal process permits a cable operator to submit a proposal for renewal to the franchise authority at any time, and a franchise authority may, after providing public notice and opportunity to comment, accept or reject it.<sup>27</sup> In practice, the informal process accommodates the negotiating process which historically has been the principle means by which cable operators have renewed their franchises. While the vast majority of franchises have been renewed informally, cable operators have historically invoked the formal process routinely to preserve their due process rights in the event a cable operator fails to reach an agreement with its franchise authority before its existing franchise expires.

---

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> *Id. at* § 546(d).

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*

<sup>27</sup> *Id. at* § 546(h).

The Cable Act does not mandate that a franchise authority or cable operator use the formal process instead of the informal process or vice versa. Legislative history suggests that the formal standards and procedures are available for the cable operator or franchise authority to initiate “if necessary.”<sup>28</sup> Indeed, in many situations both processes are utilized simultaneously. However, as noted above, this is because historically franchises have been renewed via a negotiating process between the cable operator and the franchise authority, and legislative history indicates that the formal process was established as protection to the cable operator against unfair denial of renewal by the franchise authority.<sup>29</sup>

However, with DIVCA, there is no negotiation process. The Legislature has replaced that regime with a new state video franchising process in which the statute identifies all the video related obligations that video service providers must fulfill in relationship to the communities included within a video service provider’s franchise. As explained in more detail below, we seek comment on whether to include a formal process in our renewal rules. The streamlined process envisioned by Pub. Util. Code § 5850(b) appears to be consistent with the informal process outlined in 47 U.S.C. § 546(h), and we seek proposals for any needed modifications.

### **3.1.2. The Commission’s authority under 47 U.S.C. § 546 to renew franchises**

Under federal law, the power to renew a franchise vests with the franchising authority.<sup>30</sup> However nothing requires that the authority be a local authority.

---

<sup>28</sup> H.R. Rep. No. 98-934, at 72 (1984).

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546.

Section 522(10) of the Cable Act defines a franchise authority as a governmental authority empowered by Federal, State, or local law to grant a franchise. Moreover, 47 U.S.C. § 522(9) defines the term franchise as “an initial authorization, or renewal thereof, (including a renewal of an authorization which has been granted subject to § 546 of this title), issued by a franchise authority whether that authority is designated as a franchise permit, license, resolution, contract, certificate, agreement, or otherwise, which authorizes the construction or operation of a cable system.” Thus, DIVCA’s designation of the Commission as the sole franchising authority in the state and, therefore, as the sole entity authorized to issue and renew state issued franchises is consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 546.

**3.1.3. Consistency of the renewal process set forth in  
Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5850(b) with the federal  
informal process in 47 U.S.C. § 546(h)**

The streamlined renewal process set forth in Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5850(b) is generally consistent with the informal process identified in 47 U.S.C. § 546(h), but will require some changes. Section 546(h) does not specify either the form or content of a renewal proposal. Additionally, while 47 U.S.C. § 546(h) requires a franchise authority to provide the public with notice and opportunity to comment prior to granting or denying a proposal, it does not identify any criteria that a franchise authority must take into account in making this decision. Because the federal statute gives only minimum specifications for franchising renewal procedures, the renewal process outlined in Pub. Util. Code § 5850(b) does not appear to contradict 47 U.S.C. § 546(h) for video service providers subject to DIVCA.

We realize that the affidavit and application form<sup>31</sup> required by DIVCA for the renewal of a video service franchise is different from the kind of proposal that cable operators historically have submitted during renewal negotiations. Such proposals are often detailed plans covering all aspects of cable television franchise aimed at meeting the cable related needs of the community as defined by the franchise authority. They served as the starting point for negotiations which, if successful, lead to an agreement resulting in the renewal of the franchise.

In contrast, under DIVCA there are no negotiated agreements.<sup>32</sup> This is because DIVCA, rather than a franchising authority, has identified all the video related obligations that video service providers must fulfill in relationship to the communities encompassed within a video service provider's franchise, both with respect to an initial franchise and one subject to renewal.<sup>33</sup> These obligations were codified in order to further the Legislature's goal of promoting competition for video and broadband services which it determined to be a matter of statewide concern.<sup>34</sup> Thus, in contrast to the proposals that cable operators have historically provided to franchise authorities in connection with the franchise renewal process, the proposal submitted under DIVCA is, for the most part,

---

<sup>31</sup> In today's decision, we propose to revise the current definition of "application" in GO 169 to be limited to a request to the Commission for a grant, amendment, or renewal of a State Video Franchise. Thus, the term "application" as used in this decision and GO 169 means a State Video Franchise Application, and not a formal application to the Commission as provided in Article 2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

<sup>32</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code §§ 5800 *et seq.*

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*

<sup>34</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5810.

limited to an agreement by a video service provider to be bound by the terms of a renewed franchise defined by DIVCA.

We note that at the time the Cable Act was enacted in 1984, Congress acknowledged that some states had elected to define certain terms of cable television franchises by statute. For example, the House of Representatives Report states that, “some states have also acted to regulate the cable television franchise process... indirectly through state statutes specifying the terms on which a municipality may grant and enforce a franchise.”<sup>35</sup> In these states, it is likely that the renewal proposals submitted by a cable operator to a franchise authority reflected the franchise terms that had been defined by statute. We see no difference in principle between these proposals and the application and affidavit required under DIVCA’s streamlined renewal process in which the video service provider agrees to be bound by the franchise terms defined by DIVCA.

We also seek comment on whether the criteria for approval of a video service provider’s franchise renewal application under DIVCA is consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 546(h) which permits a franchising authority to accept or reject a renewal proposal “at any time.” Here, we must grant a video service provider’s proposal or request because DIVCA mandates we do so as long as the franchise renewal application is complete and the video service provider is not in violation of a final nonappealable court order issued pursuant to DIVCA.

#### **3.1.3.1. Final Nonappealable Court Order**

Section 5850(d) states that the Commission “shall not renew the franchise if the video service provider is in violation of any final nonappealable court order

issued pursuant to this section.” The Commission, however, is not the proper arbiter of whether a video service provider is in violation of a final nonappealable court order. The court issuing such an order would have primary jurisdiction to enforce that order and determine whether its order has been violated. Moreover, having the Commission engage in the legal or factual analysis required to determine whether a video service provider is in violation is not compatible with the streamlined renewal process envisioned by DIVCA in § 5850(b). Determining whether a video service provider is in violation of a court order could prove to be a very fact-intensive undertaking. There may be disputes over what obligations the court order actually required. In other instances, determining whether a violation exists could be difficult because the order required a video service provider to make complex changes to its network or operating practices, and disputes may arise as to whether those changes have been completed. We would expect that any party seeking to enforce a court order would necessarily need to return to that court for a determination that the video service provider is in fact in violation. Accordingly, in order to find that a video service provider “is in violation of a final nonappealable court order,” we will require a showing that a court of competent jurisdiction has found the video service provider to be in violation of a previous court order.

Consistent with the requirements of DIVCA, we must ensure that we do not renew a franchise under our streamlined process because we were unaware of a violation of a nonappealable court order. At the same time, we must do so in a way that relies upon objective and readily verifiable facts to ensure the renewal process remains streamlined. We propose that the applicant must disclose in its

---

<sup>35</sup> H.R. Rep. No. 98-934 at 23 (1984).

affidavit in support of its application for renewal (1) whether or not a nonappealable court order has been issued against it during the term of its existing franchise; (2) whether a court of competent jurisdiction has found that it has violated that order; and (3) whether it has received formal notice from a court of competent jurisdiction containing allegations that it is in violation of that order. If the answer to the first two questions is yes, the entity must further demonstrate that the violation has been cured. Again, the Commission will not be the arbiter of this question. The entity must provide a further court order or ruling demonstrating that the violation has been cured. If the entity cannot demonstrate that the violation has been cured to the court's satisfaction, then by the terms of § 5850(d) we must deny the application for renewal.

There may be cases where a court has not found the entity to be in violation of a final nonappealable court order, but there is an ongoing dispute before a court of competent jurisdiction as to whether the entity is in violation of such order at the time the franchise renewal application is submitted. In that case, we would expect the entity to answer yes to question three. If there is an ongoing dispute at the time of renewal, we propose to grant the franchise renewal application with the condition that the franchise may later be revoked if the entity is later found to have been in violation of a final nonappealable court order.

We believe that this is an appropriate approach for several reasons. First, it is consistent with the streamlined process envisioned by DIVCA because it relies on objective and readily verifiable criteria. Second, it ensures that an applicant is not denied access to the informal renewal process based on merely anecdotal allegations of a violation of a nonappealable order. Third, we have the authority under § 5890(g) to suspend or revoke the franchise of a video service provider at



any time if we find that provider was in violation of a nonappealable court order at the time its franchise renewal application was granted, particularly if we find that it was granted renewal by relying on a misstatement or omission.<sup>36</sup> We seek comment on our proposal to modify the streamlined renewal process to reflect DIVCA's requirement that a video service provider's franchise shall not be renewed if it is in violation of a final nonappealable court order.

### **3.1.3.2. Public Notice and Opportunity for Comment**

While 47 U.S.C. § 546(h) permits a franchising authority to grant or deny a proposal "at any time," it requires that before making this decision, the public be provided with notice of the proposal and the opportunity for comment. Even though the streamlined process referenced in Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5850(b) does not contemplate a notice and comment period, DIVCA does instruct us to make the renewal process consistent with federal law.<sup>37</sup> To make this process consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 546(h), we propose to supplement our rules to allow for notice and comment. However, consistent with DIVCA we find that the scope of these comments should be limited to the completeness of the video service provider's franchise renewal application.

Limiting the scope of comments is appropriate in the current context, because DIVCA, as opposed to the Commission, has defined the obligations of video service providers with respect to the communities included within each franchise. Accordingly, the decision to grant renewal involves little Commission discretion, in marked contrast to a franchise authority's decision to accept or

---

<sup>36</sup> D.07-13-014, *mimeo* at 177-178.

<sup>37</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5850(c).

reject an agreement for a renewed franchise whose terms it has negotiated. Indeed, it appears that the notice and comment provisions included in 47 U.S.C. § 546(h) are intended as a check against potential abuse of discretion by a franchise authority which might otherwise accept or reject a negotiated agreement that was not in the interest of the community. This scope of comments is not necessary, however, where the terms of the franchise and needs of the public have been determined by statute as is the case with DIVCA.

To accommodate the opportunity for notice and a comment period, an applicant must serve a copy of the franchise renewal application upon the service list for this docket and the appropriate contact person for each local entity where the applicant provides service. The franchise renewal application will also be posted on the Commission's web page, along with instructions for the submission of comments. We propose that comments be submitted to the Commission's Video Franchise Group no later than 15 days after the date the franchise renewal application is served upon the appropriate parties. We do not envision that the comment process will require any modification to the time frame for the processing and approval of applications for the issuance of new franchises. This is consistent with § 5850(b) which states, "Except as otherwise provided in this section, the criteria and process described in Section 5840 shall apply to a renewal registration, and the Commission shall not impose any additional or different criteria."

### **3.1.3.3. Timing of Renewal Submission**

Finally, 47 U.S.C. § 546(h) states that a cable operator may submit a proposal renewal at any time. We interpret this to mean that a cable operator can submit a proposal for renewal within any reasonable time before its existing franchise expires and that a franchise authority must act on the proposal.

Consistent with this interpretation of 47 U.S.C. § 546(h), we propose to accept proposals for renewal under our streamlined process no later than three months prior to the date a video service provider's existing franchise expires. However, as discussed below, if parties believe that the establishment of a formal process is necessary, then this timeline should be adjusted to accommodate the possibility that a video service provider might invoke such a process.

**3.1.4. Consistency of the renewal process set forth in § 5850(b) with the federal formal process set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g)**

As noted above, historically, the vast majority of franchise renewals have been the product of informal negotiations between a franchise authority and a cable operator. Despite the fact that cable operators historically have used the informal process to renew the vast majority of existing franchises, they have often simultaneously invoked the formal process under 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g) to preserve their due process rights in the event that negotiations fail to achieve an agreement before their existing franchise expires. This is because under the federal formal process, a franchise renewal cannot be denied unless certain conditions are met and because the process guarantees cable operators the right to appeal a decision to deny renewal.<sup>38</sup>

However, the federal formal process represents a substantial departure from the renewal process DIVCA explicitly contemplates. In contrast to the renewal process envisioned by DIVCA, the federal formal process conditions renewal of an existing franchise on a procedurally-intensive review of a video service provider's past performance under its existing franchise as well as an

---

<sup>38</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546.

assessment of the video service provider's plans to meet the future cable related needs of the communities the video service provider serves.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, because the formal process potentially requires the Commission to make findings regarding all aspects of a video service provider's franchise operations under DIVCA, it is a challenge to implement in a manner that preserves DIVCA's division of regulatory authority between the Commission and local entities.<sup>40</sup>

We believe that it is unlikely that a video service provider would choose the formal process over the renewal process contemplated by DIVCA because the renewal process envisioned by DIVCA does not require any assessment of the future cable related needs of the community or any review of past performance, other than in cases of violations of final nonappealable court orders. Moreover, even in instances where a video service provider was in violation of a nonappealable court order, we question the value of a video service provider invoking the formal process. This is because a violation of a nonappealable order is sufficient grounds under the formal process for us to deny renewal. In other words, conducting a procedurally intensive formal process would be a superfluous exercise.

We do not suggest that the federal formal process is not required; it is a video service provider's right under federal law to request such a proceeding. However, federal law does not *mandate* the use of the formal process. Given that we do not foresee a situation in which a video service provider would invoke such a procedure in light of the renewal process DIVCA contemplated, and given the difficulties and considerable demands that would be placed upon the

---

<sup>39</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546; Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5850.

<sup>40</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(d).

Commission's resources in establishing such a procedure, we do not think it is necessary at this time to establish rules for such a process.<sup>41</sup>

Nonetheless, parties may recommend a formal process, with a supporting practical and legal rationale and details on how such a process would be implemented in a manner that is consistent with our procedures, the requirements of DIVCA, and 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g). In addition, parties should address the issues listed below.

#### **3.1.4.1. Division of Regulatory Authority Between the Commission and Local Entities**

As stated previously, pursuant to the formal process, the Commission would be required to issue a written decision on potentially every aspect of the video service provider's performance under DIVCA, including those which DIVCA grants local entities exclusive authority to regulate.<sup>42</sup> Parties should

---

<sup>41</sup> Although the Commission has the discretion under 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)(1) to invoke the formal process, to do so would result in a departure from the streamlined renewal process which Pub. Util. Code § 5850(b) envisions as the exclusive means for renewing a state issued franchise. In addition, since the formal process requires a review of the video service provider's performance of the franchise terms, the Commission would be voluntarily injecting itself into a potential conflict between video service providers and local entities on issues over which it has no regulatory authority under DIVCA, such as franchise fees and Public, Educational, and Governmental Access (PEG) requirements. Finally, a video service provider is entitled to renewal under DIVCA's streamlined process if the video service provider's franchise renewal application is complete and it is not in violation of a final nonappealable court order. For these reasons, we do not envision the Commission invoking the formal process outlined in federal law, though the Commission is not precluded from doing so.

<sup>42</sup> Under DIVCA, the Commission is responsible for enforcing requirements with respect to anti-discrimination (Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5890), reporting (§§ 5920 and 5960) cross subsidization prohibitions (§§ 5940 and 5950) and regulatory fees (§ 401, §§ 440-444, § 5840). Local entities, on the other hand, have exclusive regulatory authority to enforce franchise fee provisions (§ 5860), PEG channel requirements

*Footnote continued on next page*

therefore comment on how DIVCA's division of regulatory authority between the Commission and local entities would be preserved in the context of a formal proceeding.

#### **3.1.4.2. Timing of the Filing of Franchise Renewal Applications**

As discussed above, we propose that video service providers submit franchise renewal applications to the Commission's Video Franchise Group no later than three months prior to the date their franchise is due to expire. If parties believe that the establishment of a formal process is necessary, then this timeline should be adjusted to accommodate the possibility that a video service provider might invoke such a process. If a formal process is requested, we would expect that proposals for renewal under our streamlined process should be submitted 36 months prior to the date a video service provider's existing franchise expires, but not later than three months prior to that date. We expect parties to include comments on the appropriate timeline for renewal in any proposals for a formal process.

#### **3.1.4.3. Reimbursement for Commission Resources Spent on Formal Proceedings**

Section 5850(b) of DIVCA states that the process and criteria for renewal of state franchises shall be the same as that described in § 5840. Section 5840(c) permits the Commission to levy a fee for processing applications for state franchises. While it is unclear whether the Legislature envisioned that some

---

(§ 5870), Emergency Alert System requirements imposed by the FCC (§ 5880), and state and federal customer service and protection standards (§ 5900). In addition, local entities are designated by DIVCA as the lead agencies for any environmental review with respect to network construction, installation, and maintenance in public rights-of-way (§§ 5820 and 5885).

video service providers might request a formal process through § 5840(c), the Legislature intended that costs incurred by the state in granting state franchises should be borne by the video service provider seeking the franchise. Depending on the size of the video service provider's franchise, the cost to the state in terms of Commission staff resources could be quite substantial. The bulk of these costs would be incurred through staff time required to conduct the formal proceedings. Therefore, if a video service provider elects to invoke the formal process, we propose to require, at the time it provides written notice of its intent to invoke the process, that it obtain a bond payable to the Commission upon completion of the formal proceeding. We believe that reasonable amount is \$200,000 per 20,000 households in the holder's video franchise area, up to maximum amount of \$1 million. Where a video service provider's franchise renewal application is approved under our streamlined process prior to any action by the Commission on the formal process, the bond would not be called.

**3.1.4.4. How the Commencement of Proceedings Described in 47 U.S.C. § 546(a) Would be Initiated and Carried Out**

Under 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)(1)-(2), no later than six months following the date a cable operator submits its written request to invoke the formal process, the franchise authority must commence a proceeding for the purpose of identifying the future cable-related needs of the community and reviewing the performance of the cable operator under its existing franchise. The franchise authority is required to provide public notice of the proceeding and afford the public with adequate opportunity to participate.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(a).

Comments should include details on how the public, interested third parties, affected local entities, and Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) would be provided an opportunity to participate in this phase of the proceeding. In particular, we seek comment on the role of local entities in the ascertainment process given that they have exclusive enforcement authority over many provisions of DIVCA and have unique access to data relevant to assessing a video service provider's performance with respect to the obligations imposed by these provisions. Parties should also comment on how the results of this ascertainment phase are to be reflected in the subsequent phase of the formal proceeding and to what extent the Commission is bound by the results of this proceeding in that next phase, where the Commission requests a proposal from the video service provider. Parties should also address whether at the close of the ascertainment phase of the proceeding, the franchise authority is obligated to issue a report or decision identifying the issues to be considered as part of the next phase of the formal process, and whether parties should have the opportunity to comment on the issues the franchise authority identifies at the conclusion of the proceeding.

#### **3.1.4.5. Definitions of "Future Cable Related Needs" and "Past Performance Review"**

As indicated above, many of the difficulties associated with incorporating the formal process into our rules for a renewal are a function of how broadly "future cable needs" and "past performance review" are defined.

A central element of the formal process is the identification of the future cable related needs of the community served under a video service provider's existing franchise. The issue arises within the formal process in the



“ascertainment phase” in which the public and the franchise authority identify these needs.<sup>44</sup> It arises again following the ascertainment phase when the video service provider is required to submit a proposal to the franchise authority that is aimed at meeting the needs that were identified in the ascertainment phase.<sup>45</sup> Renewal of a franchise is also conditioned on a finding by the franchise authority that the cable operator has complied with all the material terms of its existing franchise and with applicable law.<sup>46</sup> The past performance of a video service provider is considered in each phase of the formal process along with the consideration of future cable related needs of the community.

We seek comment on whether there is a way to define these terms so that a determination made with respect to them is consistent with the requirements of DIVCA, and still provides a meaningful process under federal law. For example, while the issue of future cable related needs of the community must be considered in the context of the formal proceeding, we note that DIVCA has defined the future cable related needs of all communities by establishing a minimum set of requirements which the Legislature found sufficient to meet the needs of all communities when balanced against the competing goal of promoting competition for video and broadband services.<sup>47</sup> Indeed, the Legislature found that this latter goal was a matter of statewide concern of

---

<sup>44</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(a).

<sup>45</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(b).

<sup>46</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g).

<sup>47</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5810.

sufficient importance to justify placing limits on the demands that individual communities might make on video service providers in the franchising process.<sup>48</sup>

This would suggest that the identification of future cable related needs and the subsequent consideration of a video service provider's plans to meet these needs in the context of 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g) should be limited to the video service provider's future plans to comply with its obligations under DIVCA. In other words, the formal process should not be an opportunity to expand or limit the obligations of video service providers under DIVCA. Its sole purpose should be to determine whether a video service provider's specific plans are sufficient to meet its obligations under DIVCA over the term of a renewed franchise. We seek comment on whether this definition of future cable related needs is consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g) and whether our analysis of DIVCA supports this conclusion.

Likewise, it appears that 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g) mandates a review of the performance of the video service provider with respect to all the terms of its existing franchise. However, DIVCA does not envision any review of past performance in the context of the Commission's renewal process, except for the fact that the Commission may not renew a franchise if the video service provider is in violation of a final nonappealable court order.<sup>49</sup> We believe that the Legislature limited the scope of the review of past performance in order to balance its goal of promoting competition for video and broadband services with the need to hold video service providers accountable for their performance under

---

<sup>48</sup> *Id.*

<sup>49</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5840(b).

their existing franchises.<sup>50</sup> In the interests of promoting competition, it eliminated the protracted and resource-intensive reviews of a video service provider's entire past performance under its existing franchise that historically had been part of the renewal process. However, to achieve a basic level of accountability for past performance, the Legislature determined that the Commission should not renew a video franchise if the video service provider were found to be in violation of a final nonappealable court order. If parties provide comment on establishing a formal process, we ask if it would be consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 546(a)-(g) to interpret the past performance review under the formal process as applying only to violations of final nonappealable court orders. If not, parties should provide alternative definitions of these terms and explain how they would be incorporated into the formal process in a manner that would be consistent with federal law and DIVCA.

**3.1.4.6. Submission of Renewal Proposals,  
Renewal, and Preliminary Assessment of  
Nonrenewal**

Under 47 U.S.C. § 546(b)-(c), at any point following the completion of the proceeding described in subsection (a), a cable operator may submit a renewal proposal on its own initiative or in response to a request for renewal proposal by the franchising authority. If the franchise authority requests the proposal, it can specify what must be included in it and when it must be submitted.<sup>51</sup> Once the proposal has been submitted, the franchise authority must provide "prompt"

---

<sup>50</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5810.

<sup>51</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(b).

public notice.<sup>52</sup> Within four months after submission of the proposal, the franchise authority must either renew the cable operator's franchise or issue a preliminary assessment that the franchise should not be renewed.<sup>53</sup> Proposals should describe in detail how to initiate and carry out the proceedings described in 47 U.S.C. §§ 546(b) and (c).

We note that historically, a franchise authority and a cable operator have often used the four-month period following the submission of the renewal proposal to reach a negotiated agreement on disputed issues. If a formal process is established, we seek comment on whether we should do the same. Parties should provide details on how this negotiation process would work, particularly given the division of regulatory authority between the Commission and local entities.<sup>54</sup> Parties should also comment on whether the same the rules for approving a settlement agreement between parties in a Commission proceeding should apply to the approval of renewal agreements between Commission and a video service provider.<sup>55</sup> Parties should also comment on whether negotiations between the Commission, local entities, and the video service provider should be subject to the same confidentiality rules applicable to Commission settlement negotiations and whether the provisions of any agreement reached between the Commission and a video service provider be non-binding in other Commission renewal proceedings.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(c).

<sup>53</sup> *Id.*

<sup>54</sup> *See* Cal. Pub. Util. Code §§ 5800 *et. seq.*

### 3.1.4.7. Administrative Proceeding

Section 546(c)-(d) of the Cable Act set forth the requirements for the administrative proceeding which must be conducted by a franchise authority in the event it issues a preliminary assessment denying a cable operator's request for renewal. The purpose of the proceeding is to consider whether: 1) the cable operator has substantially complied with the material terms of the existing franchise and applicable law; 2) the quality of the operator's service has been reasonable to meet community needs; 3) the cable operator has the financial, legal and technical ability to provide the services, facilities and equipment set forth in the operator's proposal; and 4) the operators proposal is reasonable to meet future cable related needs and interests of the community taking into account the cost of meeting such needs and interests.<sup>57</sup> An adverse finding with respect to any of the four factors is sufficient grounds for denying the video service provider's request for renewal.<sup>58</sup> Parties advocating for the establishment of a formal process should include details on how to implement this section. In particular, we seek comment on the use of the Commission's formal application procedure prescribed by Article 2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure for these purposes, and whether the opportunity for protest should be eliminated for applications for renewal of an existing franchise, given that the earlier phases of the formal renewal process may have already defined the issues for the formal proceeding.

We also seek comment on whether participation in the administrative proceeding should be limited to the video service provider, local entities within

---

<sup>57</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(c).

<sup>58</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(d).

the video service provider's franchise service territory, and DRA.<sup>59</sup> On the one hand, while DIVCA designates the Commission as sole franchising authority, it divides regulatory authority over DIVCA requirements between the Commission and local entities. DIVCA also authorizes DRA to advocate on behalf of video subscribers in renewal proceedings.<sup>60</sup> On the other hand, though the Legislature may not have envisioned that a video service provider would invoke the federal formal renewal process, it is clear that DIVCA intended that the process be as streamlined as possible. Given the size of some state issued franchises and the large number of local entities located within them that may elect to participate, the scope of the proceeding could become unmanageable. Parties should present recommendations for managing such potentially expansive proceedings.

**3.1.4.8. Adverse Findings With Respect to  
47 U.S.C. § 546(d)**

Under 47 U.S.C. § 546(d), the Commission can deny a franchise renewal application if it makes an adverse finding with respect to any of the four criteria set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 546(c)(1)(A)-(D). However, a franchise authority may not base its denial on an adverse finding with respect to the criteria set forth in § 546(c)(1)(A) or (B) unless the franchise authority has provided the video service provider notice and opportunity to cure, or in any case in which the franchise authority has waived its right to object, or the franchise authority fails to object within a reasonable timeframe after receiving written notice from the video

---

<sup>59</sup> Historically, the franchise authority and the cable operator were the only parties that participated in the administrative proceeding. Indeed, neither 47 U.S.C. § 546(c)-(d) nor the associated legislative history make reference to participation in the administrative proceeding by any other parties. On the other hand, neither 47 U.S.C. § 546(c) or (d) expressly limit who can participate in the proceeding.

service provider of a failure or inability to cure.<sup>61</sup> Parties should include in their comments details on how this provision should be implemented, including how and when such notice should be provided and the contents of such notice.

We also note that 47 U.S.C. § 546(d) states that it is the franchise authority that must provide notice. Under DIVCA, the Commission is the “sole franchising authority for state franchises to provide video service.”<sup>62</sup> We interpret this to mean that Commission is the sole franchising authority with respect to the issuance and renewal of state issued franchises. However, it is not the sole authority with respect to the enforcement of DIVCA’s franchise requirements. While local entities are not recognized as franchising authorities, DIVCA nonetheless vests them with some of the powers that were historically only granted to franchising authorities under traditional franchising regimes. To the extent that a local entity has authority to enforce specific DIVCA requirements, such as those related to consumer protection, franchise fees, and PEG access, we ask parties to comment on whether the notice requirement set forth in 47 U.S.C. § 546(d) can be met if such notice has been provided by local entities.

#### **4. Preliminary Scoping Memo**

This rulemaking will be conducted in accordance with Article 6 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.<sup>63</sup> As required by Rule 7.3, this order includes a Preliminary Scoping Memo as set forth below.

---

<sup>60</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5900(k).

<sup>61</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 546(d).

<sup>62</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5840(a).

<sup>63</sup> All references to Rules are to the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

#### **4.1. Issues**

The issue to be considered in this proceeding, as discussed above in this Order Implementing Rulemaking (OIR), is the modification of GO 169 in order to establish procedures for implementing the franchise renewal provision of the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006. In sections 1-3 above, we discussed the subject matter of this rulemaking, which briefly summarized below are:

- establishing procedures for implementing the franchise renewal provisions of the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006;
- establishing renewal procedures to reflect DIVCA's requirement that a video service provider's franchise shall not be renewed if it is in violation of a final nonappealable court order, as discussed in section 3.1.3.1 of this OIR;
- establishing procedures for a notice and comment period on franchise renewal applications, as discussed in section 3.1.3.2 of this OIR;
- the timing of franchise renewal application submissions as discussed in section 3.1.3.3 of this OIR;
- whether establishing formal franchise renewal procedures consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 546 is necessary, as discussed in section 3.1.4 of this OIR; and
- if a formal franchise renewal procedure consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 546 is necessary, the specific requirements and procedures that should be adopted, including how DIVCA's division of regulatory authority between the Commission and local entities would be preserved in the context of a formal proceeding (section 3.1.4.1); the timing of franchise renewal applications (section 3.1.4.2); the reimbursement for Commission resources spent on formal proceedings (section 3.1.4.3); how the commencement of proceedings described in 47 U.S.C. § 546(a) (ascertainment phase) would be initiated and carried out (section 3.1.4.4); how "future cable related needs" and "past performance



review” should be defined (section 3.1.4.5); what procedures should be established for the submission of renewal proposals and preliminary assessment of nonrenewal (section 3.1.4.6); how the administrative proceeding described in 47 U.S.C. § 546(c)-(d) should be implemented, including whether the Commission’s formal application procedure prescribed by Article 2 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure should be used and participation limited (section 3.1.4.7); and how the adverse findings and notice procedures in 47 U.S.C. § 546(d) should be implemented (section 3.1.4.8).

In addition to responding to the specific issues and proposals raised herein, parties may offer suggestions of their own or modifications to the proposals. The assigned Commissioner has discretion to add the suggestions or modifications in finalizing the Scoping Memo and may provide for further comment, as appropriate.

#### **4.2. Category of Proceeding and Need for Hearing**

Rule 7.1(d) requires that an OIR preliminarily determine the category of the proceeding and the need for hearing. As a preliminary matter, we determine that this proceeding is a “quasi-legislative” proceeding, as that term is defined in Rule 1.3(d). It is contemplated that this proceeding shall be conducted through written comments without the need for evidentiary hearings.

Anyone who objects to the preliminary categorization of this Rulemaking as “quasi-legislative,” or to the preliminary hearing determination, must state the objections in opening comments to this Rulemaking. If the person believes hearings are necessary, the comments must state:

- The specific disputed fact for which hearing is sought;
- Justification for the hearing (e.g., why the fact is material);

- What the party would seek to demonstrate through a hearing; and
- Anything else necessary for the purpose of making an informed ruling on the request for hearing.

After considering any comments on the Preliminary Scoping Memo, the assigned Commissioner may issue a final Scoping Memo that, among other things, will make a final category determination; this determination is subject to appeal as specified in Rule 7.6(a).

### **4.3. Schedule**

For purposes of meeting the scoping memo requirements, and to expedite the proceeding, we establish the following preliminary schedule:

<b>DATE</b>	<b>EVENT</b>
June 4, 2013	Deadline for requests to be on service list
June 14, 2013	Initial Comments filed and served
June 28, 2013	Reply Comments filed and served
TBD	Prehearing Conference
TBD	Scoping Memo

The assigned Commissioner through his/her ruling on the scoping memo and subsequent rulings, and the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) by ruling with the assigned Commissioner's concurrence, may modify the schedule as necessary during the course of the proceeding. The assigned Commissioner or assigned ALJ may, if it appears useful, convene a prehearing conference following the opening and reply comments.

We anticipate this proceeding will be resolved within 18 months from the issuance of the scoping memo.

## **5. Service List and Subscription Service**

The temporary service list for this proceeding shall be the service list from R.06-10-005, the last proceeding that adopted rules and procedures for DIVCA.

In addition, this OIR shall be served on all holders of state-issued franchises, local entities located in the service areas of existing franchise holders, a list of California cable television companies provided by the California Cable Television and Telecommunications Association, the California League of Cities, the California State Association of Counties, and a list of city attorneys for each California city provided by the California League of Cities.

On or before May 14, 2013, any person or representative of an entity seeking to become a party to this Rulemaking (i.e., actively participate in the proceeding by filing comments or appearing at workshops) should send a request to the Commission's Process Office, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, 94102 (or [Process\\_Office@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Process_Office@cpuc.ca.gov)) to be placed on the official service list. Individuals seeking only to monitor the proceeding (i.e., but not participate as an active party) may request to be added to the service list as "Information Only." Requests to be added to the service list should include the following information:

- Docket Number of the OIR;
- Name and Party Represented, if Applicable;
- Postal Address;
- Telephone Number;
- E-mail Address; and
- Desired Status (Party or "Information Only").

The service list will be posted on the Commission's website, [www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov) soon thereafter.

The Commission has adopted rules for the electronic service of documents related to its proceedings, Rule 1.10, available on our website at [http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/RULES\\_PRAC\\_PROC/44887.htm](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/RULES_PRAC_PROC/44887.htm). We

will follow the electronic service protocols adopted by the Commission in Rule 1.10 for all documents, whether formally filed or just served.

This Rule provides for electronic service of documents, in a searchable format, unless the appearance or state service list member did not provide an e-mail address. If no e-mail address was provided, service should be made by United States mail. In this proceeding, concurrent e-mail service to all persons on the service list for whom an e-mail address is available will be required, including those listed under "Information Only." Parties are expected to provide paper copies of served documents upon request.

E-mail communication about this OIR proceeding should include, at a minimum, the following information on the subject line of the e-mail:

R. [xx xx xxx] – OIR on Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act. In addition, the party sending the e-mail should briefly describe the attached communication; for example, "Comments." Paper format copies, in addition to electronic copies, shall be served on the assigned Commissioner and the ALJ.

This Rulemaking can also be monitored through the Commission's document subscription service; subscribers will receive electronic copies of documents in this Rulemaking that are published on the Commission's website. There is no need to be on the service list in order to use the subscription service. Instructions for enrolling in the subscription service are available on the Commission's website at <http://subscribecpuc.cpuc.ca.gov/>.

## **6. Public Advisor**

Any person or entity interested in participating in this OIR who is unfamiliar with the Commission's procedures should contact the Commission's Public Advisor in San Francisco at (415) 703-2074 or (866) 849-8390 or e-mail

[public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov); or in Los Angeles at (213) 576-7055 or (866) 849-8391, or e-mail [public.advisor.la@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:public.advisor.la@cpuc.ca.gov). The TTY number is (866) 836-7825.

## **7. Intervenor Compensation**

Pursuant to D.07-03-014, Conclusion of Law 147, DIVCA does not allow the Commission to order a grant of intervenor compensation in this proceeding.

## **8. Ex Parte Communications**

*Ex parte* communications are defined in Rule 8.1. In quasi-legislative proceedings such as this one, *ex parte* communications are allowed without restriction or reporting requirement as set forth in Rule 8.3.

Therefore **IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. An Order Instituting Rulemaking is instituted on the Commission's own motion for the purpose of amending General Order 169 and establishing procedures for implementing the franchise renewal provision of the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006.
2. This Rulemaking is preliminarily determined to be a quasi-legislative proceeding, as that term is defined in Rule 1.3(d), and it is preliminarily determined that no hearings are necessary.
3. The temporary service list for this proceeding shall be the service list from R.06-10-005, the last proceeding that adopted rules and procedures for the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006. In addition, this Order Instituting Rulemaking shall be served on all holders of state issued franchises, cable television companies operating under local franchises identified from the membership list included in the directory published by the California Cable Television and Telecommunications Association, the California Cable and Telecommunications Association, a list of city attorneys for each California city that was provided by the California League of Cities, the California League of

Cities, a list of county counsels for each California county that was provided by the California State Association of Counties, and the California State Association of Counties.

4. The preliminary schedule for this proceeding is as set forth in the body of this Order Instituting Rulemaking. The assigned Commissioner through his/her scoping memo and subsequent rulings, and the assigned Administrative Law Judge by ruling with the assigned Commissioner's concurrence, may modify the schedule as necessary.

5. The issues to be considered in this Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) are:

- (a) establishing procedures for implementing the franchise renewal provisions of the Digital Infrastructure and Video Competition Act of 2006 (DIVCA);
- (b) establishing renewal procedures to reflect DIVCA's requirement that a video service provider's franchise shall not be renewed if it is in violation of a final nonappealable court order, as discussed in section 3.1.3.1 of this OIR;
- (c) establishing procedures for a notice and comment period on franchise renewal applications, as discussed in section 3.1.3.2 of this OIR;
- (d) the timing of franchise renewal application submissions as discussed in section 3.1.3.3 of this OIR;
- (e) whether establishing formal franchise renewal procedures consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 546 is necessary, as discussed in section 3.1.4 of this OIR; and
- (f) if a formal franchise renewal procedure consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 546 is necessary, the specific requirements and procedures that should be adopted, including how DIVCA's division of regulatory authority between the Commission and local entities would be preserved in the context of a formal proceeding (section 3.1.4.1); the timing of franchise renewal applications (section 3.1.4.2); the reimbursement for Commission resources spent on formal proceedings (section 3.1.4.3); how the commencement of

proceedings described in 47 U.S.C. § 546(a) (ascertainment phase) would be initiated and carried out (section 3.1.4.4); how “future cable related needs” and “past performance review” should be defined (section 3.1.4.5); what procedures should be established for the submission of renewal proposals and preliminary assessment of nonrenewal (section 3.1.4.6); how the administrative proceeding described in 47 U.S.C. § 546(c)-(d) should be implemented, including whether the Commission’s formal application procedure prescribed by Article 2 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (section 3.1.4.7) should be used; and how the adverse findings and notice procedures in 47 U.S.C. § 546(d) should be implemented (section 3.1.4.8).

6. Comments and reply comments must be filed on or before May 24, 2013 and June 10, 2013, respectively, unless the assigned Commissioner or Administrative Law Judge modifies the schedule. Comments and reply comments shall conform to the requirements of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

7. Any persons objecting to the preliminary categorization of this Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) as “quasi-legislative,” or to the preliminary determination on the need for hearings, issues to be considered, or schedule shall state their objections in their opening comments of this OIR.

8. On or before May 14, 2013, any person or representative of an entity seeking to become a party to this Order Instituting Rulemaking must send a request to the Commission’s Process Office, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102 (or [Process\\_Office@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Process_Office@cpuc.ca.gov)) to be placed on the official service list for this proceeding. Individuals seeking only to monitor the proceeding, but not participate as an active party may request to be added to the service list as “Information Only.”

9. After initial service of this order, a new service list for the proceeding shall be established following procedures set forth in this order. The Commission's Process Office will publish the official service list on the Commission's website ([www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov)) as soon as practical. The assigned Commissioner, and the assigned Administrative Law Judge, acting with the assigned Commissioner's concurrence, shall have ongoing oversight of the service list and may institute changes to the list or the procedures governing it as necessary.

This order is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.



## **APPENDIX A**

# **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL ORDER 169 IMPLEMENTING FRANCHISE RENEWAL PROVISIONS FOR THE DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND VIDEO COMPETITION ACT OF 2006**

[The following shows proposed amendments and additions to General Order 169. Unless revised here, the remaining sections of General Order 169 will be unchanged; however the table of contents, section numbers, and footnotes will be revised and renumbered accordingly.]

## Definitions

\*\*\*

D. "Application" means an Application in the form prescribed by the Commission for seeking a grant, or amendment, or renewal of a State Video Franchise and should be referred to as a State Video Franchise Application. ~~or (2) an Application in the form prescribed by Rule 2.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure if the Applicant seeks an extension of time to meet the requirements of subdivision (b), (c), or (e) of Public Utilities Code section 5890.~~

## **V. Application Process for Renewal of State Video Franchise**

The application requirements and process for a renewal of a state franchise shall be the same as those for issuance of an initial state franchise set forth in Section IV of this General Order, with the following exceptions.

### **A. Date for Submission of Applications for Renewal**

An application for the renewal of a state video franchise shall be submitted to the Commission's Video Franchise Group no later than 3 months prior to the date of the current franchise is due to expire or 3 months prior to the end of the 10th year from the date of its issuance.

### **B. Public Participation**

Once an Applicant submits an application for renewal to the Commission's Video Franchise Group, it shall concurrently serve a copy of the application for renewal on the service list for Rulemaking XX-XX-XXX and the appropriate contact person for each Local Entity where the Applicant will provide service. The public, including DRA, may submit written comments on the completeness of the application within 15 days from the date it has been served. Comments shall be submitted to the Commission's Video Franchise Group electronically at \_\_\_\_\_cpuc.ca.gov or by United States postal mail.

**C. Adequate Assurance of Financial, Legal and Technical Qualifications/  
Bond Requirement**

To meet this requirement, an applicant must verify that it has previously submitted a bond which meets the requirements set forth in Section IV.A.1.a of this General Order. If the Applicant has not submitted the required bond to the Commission, the application for renewal shall be considered incomplete.

**V. VI. Ineligibility of Entities in Violation of the Cable Television and Video Providers Service and Information Act or the Video Customer Service Act**

No person or corporation shall be eligible for a State Video Franchise, including a State Video Franchise obtained from transfer of an existing State Video Franchise, if that person or corporation is in violation of any final nonappealable order relating to either the Cable Television and Video Providers Customer Service and Information Act (Cal. Govt. Code §§ 53054 et seq.) or the Video Customer Service Act (Cal. Govt. Code §§ 53088 et seq.).<sup>1</sup> In addition, no person or corporation shall be eligible for the renewal of a State Video Franchise, if that person or corporation is in violation of any final non appealable court order relating to either Cable Television and Video Providers Customer Service and Information Act (Cal. Govt. Code §§ 53054 et seq.), the Video Customer Service Act (Cal. Govt. Code §§ 53088 et seq.) or the Digital Information and Video Competition Act (Cal. Pub. Code §§5800 et seq.).<sup>2</sup>

**VI. VII. The State Video Franchise - Authorization to Offer Service, Obligations, Amendment, Transfer, Voluntary Termination, and Miscellaneous Changes**

\*\*\*

**G. Extension of Deadlines**

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 5890(f)(1), a State Video Franchise Holder may apply to the Commission for an extension of time to meet the requirements of subdivision (b), (c), or (e) of section 5890. An application for extension shall be in the form of a formal application to the Commission, as provided in Article 2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 5840(d).

<sup>2</sup> Id. at § 5840(d) and § 5850(d)

~~Application for~~ formal application for extension must be filed as soon as practicable after the State Video Franchise Holder determines that it likely will not be able to meet one or more requirements of subdivision (b), (c), or (e), as applicable, but no sooner than two years from the commencement of service. In no event should the ~~Application for an~~ extension be filed later than the earliest deadline under any of the requirements for which an extension is sought.

~~An Application for~~ formal application for extension must state good cause for the Commission to grant the extension. "Good Cause" may include, without limitation, factors beyond the control of the State Video Franchise Holder set forth in section 5890(f)(3). The ~~Application~~ formal application for extension must also state the basis on which the State Video Franchise Holder contends that it has made substantial and continuous efforts to meet the requirements of subdivision (b), (c), or (e) of section 5890, as applicable. The ~~Application~~ formal application for extension must also propose a new schedule for offering service under section 5890, and must support the reasonableness of the compliance deadlines under the proposed schedule.

The Commission will hold a public hearing on any formal application for extension. The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure will govern participation ~~in the Application for extension~~.

**(END OF APPENDIX A)**