MOSS & BARNETT
A Professional Association

INTERNATIONAL MUNICIPAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION



Work Session: X: Telecommunications Law

Title: FRANCHISE FEES – What Can You Legally Collect?

by

Presenter: Brian T. Grogan, Esq.

Presenter's Title: Shareholder

Presenter's Office: Moss & Barnett

2005 International Municipal Lawyers Association. This is an informational and educational report distributed by the International Municipal Lawyers Association during its 2005 Annual Conference, held September 25-28, 2005 in Savannah, Georgia. IMLA assumes no responsibility for the policies or positions presented in the report or for the presentation of its contents.

MOSS & BARNETT
A Professional Association

FRANCHISE FEES - What Can You Legally Collect?

IMLA's 70th Annual Conference
Savannah, GA

September 25-28, 2005

Prepared by:

BRIAN T. GROGAN, ESQ.
Moss & Barnett
A Professional Association
4800 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129
Telephone: (612) 347-0340
Facsimile: (612) 339-6686
Email: groganb@moss-barnett.com
Web Site:www.municipalcommunicationslaw.com

INTRODUCTION

A franchise fee is paid by a cable operator to a franchising authority for the privilege of using the public rights-of-way or to compensate for the costs of regulation. It is the single most important element in any cable television franchise and has resulted in numerous disputes between franchising authorities, cable operators and the FCC. Absent provisions in a franchise to the contrary, nothing under federal law prohibits a franchising authorities' use of franchise fees for any purpose it desires. The Cable Act (47 U.S.C. § 542(i)) specifically prohibits the FCC from regulating the use of revenue derived from franchise fees.

This paper will review FCC and court decisions affecting municipal authority to collect franchise fees on a cable operator's gross revenues as well as provide examples which franchising authorities may consider using when negotiating with cable operators.

HISTORY

Prior to adoption of the 1984 Cable Act the FCC regulated franchise fees under rules promulgated in 1972. Under those rules the FCC limited franchise fees to no more than three percent of an operator's gross revenues. Franchising authorities were permitted to seek a waiver from the FCC to increase fees between three and five percent of gross revenues if the franchising authority could demonstrate excessive regulatory costs to be incurred. *47 C.F.R. § 76.31 (1983)*. With the adoption of the 1984 Cable Act franchise fees were capped at five percent of an operator's gross revenues derived in any 12 month period. *47 U.S.C. § 542*. The Cable Act also limited the authority of the FCC to regulate both the amount of franchise fees and the use of those fees by franchising authorities. *47 U.S.C. § 542(i)*.

The Cable Act defines "franchise fees" at 47 U.S.C. § 542(g) as follows:

> *(1) the term "franchise fee" includes any tax, fee, or assessment of any kind imposed by a franchising authority or other governmental entity on a cable operator or cable subscriber, or both, solely because of their status as such;*
>
> *(2) the term "franchise fee" does not include -*
>
> *(A) any tax, fee, or assessment of general applicability (including any such tax, fee, or assessment imposed on both utilities and cable operators or their services but not including a tax, fee, or assessment which is unduly discriminatory against cable operators or cable subscribers);*
>
> *(B) in the case of any franchise in effect on October 30, 1984, payments which are required by the franchise to be made by the cable*

operator during the term of such franchise for, or in support of the use of, public, educational, or governmental access facilities;

(C) in the case of any franchise granted after October 30, 1984, capital costs which are required by the franchise to be incurred by the cable operator for public, educational, or governmental access facilities;

(D) requirements or charges incidental to the awarding or enforcing of the franchise, including payments for bonds, security funds, letters of credit, insurance, indemnification, penalties, or liquidated damages; or

(E) any fee imposed under title 17.

While the Cable Act defines "franchise fee" the Act does not provide an express definition for "gross revenues" on which the franchise fee is based. Most of the disputes regarding franchise fees involve the definition of gross revenues, particularly whether an operator can properly exclude certain revenue from the imposition of a franchise fee.

HOW SHOULD GROSS REVENUES BE DEFINED IN A CABLE FRANCHISE?

A franchise provision establishing a fee should specify the amount of the fee, the method for calculating it, the frequency of payment, and any interest or penalties for late payments. Moreover, the cable operator should be required to furnish information to support its fee payment and the franchising authority should insist on the right to review and inspect the cable operator's financial records to verify the accuracy of franchise fee payments. Of these issues the topic most frequently contested between cable operators and franchising authorities is the definition of "gross revenues." Cable operators often seek to limit the scope of the definition so as to reduce the total amount of franchise fees to be remitted to the franchising authority. As referenced earlier, the Cable Act provides no express definition for gross revenues although historically the parties have generally agreed that any and all revenue derived from the provision of cable service within the city should be considered gross revenues.

Below is a sample definition for gross revenues which addresses many of the key revenue sources which franchising authorities should focus on to ensure that all revenue and consideration is included by the operator when calculating franchise fees.

"Gross Revenue" means any and all revenue billed (whether or not received) or derived directly or indirectly by Grantee, its affiliates, subsidiaries, parent, or any entity in which Grantee has a financial interest from the operation of its Cable System within the City including, but not limited to, 1) all Cable Service fees, 2) Franchise Fees, 3) late fees, returned check charges, collection agency charges, 4) Installation and reconnection fees, 5) fee payments or other consideration earned (whether or not received) by the Grantee from programmers for carriage of

Cable Services or marketing support in connection with the Cable Services on the Cable System, 6) upgrade and downgrade fees, 7) advertising revenue with no deduction or offset for internal commissions earned by employees of Grantee or its affiliates, subsidiaries, parent, or any entity in which Grantee has a financial interest, and external commissions earned by advertising agencies/representation firms/brokers/etc. regardless of whether or not such commissions are withheld from remittances to the Grantee, 8) home shopping commissions, 9) Converter and remote control rental fees, 10) Lockout Device fees, 11) guides, and 12) production charges. The term Gross Revenue shall not include bad debts or any taxes on Services furnished by Grantee imposed upon Subscribers by any municipality, state, or other governmental unit and collected by Grantee for such governmental unit. City and Grantee acknowledge and agree that Grantee will maintain its books and records in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP).

CAN CITIES COLLECT FRANCHISE FEES ON CABLE MODEM REVENUE

Prior to March of 2002 cable operators routinely included revenue from cable modem service in franchise fee payments to municipalities. However in the spring of 2002, the FCC issued a Declaratory Ruling classifying cable modem service as an information service. As a result, cable modem service was subject solely to regulation at the federal level. Cable operators immediately stopped including cable modem revenue in franchise fee payments and several municipalities initiated litigation based on a variety of franchise requirements. These cases were largely unsuccessful and in the meantime the FCC's Declaratory Ruling had been challenged and reviewed by the Ninth Circuit.

On June 27, 2005, the United States Supreme Court held that the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") was correct in classifying cable modem service as an "information service." In a 6-3 decision, authored by Justice Thomas, the Supreme Court held that the FCC was entitled to deference and made a "reasonable policy choice" in classifying cable modem service as an information service with no cable or telecommunications component. The case, *National Cable Telecommunications Association v. Brand X*, 125 S. Ct. 2688 (2005) overturned the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Brand X v. FCC*.

As mentioned above, the cable industry had been abiding by the FCC's Declaratory Ruling for the past several years and therefore neither consumers nor municipalities have noticed any significant change as a result of this decision. Cable modem service remains free from state and local regulation because of its classification as solely an information service.

The case represents a victory for the FCC which originally issued a Declaratory Ruling

in March of 2002 classifying cable modem service as an information service only. Prior to that time municipalities had been collecting franchise fees on cable modem service revenue and some municipalities had attempted to require cable operators to provide access to unaffiliated Internet service providers (ISPs). Following the FCC's Declaratory Ruling several ISPs and numerous municipalities appealed the ruling which was ultimately heard by the Ninth Circuit. The Ninth Circuit concluded that cable modem service was not only an information service but included a telecommunications component. Had the Ninth Circuit decision been upheld cable operators would have been subject to common carrier regulation with respect to cable modem service.

The Supreme Court remanded the case to the Ninth Circuit and the Ninth Circuit will likely vacate its earlier decision and affirm the FCC's Declaratory Ruling ending the litigation. The next battle regarding broadband services will occur back at the FCC where a rulemaking proceeding is underway to determine the future of universal service funding, regulatory parity between cable modem service and DSL service, as well as customer service issues.

IMPOSITION OF A FRANCHISE FEE ON FRANCHISE FEE REVENUE

In 1995, the FCC's Cable Services Bureau ("Bureau") issued an important decision regarding franchise fee payments involving the City of Baltimore, Maryland. In Re United Artists Cable of Baltimore, Order DA 95-737, 10 F.C.C. Rcd. 7250 (C.S.B. 1995). In this decision the Bureau held that franchise fees were not revenues derived from the cable operator and therefore should not be included in the calculation of an operator's gross revenues. Shortly thereafter the FCC confirmed the Bureau's decision. See United Artists Cable, 11 F.C.C. Rcd. 18158 (1995).

The case was appealed to the Fifth Circuit and in 1997 the Fifth Circuit invalidated the FCC's Order holding that "even if franchise fees were treated as a tax they would still be treated as a normal expense of doing business once the tax was imposed directly upon the subscriber." The fact that cable operators have the right to identify the costs of government regulation on subscriber bills "does not, however, transform a cost imposed on cable operators into a cost imposed on cable subscribers….There is no plausible basis to conclude that cable operators are acting as collection agents on behalf of franchising authorities…Therefore, all money collected from subscribers, including funds used to pay franchise fees, must be included in a cable operator's gross revenue." See Dallas v. FCC, 118 F.3d 393 (1997).

While the Dallas decision was a victory for cities, implementation of the decision has been inconsistent throughout the country. In some cases, cable operators immediately changed their calculation of franchise fees to come into compliance with the Dallas decision. In other cases, cable operators sent out correspondence to franchising authorities seeking a waiver from compliance with the decision. In many other cases,

cable operators have still not brought their billing systems into compliance.

WHO PAYS FRANCHISE FEE ON NON-SUBSCRIBER REVENUES?

In October of 2001, the FCC issued an order (16 F.C.C. Rcd. 18192 (Oct. 4, 2001)) involving the City of Pasadena, California ("Pasadena Order") which permitted cable operators to pass-through franchise fees to subscribers on cable television bills based on gross revenues that encompass "non-subscriber" revenue. Specifically, this non-subscriber revenue included income generated by advertising sales and home shopping commissions. As a result of the Pasadena Order many cable operators around the country increased franchise fees on subscribers' bills by .25% or more.

A number of local franchising authorities around the country, including a group of Texas franchising authorities and the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisers petitioned the Fifth Circuit for review of the Pasadena Order. On March 27, 2003, the Fifth Circuit denied the petition for review on the grounds that the FCC had acted within its broad discretion and not in a manner that was arbitrary, capricious or manifestly contrary to the statute in question. See Texas Coalition of Cities for Utility Issues v. FCC, 324 F. 3d 802 (5th Cir. March 27, 2003).
The cities had argued that the Pasadena Order should be reversed because it conflicts with two particular provisions of the Cable Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 542 and 543. In particular, the cities contended that where the franchise fee is based on the percentage of the cable operator's gross revenue, only the portion of that fee attributable to revenue from the subscribers may be passed through to subscribers. The cities argued that the Pasadena Order permitted an improper shifting of costs on to subscribers and that each class of the cable operator's customers should bear a proportionate amount of the franchise fee (i.e., the portion of the franchise fee attributable to advertising revenue should be passed through to advertisers). The Fifth Circuit concluded that whether or not the court may have interpreted the statutes differently the FCC's decision is entitled to deference and its order is not arbitrary and capricious.

The practical result for franchising authorities across the country is that cable operators can pass-through as a separate line item on subscribers' bills all franchise fees due and owing the franchising authority. These franchise fees may include non-subscriber revenues, including home shopping and advertising revenues. In other words, cable operators are permitted to reap the benefits of growth in non-subscription revenue while subscribers must bear the financial burden of increased franchise fees.

By way of example, if a cable operator sells $100 worth of advertising to a local business to provide commercial spots on the cable system many franchises require the cable operator to pay a five percent franchise fee on that revenue. Prior to the Pasadena Order in 2001 cable operators paid the applicable $5 franchise fee on the $100 of revenue and/or assessed the $5 fee to the advertiser. Under the Pasadena

Order this $5 franchise fee is now spread over all subscribers in that jurisdiction resulting in an increase (average increase from Pasadena case is approximately .25% per month) in the total franchise fee paid by a subscriber. In essence, the more advertising a subscriber watches, the higher the franchise fee on their bill.

The Fifth Circuit decision has not resulted in any reduction in franchise fee payments to franchising authorities although subscribers must now bear the burden of additional franchise fee payments even as cable operators increase non-subscription revenue.

CAN CITIES OBTAIN BENEFITS BEYOND THE FIVE PERCENT FRANCHISE FEE?

Many franchise agreements include additional consideration provided by cable operators in the form of in-kind payments or services. These may include providing free wiring and cable service to local schools, equipment, studios and related support for local public, educational and governmental ("PEG") programming, institutional network connections and related consideration. The question is whether these in-kind contributions are permissible under the Cable Act's five percent cap on franchise fees.

By way of example, franchise negotiations often focus on the appropriate level of support to be provided for PEG programming. The Cable Act provides that for franchises in effect prior to 1984 franchising authorities may continue to enforce obligations for both capital and operational support of PEG access channels over and above the five percent cap on franchise fees. However, for franchises granted after 1984 the Cable Act limits franchising authorities' ability to seek additional in-kind support. In particular, in order to receive consideration over and above the five percent cap on franchise fees a franchising authority must ensure that in-kind benefits are not considered a "franchise fee" as defined in 47 U.S.C. § 542(g). One of the exceptions noted in 542 (g) relates to "capital costs which are required by the franchise to be incurred by the cable operator for public, educational or governmental access facilities." Franchising authorities have generally interpreted this to mean equipment and facilities related to the provision of PEG programming. The cable industry has often argued that it is narrower and relates solely to the capital costs related to the construction of a studio facility.

In 1999, the FCC's Cable Bureau responded to a letter from the City of Bowie, Maryland regarding franchise fee calculations and PEG access channel costs. (14 F.C.C. Rcd. 7674 (May 18, 1999)). At issue was whether PEG access equipment costs, salaries and training costs were subject to the five percent franchise fee cap. The Cable Bureau responded that only capital costs for construction of PEG access facilities should be excluded from the five percent cap. After pressure from franchising authorities the Cable Bureau issued a clarification stating that the legislative history of the Cable Act referred to franchise fees only as "monetary payments" that do not include any

"franchise requirements for the provision of services, facilities or equipment." However, at least one court has held that a cable operator cannot be required to waive the five percent cap on franchise fees required under the Cable Act. See Cable TV Fund 14-1 Ltd. v. City of Naperville, No. 96 C 5962, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11511(N.D. Ill. July 29, 1997).

WHAT SHOULD A FRANCHISING AUTHORITY DO TO VERIFY THE ACCURACY OF FRANCHISE FEE PAYMENTS?

A franchise fee payment audit or review may be necessary to ensure that the cable operator's past performance under the existing franchise has been satisfactory and to uncover any underpayments that may have occurred over the years.

An audit or review is performed by analyzing information obtained from a franchising authority and its cable operator. During an audit/review the following tasks are completed:

Verification of revenues.

Variance analysis.

Verify mathematical accuracy.

Review excluded revenues.

Customer coding verification.

Method of verification.

Computing any applicable underpayment.

Analyzing new sources of revenue.

The following is an initial list of documents generally requested of a cable operator necessary to conduct a review of the cable operator's financial records:

- Detailed list of revenues, by month, collected from subscribers during the desk review period.
- Schedule(s) of the calculation of the subscriber franchise fees as used to determine the amounts remitted to the municipality during the desk review period.
- Schedule(s) of the calculation of and documentation for any non-subscriber franchise fees incurred during the desk review period.
- Copies of financial statements or general ledger, preferably audited, for the desk review period.

- Schedule(s) showing detailed descriptions of Other Revenues on the general ledger or financial statements and the calculation of franchise fees, if any, related thereto during the desk review period.
- Schedule(s) detailing bad debt expense and write-offs related to franchise fees and subscriber revenue during the desk review period.
- Schedule(s) detailing franchise fee remittances to the municipality during the desk review period.

The above list is an initial request for information with respect to the franchise fee arrangement between the cable operator and a community. Additional information is often requested from a cable operator upon review of the initial response.

~~ END OF PAPER ~~

Brian T. Grogan is a shareholder with the Minneapolis law firm of Moss & Barnett practicing in the areas of telecommunications and cable television law. Brian represents municipalities throughout the country on franchise renewals, franchise enforcement, transfers of ownership, competitive franchising, right-of-way management, telecommunications planning, municipal ownership, first amendment issues, effective competition filings, tower siting, leasing and zoning, litigation and other related communication matters. He is a frequent presenter at state and national conferences regarding communications law and he is a member of the American Bar Association (Forum Committee on Communications Law), National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors, International Municipal Lawyers Association (Contracts, Franchises and Technology Section), and is past chair of the Communications Law Section of the Minnesota State Bar Association.

Brian T. Grogan, Esq.
Moss & Barnett
4800 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129
Phone: 612-347-0340
Facsimile: 612-339-6686
Email: groganb@moss-barnett.com
Web site: www.municipalcommunicationslaw.com