

New York Times
[The Challenges of Closing the Digital Divide](#)

TV NewsCheck
[The Growing Google-ization Of Washington](#)

pennlive.com
[Two years too late but Tom Corbett accomplishes his goals](#)

New York Times
[Netflix Studied Your Binge-Watching Habit. That Didn't Take Long.](#)

Politico
[Inside Clinton's tech policy circle](#)

Zap2It
[Cable Top 25 for Week Ending June 5](#)

Philadelphia Daily News
[Four ways to make Pa. taxes fairer](#)

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette
[Sen. Pat Toomey: Trump comments on judge 'deeply offensive,' but he may still support him](#)

Proud members of BCAP...
 the nation's first state cable association!



The name that launched an industry.

Serving homes and businesses

TV Everywhere

200 Mbps High-Speed Internet

Digital Phone

Connecting Pennsylvanians since 1948

secv.com

Don Budreski earlier this year noticed a roughly three-story-tall utility pole pop up across the street from his Baltimore electronics shop. "It was just odd," he said of the slender, steel post. "I thought, 'What are they putting that thing there for?'"

Mr. Budreski had caught a glimpse of a key element of Sprint Corp.'s plan to improve its network and win back customers: thousands of sidewalk utility poles. The Overland Park, Kan., company wants to install low-power cellular antennas in public rights of way, land typically holding utility

poles, street lamps and fire hydrants. In places where it can't strap antennas to existing poles, it wants to erect new poles.

Sprint is primarily working with Mobilitie LLC, a Newport Beach, Calif., company to build these cellular antenna systems from California to Massachusetts. Mobilitie has begun installing them, which it says are typically the size of a briefcase and often inside boxes attached to the poles. But the rollout has been delayed as communities confront what some consider unsightly installations and authorities wrestle with new regulatory questions. Sprint recently slashed its capital spending plans for the year as it waits for zoning approvals. Mobilitie says it has about 1,000 permits approved and will start large-scale installations once more are in hand.

In the past, wireless carriers built towers of 200 feet or more that could send signals over large areas to cover as many customers as possible. Now that more people use smartphones to stream videos and surf the Web, carriers want to put lower-power antennas closer to the ground so that fewer people will connect to each one—resulting in less network congestion. "It's not a new concept," said John Saw, Sprint's chief technology officer. "All carriers are trying to 'densify' their networks." But Sprint's goal is to be "cheaper

and faster and more innovative” than its rivals, he said.

Popping antennas on existing utility poles is something most carriers are hoping to do. But cash-strapped Sprint aims to take the concept further than rivals: It is hoping to install as many as 70,000 antennas in the public right of way over the next few years. By comparison, it has 40,000 traditional antenna sites on towers or rooftops.

It is a central piece of a strategy devised in early 2015 by Sprint Chairman Masayoshi Son to improve service while keeping costs down. Companies can negotiate with a city for one deal that includes various permits. Mobilite's Mr. Jabara says building and operating these so-called small cells costs about \$190,000 over 10 years, whereas a traditional tower costs \$732,000 because of real estate rents, power and other costs.

The airwaves Sprint owns are ideally suited for this design because their high frequency prevents them from traveling long distances. Rather than string fiber-optic cables to each antenna, Sprint hopes to link them via wireless connections, further bringing down costs and speeding deployment. Analyst Jonathan Atkin at RBC Capital Markets is skeptical, saying Sprint may only be able to build a fraction of the sites it wants in public rights-of-way governed by federal, state and local laws.

Mobilite's practices in some places have faced local resistance. It has filed applications under various corporate names, including the Illinois Utility Pole Authority, NC Technology Relay Networking, and Interstate Transport and Broadband. It has used similar-sounding names in at least 30 states. Joseph Van Eaton, a lawyer who represents municipalities dealing with the applications, says the names are misleading. “You may very well end up with some of these applications being granted for exactly the reason why they like these names—it sounds official,” he said.

Mobilite is willing to modify its applications to avoid being disruptive, says Chief Executive Gary Jabara. “It's more important to be a good citizen” than to move quickly, he said. “You have to do the right thing.” Mr. Jabara says the names also make it easier for local officials to understand the status of his firm. The company is a registered utility and those business names help reflect that status, he says. “In some states it's more comprehensible for a jurisdiction to work with an authority,” he said. In the future, the company will most often use the name “Mobilite” in dealings with local officials, he said.

In Salem, Mass., Mobilite applied last fall to install antennas on seven poles. After some residents expressed concerns over the look of the antennas, the company withdrew three applications and agreed to camouflage the other four. In Baltimore, Mobilite was fined \$5,000 for failing to get proper permits for the temporary pole across from Mr. Budreski's shop, which was taken down after a few days. The company since has received approval to attach equipment to 14 poles across the city. It will pay Baltimore \$70,000 for pole attachment rights in the first year of the deal. Mr. Jabara says that amount is unusually high, and many places charge less than \$50 a year per pole.

Mr. Jabara says such incidents were inadvertent mistakes. Sprint's Mr. Saw says his company is committed to being patient and making sure municipalities are comfortable with its plans. “We're not surprised that sometimes you will run into opposition in certain jurisdictions,” Mr. Saw says. “‘Not in my backyard’ has been around for a very long time.” – **Wall Street Journal**

Susan Wojcicki holds a unique place in the history of the technology industry. These days she plays a key role in the future of media and entertainment, too.

Larry Page and Sergey Brin rented three rooms and the garage in Ms. Wojcicki's home near here in September 1998, the same month they incorporated Google Inc. A year later, the co-founders hired her. She soon launched Google's fledgling advertising business, which became one of the biggest moneymakers in the history of commerce. She also urged the company, now a unit of Alphabet Inc., to acquire YouTube back in 2006. Now, as YouTube's chief executive, the 47-year-old Ms. Wojcicki's next task is turning the video hub into a business.

YouTube boasts more than one billion users but little to no profit. She leads several big initiatives aimed at making the platform profitable, including a push into virtual reality, live programming, and a \$10-a-month ad-free subscription service launched in October. YouTube remains a dominant force in online video, with more than 180 million unique viewers on traditional computers in February, compared with about 81 million viewers on the No. 2 service, Facebook Inc., according to research firm comScore. (The figures don't include mobile devices, which the company says account for most YouTube views.)

As Facebook Inc. accelerates its push into video, YouTube's dominance is by no means secure. Users now spend an average of 50 minutes a day on Facebook, compared with 17 minutes on YouTube, according to comScore. Snapchat Inc. and Twitter Inc., which have licensed Olympics and National

Football League rights, respectively, also are pushing into video.

And Netflix Inc. and Amazon.com Inc. are attracting more subscribers to their video-streaming services. Meanwhile, several cable channels are letting users stream videos to any device. Even so, Ms. Wojcicki says her biggest competitor is traditional television. She wants to make its billions of viewers an audience primarily for online content. Yet, even she says about half the time she skips the ads that run before YouTube videos—the service’s main moneymaker. In a recent interview, Ms. Wojcicki—sister of another tech CEO, 23andMe Inc.’s Anne Wojcicki—talked about YouTube’s strategy, competitors and culture.

Edited excerpts below:

WSJ: How would you describe your mandate?

Ms. Wojcicki: I see an opportunity to reinvent TV. When I look at the future of TV, I think it’s going to be on demand; it’s going to be mobile and cross-device; it’s going to be global; and it’s going to include a diverse set of content. YouTube’s goal is to build that platform and be the next-generation content and TV provider.

WSJ: YouTube has more than a billion viewers but few, if any, profits. How do you solve that?

Ms. Wojcicki: Right now we’re in a period of growth. We’re thinking about how we get to the next billion users and how we build additional monetization. We’re focused on setting ourselves up for the most successful long-term business. We’re reinvesting in the business to reach users and offer more monetization options and better service.

WSJ: So are profits a priority today?

Ms. Wojcicki: Growth is the priority.

WSJ: Who is your biggest competitor?

Ms. Wojcicki: Snapchat, Facebook, Netflix. In some sense our biggest competitor is the traditional way of watching TV. It’s such a big space, and there’s so much opportunity for everyone. We all need to just think about how we can deliver our core proposition better to our users, as opposed to, ‘Oh, Player X has this feature; I need to have it, too.’

WSJ: Advertisers have been slower than viewers to embrace online video. Why?

Ms. Wojcicki: Users can make decisions relatively quickly, and there is no cost associated with making a change in your viewing behavior. But if you’re an advertiser, you need to make sure it works. Advertisers usually start small and test it. It doesn’t make sense for them to advertise in a place where there are no users, right? I’m confident that advertisers will catch up and the ad dollars will flow to digital. It’s just going to take some time.

WSJ: What do online-viewing habits tell you about humanity?

Ms. Wojcicki: People are much more interested in the regular person than we may have thought. That was the insight that led me to acquire YouTube in the first place. Before, we thought that users only wanted to see professional, finished types of content, but they actually want to see all types of content. There’s a very human element of YouTube, where people are just connecting with other people.

WSJ: You and your husband, another Google executive, typically make it home for dinner with your five children. Readers will want to know how you do it.

Ms. Wojcicki: The first thing is to make sure that my work life is manageable. For me, it has to do with prioritization and identifying the most important things to get done. Then being able to say that you are finished at the end of the day and you’re going to go home and not think about work. We try to have the rule to not check email between 6 p.m. and 9 p.m., because if you are on your phone then it’s hard to disconnect [from work]. I also keep reminding people that success is not based on the number of hours that you’ve worked. It isn’t like venture capitalists say, ‘Well, how many hours are you planning on working?’ They ask, ‘What is your insight? What can you bring to the table?’ If you are working 24/7, you’re not going to have any interesting ideas. Work-life separation is really important for productivity—being efficient at work and also trying to be really present when you’re at home. – **Wall Street Journal**

Anyone who works for a living knows that your co-workers can become a second family. As the executive producer of “Hawaii Five-0,” I’m responsible for a “second family” of hundreds of people. But right now that family is threatened—not because of problems with production or a failure of creativity—because the Federal Communications Commission’s proposed new rules for TV “set-top boxes” threaten to pull the rug out from under us, and every other show.

The FCC says its decision is about saving consumers money by allowing them to buy set-top boxes at retail instead of getting them from their cable providers. But the proposal is actually a shameless content

grab that will force creatives to hand over work to a few favored companies to use, repackage and exploit in new FCC-mandated devices.

Nobody likes TV cable boxes. That is why the market has delivered, without federal interference, all kinds of alternatives to watch content. With Apple TV, Google Chromecast, Amazon Firestick, Roku and app-based streaming services—including those that premium cable networks now offer—everyone from a sports nut to a “Game of Thrones” cosplayer has options to save money if he or she doesn’t want everything a cable or satellite subscription offers.

Yet FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler insists that we have reached some ultimate crisis that demands special action from the federal government to free us all from the tyranny of set-top cable boxes. Oddly, the White House weighed in before many of us in the industry had a chance to offer our concerns: “In many ways, the set-top box is the mascot for a new initiative we’re launching today,” the White House argued in a blog post supporting the mandate. “That box is a stand-in for what happens when you don’t have the choice to go elsewhere.”

But something else is at work here: The Big Tech companies pushing for this proposal want to get their hands on your viewing data, like they got their hands on your Internet-usage information. In reality, the FCC’s effort to “unlock the box” is about giving the keys to the data miners who want to know even more about you by coming into your living room to mine and sell data about your television habits in ways that, by law, your satellite and cable companies cannot.

To do all this, the FCC will let these data miners leapfrog over the regulatory agreements and contracts that every cable and satellite company has negotiated with the networks that own and distribute content. Without license fees, contracts and other bothersome stuff, Big Tech will be free to make money off of your data, including selling advertising based on shows you watch.

And that’s not all. If you search for “watch Hawaii Five-0” online, the results include more pirated versions than legitimate options. Incredibly, the FCC proposal will bring these unlicensed (and not-paid-for) pirated copies to your living room, presenting them as “equal” choices. It is difficult enough to compete with “free” pirate versions of our show on laptops and mobile devices. If audiences can choose between paid and pirated shows, many or most will take the “free” stuff.

By encouraging piracy, the FCC proposal won’t only hurt the studios and networks that create content, it will also hurt individual creatives. This includes me and my writers, directors, actors and other hardworking people—cameramen, technicians, carpenters, construction crews, caterers, cleaners and everyone else who contributes to the creative process—all while driving more money to corporate behemoths and sleazy pirates.

There is a phrase, common among surfers, called “snaking” or “dropping in,” which is when one surfer grabs a wave from another, better-positioned rider. Yes, even out in the wilds of the roiling sea, riders have managed to find a way to treat each other fairly. Don’t let the FCC and the companies pushing for this proposal drop in on your living room. This is your wave, not Silicon Valley’s. – **Wall Street Journal** **op-ed by Peter Lenkov, CBS executive producer and a member of CreativeFuture, a group opposed to digital piracy.**

In John Micek's Morning Coffee column, (["Here's why it's so tough to get a bill passed in the Pa. Legislature, report,"](#) May 31) Micek cites a [Philadelphia Inquirer article](#) in which my House colleague gives her initial interpretation of government gridlock.

After eight years in the House, I have a different perspective on the legislative process, which I believe serves a distinctly democratic purpose. A majority of the 253 elected officials must agree on a piece of legislation for it to become law. While it may be frustrating, this process separates good bills from bad, consolidates ideas, gathers feedback, and most importantly, keeps government from legislating every aspect of our lives. Although many are well-intended, not all reach the governor's desk.

I was surprised at my colleague's comments, because even in the short time she's been serving in the House, we've tackled a variety of bipartisan issues, including public safety measures, children protection bills and domestic violence victim protections — many of which became law and none of which included handouts to "the fossil fuel industry or multinational corporations."

The truth is we are elected to represent the people. So while there may be 253 members declaring opinions in Harrisburg, their opinions are based on the voices of more than 12 million citizens. It's easy to question leadership, judge motivations, point fingers of blame and vent frustrations, but the bottom line is, 102 votes are needed in the House and 26 in the Senate. Building consensus isn't easy, nor is it supposed to be. Our constituents don't want us to rubber stamp bills, especially those with a huge impact on all Commonwealth citizens. – **Letter to pennlive.com from Pennsylvania State Rep. Sheryl Delozier (R-**

Cumberland)



127 State Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101
717.214.2000 • bcapa.com

**First in Broadband.
The Future of Broadband.®**
