CONCENT AGENDA

CITY OF SAN ANTONIO INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Department of Finance

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: Ben Gorzell Jr. CPA, Public Utilities Supervisor/Assistant Finance Director

THROUGH: Terry M. Brechtel, City Manager

COPIES TO: Melissa Byrne Vossmer, Assistant City Manager; Milo D. Nitschke, Director

of Finance; Andrew Martin, City Attorney; file

SUBJECT: Modification of the Term of the Time Warner Cable Franchise Agreement

DATE: September 11, 2003

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION:

This Ordinance modifies the Time Warner Cable Franchise Agreement, which was passed by Ordinance No. 49433 and became effective on November 7, 1978, in order to extend the term of the Franchise to June 30, 2004.

Staff recommends approval of this Ordinance.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Time Warner Cable operates under a cable television franchise agreement originally granted to UA Columbia Cablevision of Texas, Inc. in 1978. This original franchise agreement has been transferred several times with acquisitions, reorganizations, and changes in ownership of the original franchise. The franchise agreement was for an original term of (15) fifteen years, was renewed for an additional (10) ten years, and will expire on November 7, 2003.

Time Warner Cable notified the City of its intent to seek renewal of its franchise agreement with the City in accordance with the Cable Act. Franchise renewal negotiations have been ongoing and progress has been made. To provide additional time to complete negotiations, both parties have agreed to extend the term approximately (7) seven months from November 7, 2003 to June 30, 2004. No other terms or conditions of the current franchise agreement have been modified. It is important to note that this modification of the franchise agreement is not considered a franchise renewal under provisions of the Federal Cable Act. Additionally, neither the City nor Time Warner Cable waive any rights that either party may have had prior to the approval of the extension of the term.

POLICY ANALYSIS:

The City uses the outside legal firm of Miller, Canfield, Paddock, & Stone to assist the City in negotiating the renewal of Time Warner Cable's franchise agreement. Miller, Canfield, Paddock, & Stone has specialized expertise in the area of telecommunications and cable law and their services complement the legal services provided by the City Attorney's Office.

Mayor & City Council September 11, 2003 Page 2

The extension of the term of Time Warner Cable's franchise agreement to June 30, 2004 will allow both parties to continue negotiations under the informal process as defined under the Federal Cable Act. Additionally, it will allow the City to reopen its franchise agreement with Grande Communications and complete that process by June 30, 2004 as well. This timeline will also facilitate the City's ability to bring both franchise agreements to City Council for consideration simultaneously.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

This Ordinance will not have a financial impact.

COORDINATION:

This Ordinance has been coordinated with the City Attorney's Office. The City also uses the legal firm of Miller, Canfield, Paddock, & Stone to assist in franchise renewal negotiations.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS:

The ethics disclosure form is attached.

Ben Gorzell Jr.,CPA

Public Utilities Supervisor/

Assistant Director of Finance

Approved:

Melissa Byrne Vossmer

Assistant City Manager

Tom. Inschil

Terry M. Brechtel City Manager

City of San Antonio Discretionary Contracts Disclosure*



For use of this form, see City of San Antonio Ethics Code, Part D, Sections 1&2
Attach additional sheets if space provided is not sufficient.
State"Not Applicable" for questions that do not apply.

* This form is required to be supplemented in the event there is any change in the information under (1), (2), or (3) below, before the discretionary contract is the subject of council action, and no later than five (5) business days after any change about which information is required to be filed.

Disclosure of Parties, Owners, and Closely Related Persons

For the purpose of assisting the City in the enforcement of provisions contained in the City Charter and the Code of Ethics, an individual or business entity seeking a discretionary contract from the City is required to disclose in connection with a proposal for a discretionary contract:

(1) the identity of any individual who would be a party to the discretionary contract:

N/A				
(2) the iden	itity of a∩y <u>busine</u>	ss entity ^l that wou	uld be a party to the dis	scretionary contract:
Time War	ner Cable, Inc.			
(A) any		ness entity that w	vould be a <i>subcontra</i>	ctor on the discretionary
N/A	ract;			
and the	name of:			
sub		entity, of any indiv		oartner, or a parent or y who would be a party to
AOL Time \	Varner Inc.			

¹ A business entity means a sole proprietorship, partnership, firm, corporation, holding company, joint-stock company, receivership, trust, unincorporated association, or any other entity recognized by law.

I/A					
olitical Contributions					
any individual or business entity connection with a proposal for	a discretiona	ry contrac	t all politic	al contribu	tions totaling on
undred dollars (\$100) or mo	re within the	past twei	nty-four (24	(i) months	made directly of
ndirectly to any current or form	that contribute	s to City	Council ele	ections, by	any individual o
ousiness entity whose identit	v must be d	isclosed	under (1),	(2) or (3) above. Indired
ontributions by an individual adividual's spouse, whether s	include, but tatutory or co	are not mmon-la\	limited to, v. Indirec	contributio t contributi	ns made by th ons by an entil
nclude, but are not limited to,	contributions	made thro	ough the of	ficers, owr	ers, attorneys, o
egistered lobbyists of the entity					
o Whom Made:	Amount:		Date of Contribution:		
				11	
N/A		N/A		N/A	
	<u>anno anno anno anno anno anno anno anno</u>	L			
)isclosures in Proposals					
Disclosures in Proposals Any individual or business entity	y seeking a dis	scretionary	/ contract w	ith the city	shall disclose ar
Disclosures in Proposals Any individual or business entity known facts which, reasonably employee would violate Section	understood, r	aise a qu	estion" as t	o whether	any city official o
Any individual or business entity known facts which, reasonably employee would violate Section	understood, r n 1 of Part B	aise a qu , Imprope	estion" as t	o whether	any city official o
Any individual or business entity known facts which, reasonably employee would violate Section	understood, r n 1 of Part B	aise a qu , Imprope	estion" as t	o whether	any city official o
Any individual or business entity known facts which, reasonably	understood, r n 1 of Part B	aise a qu , Imprope	estion" as t	o whether	any city official o
Any individual or business entity known facts which, reasonably employee would violate Section	understood, r n 1 of Part B	aise a qu , Imprope	estion" as t	o whether	any city official o
Any individual or business entity known facts which, reasonably employee would violate Section	understood, r n 1 of Part B	aise a qu , Imprope	estion" as t	o whether	any city official
Any individual or business entity known facts which, reasonably employee would violate Section	understood, r n 1 of Part B	aise a qu , Imprope	estion" as t	o whether o Benefit	any city official o

² For purposes of this rule, facts are "reasonably understood" to "raise a question" about the appropriateness of official action if a disinterested person would conclude that the facts, if true, require recusal or require careful consideration of whether or not recusal is required.