

Fierce Cable

Ergen: Dish not doing M&A deal would be 'malpractice' in the wake of AT&T-Time Warner merger

Ars Technica

What the Trump win means for tech, science, and beyond

New York Times

Silicon Valley Reels After Trump's Election

Reading Eagle

New area code coming to portions of Berks County

Philadelphia Inquirer

Despite Trump win, Pa. Dems claim state row offices

USA Today

Obama is right: Social media deepens political division

Philadelphia Daily News

Editorial: Election has left us with two Americas

Allentown Morning Call

How Donald Trump managed to turn Pennsylvania red



BCAP offices will be closed Friday, November 11

Against almost all expectations, Donald Trump has been elected president of the United States, and suddenly, the future of the open internet looks radically different.

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

barred data throttling and paid fast lanes, were celebrated as a central tenant of Obama-era government regulation. At the time, Obama said the "decision will protect innovation and create a level playing field for the next generation of entrepreneurs."

Now it seems possible that next generation won't see net neutrality in action. Although telecom policy was hardly a central pillar of Trump's candidacy, he has gone on record against it. "Obama's attack on the internet is another top down power grab," **Trump tweeted in 2014**. "Net neutrality is the Fairness Doctrine. Will target conservative media." (It's unclear what Trump means with comparisons to the FCC's long-eliminated Fairness Doctrine, which required broadcasters to provide airtime for opposing views. Conservative media was also not "targeted" by net neutrality in any tangible way.)

Trump's fellow Republicans in Congress, who retained a majority in the House and Senate, have also roundly criticized the rules. In 2014, Ted Cruz **called net neutrality** "Obamacare for the internet," claiming it would

The r
eleas
e of
the
FCC'
s net
neutr
ality
rules
in
2015
herald
ded
one
of the
most
import
tant
progr
essiv
e
chan
ges
to the
intern
et in
mem
ory.
The
rules,
which

slow down private sector innovation. That view was shared by many of his colleagues, who, **with help from telecom dollars**, have repeatedly floated challenges to net neutrality. Those efforts have failed, and in June, **an appeals court upheld the FCC's order**, beating back a legal challenge from the telecom industry.

With a Republican-controlled White House and Congress, however, it's not difficult to see those rules being gutted. In May, the House passed the "No Rate Regulation of Broadband Internet Access Act," which activists argued would **effectively stifle any FCC attempts at net neutrality enforcement**. That measure was largely symbolic legislation for conservatives. No matter how far such efforts advanced, they were ultimately heading for President Obama's desk — where a prompt veto had always been promised. Clinton pledged similar support, and even with a Republican-controlled Congress, she would have likely been able to forestall any major rollbacks. "We have an obligation to protect an open internet and defend net neutrality," **she tweeted in June**.

"We have an obligation to protect an open internet and defend net neutrality," Clinton said this year.

President Trump will be unlikely to have similar qualms, and the dismantling could begin in earnest sooner rather than later. **Politico reported last month** that Jeffrey Eisenach, a longtime critic of FCC regulation, has been tapped for Trump's presidential transition team. (Eisenach's dual role as a conservative think tank scholar and paid consultant for Verizon was also detailed in a **recent New York Times story**.) Although it can sometimes be difficult to determine Trump's positions from his public statements, the move seems to be a definitive sign that a Trump administration will roll back the FCC's telecom regulations. Trump FCC commission appointments will also likely swing power back to conservatives at the agency.

There's reason to believe Trump will not take a uniformly conservative stance in some related policy battles. He has loudly proclaimed his opposition to the proposed AT&T–Time Warner merger deal, which now faces renewed doubt about its feasibility. Trump has been silent on broadband expansion, another major issue for the Obama administration, although he has promised general infrastructure improvements.

Already, proponents of net neutrality are bracing for impact. Dish Network CEO Charlie Ergen **said today** that he expected "challenged or weakened" net neutrality rules in the future. The only question may be when. — **The Verge; more from Variety**

Dish Network Corp. on Wednesday reported revenue growth in the third quarter, as its acquisition costs decreased and its average monthly revenue per subscriber increased, but the satellite-television provider continued to lose subscribers.

Dish said added about 736,000 gross paid subscribers during the quarter ended Sept. 30, compared with about 751,000 in the year-ago quarter. But net subscribers declined by 116,000 during the quarter, compared with a loss of 23,000 subscribers last year. The company said it had fewer new paid subscribers because it had stricter customer-acquisition policies and an increased focus on acquiring higher-quality subscribers. It also faced increased competition in the quarter. The average acquisition cost per subscriber fell to \$640 from \$736, while the

average monthly revenue per subscriber rose to \$89.44 from \$86.33.

In all, the company reported a profit of \$307.4 million, or 64 cents a share, up from \$196.5 million, or 42 cents, a year ago. Revenue edged up 0.3% to \$3.75 billion. Analysts polled by Thomson Reuters had anticipated earnings of 68 cents a share on \$3.74 billion in revenue.

The company closed the quarter with roughly 13.6 million pay-TV subscribers, compared with 13.9 million at the end of the year-ago quarter. The company includes subscriptions to its Sling TV streaming service in its total pay-TV metrics. Pay-TV subscriber churn, the rate at which subscribers leave the service, rose to 2.11% from 1.86% a year earlier because of marketing and discounts from competitors as well as cord-cutting, as some consumers drop television subscriptions in favor of streaming services. Dish also said it was more selective in offering retention credits. Dish lost roughly 20,000 net broadband subscribers during the quarter, bringing its total broadband base to about 593,000.

– *Wall Street Journal*

With most political polls ahead of the presidential election pointing to a Hillary Clinton victory, the news media spent weeks wondering if Donald Trump would stick to his word and refuse to concede if he lost the election. In the wee hours of Wednesday morning, TV anchors were faced with a different question. “I didn’t ask Hillary Clinton. I obviously made an oversight,” Fox News anchor Chris Wallace said less than an hour before the network called the election for Mr. Trump.

In the final presidential debate, Mr. Wallace pressed Mr. Trump on whether he was willing to accept the result of the election, to which Mr. Trump said he would “keep you in suspense.” Around 2:30 a.m. Wednesday, the Associated Press called Wisconsin for Mr. Trump, putting the Republican candidate over the 270 electoral-vote threshold needed to win the presidency. Soon after, Mrs. Clinton called Mr. Trump to concede, and on Wednesday she delivered a concession speech urging her supporters to have an open mind about his presidency.

Mr. Wallace isn’t the only journalist now acknowledging oversights. Many media outlets and polls had this election wrong, calling into question their research methods and whether they have lost touch with the America between the coasts that carried Mr. Trump to victory. The New York Times website declaring a “Stunning Upset” wasn’t so shocking to much of the country.

Going into the final day of the election cycle, almost all of the most widely watched media-polling analysis outfits and political pundits were predicting a comfortable Clinton victory. The narrative in the media—particularly after the Federal Bureau of Investigation affirmed Mrs. Clinton wouldn’t face charges over her email practices—was the race was hers to lose. “There is no question the polling was off. It wasn’t capturing support for Trump,” said CBS News President David Rhodes. “Is there a real reckoning for some of this polling and voluminous analysis that suggest this is her race to lose? Absolutely, there is.” Mr. Rhodes said Tuesday night that there was some evidence that supporters of Mr. Trump were under-indexing in exit polls, possibly because they were rebuffing poll takers’ questions. “If that was true in the exit polls, you have to ask if that was true in other surveys as well,” he said.

Echoing Mr. Rhodes' concerns, Fox News' Mr. Wallace said he has become "a big skeptic of exit polls...they certainly led one to believe that she was going to win fairly early and handily." Mr. Wallace noted that there was a similar problem with the 2004 exit polls, which had John Kerry far ahead of George W. Bush. "They dramatically overcounted Democrats and undercounted Republicans," he said, adding that "Republicans apparently are less forthcoming than Democrats."

In the days just before election, a range of polls conducted for media outlets, including The Wall Street Journal and NBC News, ABC and the Washington Post, and CBS News and Fox News, put Mrs. Clinton's popular vote lead at 4 points. Only two polls consistently showed Trump in the lead—the USC Dornsife/Los Angeles Times and the IBD/TIPP tracking polls. They were often dismissed by pundits and media data analysts as outlying surveys, but in the end turned out to be the most accurate. "Late in this process we were getting notes suggesting we were crazy because our numbers were a long way from the rest of the polls," said Terry Jones, Investor's Business Daily's editorial page editor. "But we went back and continually retested our data and as things began to tighten we started feeling far more confident about our numbers."

Going into Tuesday, Realclearpolitics.com, which compiles a so-called poll of polls, had predicted a narrow Clinton victory, estimating that the Democratic candidate would eke out 272 electoral votes by holding on to Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin (but losing Nevada). The New York Times' Upshot had predicted that Mrs. Clinton had an 85% chance of victory, giving her—as the media outlet put it—the same chance of losing as a National Football League kicker missing a 37-yard field goal.

Early on during Tuesday's coverage, the networks seemed to be anticipating a quick night's work. Mrs. Clinton jumped out to an early electoral lead and TV-news anchors were preparing for the first female president-elect and ready to dismiss Mr. Trump's nomination as an anomaly and symbol of a Republican party in disarray. Some voters wanted change, but Mr. Trump "wasn't the right vessel," CBS News anchor Charlie Rose said on air Tuesday. Even Republican pollsters had forecast Mrs. Clinton in an early TKO. "Hillary Clinton will be the next president of the United States," GOP pollster Frank Luntz tweeted just before most polls started to close on the East Coast.

While there is much finger-pointing going on about the media's coverage, CBS's Mr. Rhodes noted, in the spirit of Yogi Berra, that "you don't know until you know." On Election Day, data from real-time exit-polling firm Votecastr was published throughout the day on Slate and Vice News, predicting a Clinton lead in several battleground states—a change from traditional media practices of waiting for polls to close before releasing such information. ESPN's Fivethirtyeight.com, the data-analysis site run by Nate Silver, predicted a 71% chance of a Clinton victory.

In the days prior, the site gave Mrs. Clinton slightly lower odds of about 65%. The site's slightly greater caution compared with others led Ryan Grim, a political writer at the Huffington Post (which gave Mrs. Clinton a 99% chance of victory), to accuse Mr. Silver of improperly weighting his analysis in favor of Mr. Trump. On Wednesday, Mr. Grim apologized.

“Yes. You were right that there was far more uncertainty than we were accounting for. I apologize. Gonna stick to punditry,” Mr. Grim wrote on Twitter.

Much of the media has been maligned for not being aggressive enough in its coverage of Mr. Trump’s rise, business operations and questionable statements on the stump. At the same time, though, Mrs. Clinton’s struggles against President Barack Obama in 2008 and Sen. Bernie Sanders this year weren’t seen as red flags to many of the forecasters.

New York University journalism professor Jay Rosen wrote in a Sunday night analysis that there has been a “shift in political culture away from journalism’s grasp” because of Mr. Trump’s ability to deflect criticism and negative reports. “Covering Trump was a massive challenge,” Mr. Rosen wrote. “Recovering from him may be all but impossible for the political press.” – *Wall Street Journal*



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

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