Legislative Analysis

Mitchell Bean, Director
Phone: (517) 373-8080
http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa

UNIFORM LOCAL FRANCHISES FOR VIDEO SERVICE PROVIDERS

House Bill 6456 (H-2, with Floor Amendment)
Sponsor: Rep. Mike Nofs
Committee: Energy and Technology

Complete to 10-17-06

A SUMMARY OF HOUSE BILL 6456 AS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE AND AMENDED ON SECOND READING

The bill, to be known as the "Uniform Video Services Local Franchise Act," would create a system of uniform local franchising for providers of video service, with some voluntary local variation permitted. The bill is intended to foster competition and increase investment in the cable television and video services industry.

Video service providers, generally speaking, are any companies, including both traditional cable television companies and competitors, providing video programming through any technology that uses the public rights-of-way.

BRIEF SUMMARY:

The bill contains the following features:

- A video provider would need a franchise agreement with the local governmental unit to offer video services within its boundaries. Agreements would last for 10 years, renewable for 10 more years. Local units of government would have to approve complete agreements within 30 days.

- An expiring existing franchise agreement *could not* be renewed or extended. In addition, existing franchise agreements would be replaced by uniform agreements or modified to include only those provisions required under a uniform agreement.

- The Public Service Commission would provide a uniform franchising form for the parties to use. (However, the PSC could not regulate providers as public utilities.)

- Local units and video providers could enter into voluntary franchise agreements different from the uniform agreements.

- A local unit could not require a video service provider to get a separate franchise and could not impose any fee or franchise requirement other than as prescribed in the bill.

- A video service provider would pay an annual video service fee to the local unit, as well as a quarterly support fee for public, educational, and governmental (PEG) programming. Annual video service fees could not exceed five percent of gross revenues. Quarterly PEG fees could not exceed one percent of gross revenues.

- A local unit must allow a video service provider to install, construct, and maintain a communications network within a public right-of-way and allow "open, comparable, nondiscriminatory, and competitively neutral access to the public right-of-way."

- A provider could not deny service access to any group of potential residential subscribers because of the race or income of the residents. (Such discrimination is sometimes referred to as "redlining.")

- Providers would have to file an annual report with the local unit and PSC on non-discriminatory access and build-out requirements.

- The PSC would file an annual report with the Governor and Legislature on video service competition, with recommendations for legislation.

- If a local unit authorizes more than one provider franchise agreement, it could not enforce any franchise term more burdensome than found in another agreement.

- Video franchise agreements would be fully transferable simply by filing with the local unit within 15 days of the transfer. A provider could terminate its franchise agreement or modify its service footprint simply by submitting notice to the local unit (except when it would produce racial or income redlining.)

- A provider would have to establish a dispute resolution process for customers and maintain a local or toll-free telephone number.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This bill will increase State of Michigan expenditures for the Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) by an indeterminate amount. The MPSC is directed to develop a standard form for local governments to use in authorizing video providers within their jurisdiction. This form is to be issued as an order by MPSC. While the cost of developing the form is not expected to be significant, MPSC will also incur additional costs to administer and enforce the provisions of the bill. No additional State of Michigan revenue is provided in the bill for monitoring compliance and investigating complaints.

For local units of government in which multiple video service providers are granted franchises, local government revenue is expected to increase, at least in the short run. For local units in which only a single video service provider operates, the bill is structured to provide for fees based on a rate at least equal to current rates. Therefore, local government revenue in units with a single video service provider will increase or decline based on consumer demand for these services. Some local governments have argued that their expenditures will increase because the bill does not allow them to negotiate for in-kind services in addition to franchise fees. Such services, which include free video service to city jails and educational facilities, were estimated to cost between $25 million to $35 million by the Michigan Municipal League. However, this cost estimate cannot be independently verified.

DETAILED SUMMARY:

Following is a more detailed description of the bill.

Video Service. As defined in the bill, "video service" means video programming, as defined in 47 U.S.C. § 522(20); cable service as defined in 47 U.S.C. § 522(6); IPTV, or internet protocol television; OVS, or open video system as defined in 47 U.S.C. § 573; "if provided through facilities located at least in part in the public rights-of-way without regard to delivery technology, including internet protocol technology." The bill's definition of video service expressly excludes video programming provided by a commercial mobile service provider as defined in 47 U.S.C. § 332(d) or "provided solely as part of, and via, a service that enables users to access content, information, electronic mail, or other services offered over the public internet."

Requirements of uniform local video franchising form. Not later than 30 days after the effective date of the bill, the Public Service Commission (PSC) would be required to issue an order establishing the standardized form for the uniform video service local franchise agreement to be used by each franchising entity in the state. A "franchising entity" means the local unit of government in which a provider offers video services. Except as otherwise provided, a person would have to obtain a uniform video service local franchise before providing video services in any local unit of government.

The uniform local video franchising form would be required to include the following elements:

- The name of the provider.
- The address and telephone number of the provider's principal place of business.
- The name of the provider's principal executive officers and any persons authorized to represent the provider before the franchising entity and the PSC.
- If the provider is not an incumbent video provider, the date on which the provider expects to provide video services in the identified area.
- An exact description of the video service area footprint to be served "as identified by a geographic information system digital boundary meeting or exceeding national map accuracy standards." For large telecommunications providers with one million or more access lines in Michigan, the video service footprint would have to be identified in terms of wire centers or exchanges. Incumbent video providers (e.g., cable providers with existing franchise agreements) would not have to provide an exact video service footprint. Incumbent providers need only make right-of-way related information available to a requesting local unit of government. Such information

would be comparable to the information required by a permit under the Metropolitan Extension Telecommunications Rights-of-Way Oversight Act (Public Act 48 of 2002).

- A requirement that the provider pay the video service provider fees required under Section 6 of the bill.
- A requirement that the provider file all necessary forms with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in advance of offering video service in Michigan.
- A requirement that the provider agrees to comply with all valid and enforceable federal and state statutes and regulations.
- A requirement that the provider agrees to comply with all valid and enforceable local regulations regarding use and occupation of public rights of-way, including the police powers of the franchising entity.
- A requirement that the provider comply with all FCC requirements involving the distribution and notification of emergency messages over the emergency alert system applicable to cable operators.
- A requirement that the provider comply with the public, education, and government (PEG) programming requirements of Section 4 of the bill.
- A requirement that the provider comply with FCC customer service rules, under 47 C.F.R. § 76.309(c), applicable to cable operators and applicable provisions of the Michigan Consumer Protection Act, 1976 PA 331.
- A requirement that the provider comply with the consumer privacy requirements of 47 U.S.C. § 551 applicable to cable operators.
- A requirement that the provider comply with FCC in-home wiring and consumer premises wiring rules applicable to cable operators.
- A requirement that an incumbent video provider comply with the terms which provide insurance for right-of-way related activities contained in its last cable franchise or consent agreement.
- A grant of authority by the local unit of government to provide video service in the video service area footprint.
- A grant of authority by the local unit of government to use and occupy the public rights-of-way in the delivery of the video service, subject to the laws of Michigan and the police powers of the local unit of government.
- The penalties provided for under Section 14 of the bill.

<u>Franchise agreement required</u>. A video provider is required to enter into or possess a franchise agreement with the local unit of government before offering video services within the boundaries of a local unit of government.

<u>Deadlines for local units of government to act</u>. Once a video provider submits a franchise agreement to a local unit of government, the local unit must notify the provider within 15 business days as to whether the agreement is complete. If it is not, the local unit of government must state in its notice the reason the agreement is incomplete. If the agreement is complete, the local unit of government would have 30 days from the date of submission to approve the agreement. If the local unit does not notify the provider

regarding completeness or approve the franchise agreement within the applicable time period, the franchise agreement would be considered complete and approved.

Transfer, modification, or renewal of franchise agreements. Video franchise agreements are fully transferable to successors in interest. Notices of transfer would simply have to be filed with the appropriate local unit of government within 15 days of the completion of the transfer. A provider may terminate its video franchise agreement or modify its service footprint simply by submitting notice to the local unit of government unless doing so would violate the bill's prohibition on racial or income redlining.

If any of the information contained in the franchise agreement changes, the provider would have to notify the local unit of government.

Video franchise agreements last for a period of 10 years and are renewable for an additional 10 years.

No additional fees or franchises. A local unit of government would not be allowed to require a video service provider to obtain a separate franchise or impose any fee or franchise requirement other than those provided for in the bill. For this purpose, "franchise requirement" includes provisions regulating rates charged by video service providers, build-out requirements, or a requirement for the deployment of any facilities or equipment.

PEG Channels. A video service provider would have to designate a sufficient amount of capacity on its network to provide for the same number of public, educational, and government (PEG) channels that are in actual use on the incumbent video provider system on the effective date of the bill. A provider would be allowed to withdraw any PEG channel that a local unit of government used for less than eight hours per day for three consecutive months. If the local unit of government later certifies a schedule for at least eight hours of daily programming for a period of three consecutive months, the provider would have to restore the channel.

The local unit would have to ensure that all transmissions, content, or programming to be retransmitted by a video service provider are provided in a manner or form capable of being accepted and retransmitted by a provider (without any requirement for additional alteration or change in the content by the provider) over the particular network of the provider, with that manner or form to be compatible with the technology or protocol used by the provider.

PEG channels would be restricted to use for noncommercial purposes.

Interconnection for PEG purposes. A video service provider may request that an incumbent video provider interconnect with its video system for the sole purpose of providing access to PEG programming for a local unit of government served by both providers. Where technically feasible, interconnections would be allowed under an agreement of the parties. The new provider and the incumbent provider would be required to negotiate in good faith and would not be allowed to unreasonably withhold interconnection. The providers may use any reasonable agreed-upon method to accomplish interconnection. The requesting provider would be required to pay the construction, operation, maintenance, and other costs arising out of the interconnection, including the reasonable costs incurred by the incumbent provider.

Responsibility for content on PEG and other channels. The person producing broadcasts is solely responsible for all content provided over PEG channels. The bill would prohibit a video service provider from exercising any editorial control over PEG channel programming or on any other channel required by law. The bill exempts video service providers from any civil or criminal liability for any programming carried on any channel, including PEG channels.

Carriage of local broadcast channels. This section of the bill would apply only to a video service provider that delivers video programming in a video service area where the provider is not regulated as a cable operator under federal law.

Generally speaking, a provider would be required to provide its subscribers access to the signals of the local broadcast television licensed by the FCC to serve those subscribers over the air. This requirement does not apply to a low power station except for a qualified low power station as defined under 47 U.S.C. § 534(h)(2). A provider is required to carry digital broadcast signals only to the extent that the broadcast television station has the right under federal law or regulation to demand carriage of the digital broadcast signals by a cable operator on a cable system. Under the bill, a broadcast station would either be granted mandatory carriage or would request retransmission consent with the provider.

A provider would be required to transmit, without degradation, the signals a local broadcast station delivers to the provider, and the provider would not be required to provide valuable consideration in exchange for carriage.

A provider must not discriminate between broadcast stations and programming providers with respect to transmission of their signals, taking into account any consideration afforded the provider by the programming provider or broadcast station. The signal quality as retransmitted by the provider is not required to be superior to the quality as received from the broadcast television station. A provider also may not delete, change, or alter a copyright identification transmitted as part of a broadcast station's signal. A provider is not required to use the same or similar reception technology as the broadcast stations or programming providers.

Effect of bill on existing franchise agreements. As of the bill's effective date, an expiring existing franchise agreement *cannot* be renewed or extended.

In general, once the bill takes effect, an incumbent video provider would have to do one of the following to continue to provide video services:

- Terminate the existing franchise agreement *before its expiration date* and enter into a new uniform local franchise agreement.

- Continue under the existing franchise agreement *amended to include only those provisions required under a uniform local franchise agreement.*
- Continue to operate under the terms of an expired franchise until a uniform local franchise agreement takes effect. An incumbent video provider would have 120 days after the effective date of the law to file for a uniform local franchise agreement.

On the effective date of the bill, any provisions of an existing franchise agreement that are inconsistent with or in addition to the provisions of a uniform local franchise agreement would be deemed "unreasonable and unenforceable by the franchising entity."

<u>"Most favored nation" requirement</u>. If a local unit of government authorizes two or more service providers through an existing franchise, a uniform local franchise agreement or an agreement under Section 13, the local unit would not be allowed to enforce any term of a franchise that is more burdensome than a term contained in another franchise agreement.

<u>Annual video service provider fees</u>. A video service provider would have to calculate and pay an annual video service fee to the local unit of government. The fee would be determined as follows:

- If there is an existing franchise agreement, an amount equal to the percentage of gross revenues paid to the franchising entity by the incumbent video provider with the largest number of subscribers.
- At the expiration of an existing franchise agreement, or if there is no existing franchise agreement, an amount equal to the percentage of gross revenues established by the local unit not to exceed five percent. The amount established by the local unit would be applicable to all providers.

All fees due under this section would be due on a quarterly basis and paid within 45 days after the close of the quarter. Each payment would have to include a statement explaining the basis for the calculation of the fee. The local unit would not be allowed to demand any additional fees or charges from a provider and would not be allowed to demand the use of any calculation method other than that described in the bill.

<u>Definition of gross revenues for purpose of calculating applicable fees</u>. "Gross revenues" means "all consideration of any kind or nature, including, without limitation, cash, credits, property, and in-kind contributions received by the provider from subscribers for the provision of video service by the video service provider within the jurisdiction of the franchising unit [local unit of government]." Gross revenues specifically <u>include</u>:

- All charges and fees paid by subscribers for video service, including equipment rental, late fees, and insufficient funds fees. Fees for video service are included regardless of whether the service was sold individually, as part of a package or bundle, or was functionally integrated with services other than video services.
- Any franchise fee imposed on the provider that is passed on to subscribers.
- Compensation received by the provider for promotion or exhibition of any products or services over the video service.

- Revenue received by the provider as compensation for carriage of video programming on that provider's video service.
- All revenue derived from compensation arrangements for advertising attributable to the local franchise area.
- Any advertising paid to an affiliated third party for video service advertising.

Gross revenues specifically <u>exclude</u>:

- Any revenue not actually received, even if billed, such as bad debts (net of any recoveries).
- Refunds, rebates, credits, or discounts to subscribers or a municipality to the extent not already offset, attributable to the video service.
- Any revenues received by the provider or its affiliates from the provision of services other than video services, including telecommunications services, information services, and other services, capabilities and applications packaged, bundled or functionally integrated with video services.
- Any revenues received by the provider or its affiliates for the provision of directory or Internet advertising.
- Any amounts attributable to the provision of video service at no charge, including the provision of service at no charge to public institutions.
- Any tax, fee, or assessment of general applicability imposed on the customer or the transaction, collected by the provider, and required to be remitted to the taxing entity, including sales and use taxes.
- Any forgone revenue from the provision of video services at no charge to any person, except any forgone revenue exchanged for trades, barters, services, or other items of value.
- Sales of capital assets or surplus equipment.
- Reimbursement by programmers of marketing costs actually incurred by the provider for the introduction of new programming.
- The sale of video service for resale to the extent the purchaser certifies in writing that it will resell the service and pay a franchise fee with respect to the service.
- In the case of video services bundled or functionally integrated with other services, the revenue for all of the services is <u>included</u> unless the provider can reasonably identify the division or exclusion of the non-video service revenue from books and records kept in the regular course of business.
- Revenue of an affiliate is <u>included</u> "to the extent the treatment of the revenue as revenue of the affiliate has the effect of evading the payment of franchise fees which would otherwise be paid for video service."

<u>PEG programming support fee</u>. A video service provider would have to pay a support fee, on a quarterly basis, to the local unit of government for public, educational and governmental programming. The fee would be one of the following:

- If there is an existing franchise on the effective date of the bill, the fee paid to the franchising entity with the largest number of cable service subscribers in the local unit of government under the existing franchise agreement. (Presumably, this refers to the fee paid for PEG programming support under the existing franchise agreement.)

- At the expiration of the existing franchise agreement, the PEG support fee would be the amount required under the existing franchise agreement not to exceed one percent of gross revenues.
- If there is no existing franchise agreement, a percentage of gross revenues as established by the local unit of government not to exceed one percent as determined by a community need assessment.
- An amount agreed to by the local unit of government and the video service provider.

The bill mandates that the PEG fee apply to all providers and that the fee not exceed the "reasonable capital cost of providing the [PEG] facilities." The PEG fee would be due on a quarterly basis and paid within 45 days after the end of a quarter. Each payment would have to include a statement explaining how the amount submitted was calculated.

<u>Credits toward annual video service provider fees [not PEG fees]</u>. A video service provider would be entitled to a credit applied toward its annual video service provider fees for all funds allocated to the local unit of government from annual maintenance fees paid by the provider for use of public rights-of-way under the Metropolitan Extension Telecommunications Rights-of-Way Oversight (METRO) Act, 2002 PA 48, *minus any property tax credit approved by the Public Service Commission*. The credits would be applied on a monthly pro rata basis and would be calculated by multiplying the linear feet occupied by the provider in the public rights-of-way of the franchising entity by five cents. Credit computations and determinations would have to be made using generally accepted accounting principles. The credit for METRO Act maintenance fees (*less property tax credits*) applies only toward annual service provider fees, not PEG support fees.

<u>Audits of fees</u>. A local unit of government may perform reasonable audits of the video service provider's calculation of the fees paid to the local unit of government during the preceding 24-month period only, not more than once every 24 months. The provider must make all records reasonably necessary for the audits available at the location where the records are kept in the ordinary course of business. The local unit of government and the video service provider would each be responsible for their respective costs of the audit. Any additional amount due verified by the local unit would have to be paid by the provider within 30 days of the local unit's submission of an invoice. If the underpayment exceeds five percent of the total fees that should have been paid for the 24-month period, the provider would have to pay the local unit's reasonable audit costs.

<u>Limitations period</u>. Any claims by a local unit of government that fees have not been paid as required, and any claims for refunds or other corrections to the remittance of a provider, would have to be made within three years from the date the compensation is remitted.

<u>Identification of fees on subscribers' bills</u>. A provider may identify and collect the amount of the video service provider fee and the PEG support fee as separate line items on the regular bill of each subscriber.

<u>Use of public rights-of-way</u>. A local unit of government would have to allow a state video service provider to install, construct, and maintain a communications network within a public right-of-way and would have to provide the provider with "open, comparable, nondiscriminatory, and competitively neutral access to the public right-of-way."

A local unit of government may not discriminate against a video service provider to provide service for any of the following:

- The authorization or placement of a communications network in public rights-of-way.
- Access to a building.
- A municipal utility pole attachment.

A local unit of government may impose a permit fee on a video service provider only to the extent it imposes the same fee on incumbent video providers. Further, any permit fee must not exceed the actual, direct costs incurred by the local unit of government for issuing the relevant permit. A permit fee may not be levied if the video service provider has already paid a permit fee in connection with the same activity or if the video service provider is otherwise authorized by law or contract to place the facilities used by the video service providers in the public right-of-way. Permit fees may not be levied for general revenue purposes.

<u>Redlining & build-out requirements for large companies.</u> A video service provider would be prohibited from denying access to service to any group of potential residential subscribers because of the race or income of the residents in the local area in which the group resides. Such discrimination is sometimes referred to as redlining.

Either of the following would constitute a defense for a provider to an alleged redlining violation:

- Within three years of the date it began providing video service, at least 25 percent of the households with access to the provider's video service are low-income households (average annual household income of less than $35,000).
- Within five years of the date it began providing video service, and subsequently, at least 30 percent of the households with access to the provider's video service are low-income households.

Under Section 9(3) of the bill, telecommunications companies with more than one million access lines in Michigan providing video services would be required to provide access to its video service to a number of households equal to "at least 25 percent of the households in the provider's telecommunication service area in the state within three years of the date it began providing video service under this act and to a number not less than 50 percent of these households within six years." However, a "video service provider is not required to meet the 50 percent requirement in this subsection until two years after at least 30 percent of the households with access to the provider's video service subscribe to the service for six months."

Annual report by providers to PSC. Providers would be required to file an annual report with the local unit of government and the Public Service Commission regarding the progress toward compliance with the requirements pertaining to non-discriminatory access and build-out requirements for large telecommunications companies.

Use of alternative technology other than satellite service. A video service provider would be allowed to satisfy the non-discrimination and build-out requirements of Section 9 through the use of alternative technology, *other than satellite service*, offering "service, functionality, and content" that is similar to that provided through the provider's video service system. Providers may use alternative technology, *other than satellite service*, that does not require the use of any public right-of-way. Any alternative technology used to comply with the requirements of Section 9 must include PEG channels and emergency alert system messages.

A video service provider may apply to the local unit of government or to the PSC—in the case of large telecommunications providers subject to Section 9(3)—for a waiver of or extension of time to meet the requirements of this section if one or more of the following apply:

- The provider was unable to obtain access to public and private rights-of-way under reasonable conditions.
- Developments or buildings were not subject to competition because of existing exclusive service arrangements.
- Developments or buildings were inaccessible using reasonable technical solutions under commercially reasonable terms and conditions.
- Natural disasters.
- Factors beyond control of the provider.

The local unit of government or the PSC may grant the waiver or extension only if the provider has made "substantial and continuous" effort to meet the requirements of the bill. If an extension is granted, the local unit of government or the PSC would have to establish a new compliance deadline. If a waiver is granted, the local unit of government or the PSC would have to specify the requirements waived.

Notwithstanding any other provision, no video service provider using telephone facilities to provide video service is obligated to provide service outside its existing telephone exchange boundaries.

Notwithstanding any other provision, a video service provider would not be required to comply with, and a local unit of government would not be permitted to impose or enforce, any mandatory build-out or deployment requirements or schedules except as required by Section 9.

Dispute resolution. Each video service provider would have to establish a dispute resolution process for its customers and maintain a local or toll-free telephone number for customer service contact. The PSC would have to establish a process to review disputes not resolved under the provider's own process, disputes between a provider and a local unit of government, and disputes between providers. Each provider would have to notify its customers of the dispute resolution process.

Freedom of Information Act exemptions. Except under the terms of a mandatory protective order, trade secrets and commercial and financial information submitted to a local unit of government or the PSC would be exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. If disclosed under a mandatory protective order, a local unit of government or the PSC would be allowed use of the information for the purpose for which it is required, but the information would otherwise remain confidential. Cost studies, customer usage data, marketing studies/plans, and contracts would be rebuttably presumed exempt from FOIA disclosure. The party seeking disclosure of the information would have the burden of removing the presumption.

Limitation on PSC authority. The authority of the PSC would be limited to the powers and duties explicitly provided for in the bill. The PSC would not have the authority to regulate video service providers as public utilities.

Annual report by the PSC. The PSC would have to file an annual report with the Governor and Legislature by February 1 on video service competition in the state and recommendations for legislation, if any.

Voluntary franchise agreements with different terms. Local units of government and video service providers would be allowed to enter into a voluntary franchise agreement that includes terms and conditions different from the uniform agreement provided for in the bill, including, but not limited to, "a reduction in the franchise fee in return for the video service provider making available to the franchising entity services, equipment, capabilities, or other valuable consideration." This section does not apply unless for each provider servicing the local unit of government "it is technically feasible and commercially practicable to comply with similar terms and conditions in the franchise agreement [and it is offered to] the other provider." The bracketed language in this sentence is the floor amendment agreed to on September 21, 2006.

Remedies for violations; appeals. If, after notice and hearing, the PSC finds that a person has violated the law, it would order remedies and penalties designed to protect and make whole persons who have suffered damages, including, but not limited to:

- A fine for a first offense of not less than $1,000 or more than $20,000. For a second or subsequent offense, the PSC would order a fine of not less than $20,000 or more than $40,000. If the video service provider has less than 250,000 telecommunication access lines in Michigan, a fine for a first offense would be not less than $200 or more than $500. For a second and any subsequent offense, the fine would be not less than $500 or more than $1,000.
- Revocation of a person's state uniform video service authorization.
- Cease and desist orders.

No fines would be imposed on providers who have otherwise fully complied with the law and who can show that the violation was due to an "unintentional and bona fide error notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adopted to avoid the error." The bill cites such possible examples of bona fide errors as clerical, calculation, computer malfunction, programming, or printing errors. Errors in legal judgment with respect to a person's obligations under the law do not qualify as bona fide errors. The burden of proving that a violation was an unintentional and bona fide error is on the provider.

If the PSC finds that a party's complaint or defense is frivolous, the PSC would be required to award costs to the prevailing party, including reasonable attorney fees.

Any party of interest would have the same rights to appeal and review an order or finding of the PSC as under the Michigan Telecommunications Act, 1991 PA 179.

POSITIONS:

AT&T supports the bill. (9-25-06)
Communications Workers of America – District 4 supports the bill. (9-25-06)
Fiber to the Home Council, Washington, D.C., supports the bill. (9-25-06)
Michigan AFL-CIO supports the bill. (9-22-06)
Michigan Association of Broadcasters supports the bill. (9-25-06)
Michigan Retailers Association supports the bill. (9-22-06)
Telecommunications Association of Michigan supports the bill. (9-25-06)
Verizon supports the bill. (9-25-06)

Charter Communications is neutral on the bill. (9-25-06)
Michigan Cable Television Association is neutral on the bill. (9-22-06)

AccessVision, Battle Creek, Michigan, opposes the bill. (9-26-06)
Michigan Chapter of the Alliance for Community Media opposes the bill. (9-26-06)
Michigan Municipal League opposes the bill. (9-25-06)
Michigan Townships Association opposes the bill. (9-25-06)

Legislative Analyst: Shannan Kane
Fiscal Analyst: Richard Child