



## STATEMENT OF AT&T CONNECTICUT

**Regarding Raised House Bill No.6446**  
**AN ACT CONCERNING REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS OF PUBLIC**  
**SERVICE TECHNICIANS AND CERTIFIED COMPETITIVE VIDEO SERVICE**  
**PROVIDERS**  
**Before the Committee on General Law**  
**March 8, 2011**

**Proposal:**

Raised House Bill No. 6446 would require employees and contractors of certain video providers to hold public service technician licenses.

**Comments:**

AT&T is supportive of the intent of the bill which, as we understand it, is to require that both employees and contractors of video providers hold public service technician licenses. However, we would urge the Committee to correct what appears to be an oversight in the underlying language of the existing statute as it would not subject like employees or contractors of **all** competing providers to identical licensing requirements. We have provided a copy of alternative language to correct this with our testimony.

In 2007, the Connecticut General Assembly opened up Connecticut's video market to long sought-after competition by establishing a new licensing process for new providers like AT&T and established new rules that incumbent community antenna television companies like Comcast, Cablevision, Cox and others would have to follow as a result of competition entering their previously exclusive markets. The guiding philosophy of the 2007 law was that competition should take place on a level playing field and as such, competing providers, be they new entrants or incumbents, should be subject to like rules. Raised House Bill No. 6446 takes this same approach.

Today, AT&T employees who install video services in customer homes are required to hold a public service technician license. However, the law as written today does not require AT&T's biggest competitors in the video market, employees or contractors of incumbent video providers like Comcast, Cablevision or Cox to meet the requirements for and hold the same licenses. In addition, and just as importantly, the law doesn't require contractors of AT&T or of incumbent cable companies who might be providing the same services as employees to hold similar licenses. This oversight in the law is not in the best interest of consumers; not in the best interest of the state of Connecticut; and is contrary to the underpinnings of the philosophy that competition should take place on a level playing field.

Consumers who allow a technician into their home to install video services should be assured that no matter whom that technician works for – be it a new provider like AT&T or an established incumbent like Comcast; or be they an employee or a contractor – that technician meets minimum requirements for training and is licensed by the state of Connecticut.

In these days of scarce resources, the oversight which exists in the law is depriving the state and its taxpayers of license fees. AT&T alone spends in excess of \$130,000 a year on PST licenses for its employees. Ensuring that employees and contractors of all providers performing the same work hold a public service technician license will likely provide Connecticut hundreds of thousands of dollars more a year in additional revenue. Closing "loopholes" like the one which exists in the law with respect to license requirements should be the first step policymakers take when seeking needed revenues.

**Conclusion:**

AT&T supports the intent Raised House Bill No. 6446 but requests clarifying language to ensure that, in extending these license requirements to the employees and contractors of competing providers, no providers are unintentionally missed.

AT&T Connecticut Testimony  
Raised House Bill No. 6446  
March 8, 2011  
Page 3 of 3

**Proposed Amendment to Raised House Bill No. 6446:**

In line 10, after 16-1, insert

“or community antenna television company or a holder of a certificate of cable franchise authority as defined in 16-1,”