

From: Ron Davis  
64 Indian River Rd, Orange, CT 06477  
o 203-799-7017 h 203-795-4705  
Chairman, Cable Area 2 Cable Advisory Council  
Coordinator, OGAT -- Orange Government Access Television

**Area 2**  
**Cable Television Advisory Council For**  
**CABLEVISION**  
**Of Southern Connecticut**  
**March 7, 2008**

**HB-5814 An Act Concerning Community Access Television**

Good Morning Members of the Energy and Technology Committee. My name is Ron Davis. I am Chairman of the Cable Television Advisory Council for Cablevision, Area 2, representing Bridgeport, Stratford, Fairfield, Milford, Orange and Woodbridge. Also, I am coordinator for Orange Government Access Television, best known as OGAT; however, I am here *today* to speak for the Area 2 Advisory Council- nearly legendary for its stance on Town-Specific Government and Educational Cable TV.

This council *applauds your efforts* to champion town-specific access, but only *reluctantly* supports your committee's decision on HB-5814, "to provide towns with *one exclusive channel* for town-specific programming." Speaking *only* as Council Chairman, I note that a simpler and far-more effective manner of guaranteeing town-specific Government *and* Educational channels to towns desiring to use them would be to provide the towns with free CHOICE! This can readily be accomplished by nullifying section \*1.5 of the Cablevision/Sound View Interconnection Agreement which gives Sound View the ability to refuse towns choice of town-specific programming, over Sound View's *preferred* model, of *area-wide* programming.

By *eliminating* the section 1.5 control, Sound View may continue to serve area-wide programming to towns with little or no programming. While, left alone, the vital and *active* towns like Milford, Woodbridge and Orange, can, *and do*, produce as many as 230 local meetings and events annually! You need to protect *their right* to have the unfettered CHOICE to provide town specific, local G & E productions to their citizens.

I see many aspects of this bill and its recommended changes, that reflect the energy and intelligent research expended by your committee, in order to bring these complicated issues to this point. Probably owing to the complexities of merging and emerging technologies, I also see a number of areas, which I believe to be unbalanced, if not even *unfair*. Some examples would include: The disallowance of a community antenna television company to provide service as a competitive video service provider as noted in section 9. Another is the confusing *section 10*, requiring community antenna television companies to provide very specific funding to certain town-specific programmers, while no call for *similar funding* to *all* town-specific programmers is made, *much less* no call is made to *competitive service providers* to fund *any programmers at all*.

As a result, the Area 2 Council respectfully requests that your committee consider a *more inclusive and more level playing field*, for the provision of community access television, and for the *mutual benefit* of all producers, providers - *and* the viewing public.

Thank You

\*Section 1.5 of the DPUC sanctioned, November, 1999 Connection/Interconnection agreement between Sound View and Cablevision TOWN SPECIFIC ACCESS PROGRAMMING. To the extent that any educational institution, organization or authority or any governmental body or related official in area 2 desires to use the educational and/or governmental channel furnished by Cablevision to Sound View hereunder for their town specific programming, such institution, organization, authority, body or official shall be directed by Cablevision to contact Sound View directly. Cablevision shall not allow any educational institution, organization or authority or any governmental body or related official to use the educational or governmental channel furnished by Cablevision to Sound View hereunder for their town specific access programming *without the prior written consent of Sound View.* (Emphasis added)