

## § 76.943

basic service tier or associated equipment to cover the cumulative overcharge. This shall be reflected as a specifically identified, one-time credit on prospective bills to the class of subscribers that currently subscribe to the cable system.

(e) Refunds shall include interest computed at applicable rates published by the Internal Revenue Service for tax refunds and additional tax payments.

(f) Once an operator has implemented a rate refund to subscribers in accordance with a refund order by the franchising authority (or the Commission, pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section), the franchising authority must return to the cable operator an amount equal to that portion of the franchise fee that was paid on the total amount of the refund to subscribers. The franchising authority must promptly return the franchise fee overcharge either in an immediate lump sum payment, or the cable operator may deduct it from the cable system's future franchise fee payments. The franchising authority has the discretion to determine a reasonable repayment period, but interest shall accrue on any outstanding portion of the franchise fee starting on the date the operator has completed implementation of the refund order. In determining the amount of the refund, the franchise fee overcharge should be offset against franchise fees the operator holds on behalf of the franchising authority for lump sum payment. The interest rate on any refund owed to the operator presumptively shall be 11.25%.

[58 FR 29753, May 21, 1993, as amended at 58 FR 46736, Sept. 2, 1993; 59 FR 17974, Apr. 15, 1994; 60 FR 52120, Oct. 5, 1995]

## § 76.943 Fines.

(a) A franchising authority may impose fines or monetary forfeitures on a cable operator that does not comply with a rate decision or refund order directed specifically at the cable operator, provided the franchising authority has such power under state or local laws.

(b) If a cable operator willfully fails to comply with the terms of any franchising authority's order, decision, or request for information, as required by § 76.939, the Commission may, in addition to other remedies, impose a for-

## 47 CFR Ch. I (10-1-15 Edition)

feiture pursuant to section 503(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 503(b).

(c) A cable operator shall not be subject to forfeiture because its rate for basic service or equipment is determined to be unreasonable.

[58 FR 29753, May 21, 1993, as amended at 59 FR 17974, Apr. 15, 1994]

## § 76.944 Commission review of franchising authority decisions on rates for the basic service tier and associated equipment.

(a) The Commission shall be the sole forum for appeals of decisions by franchising authorities on rates for the basic service tier or associated equipment involving whether or not a franchising authority has acted consistently with the Cable Act or §§ 76.922 and 76.923. Appeals of ratemaking decisions by franchising authorities that do not depend upon determining whether a franchising authority has acted consistently with the Cable Act or §§ 76.922 and 76.923, may be heard in state or local courts.

(b) Any participant at the franchising authority level in a ratemaking proceeding may file an appeal of the franchising authority's decision with the Commission within 30 days of release of the text of the franchising authority's decision as computed under § 1.4(b) of this chapter. Appeals shall be served on the franchising authority or other authority that issued the rate decision. Where the state is the appropriate decisionmaking authority, the state shall forward a copy of the appeal to the appropriate local official(s). Oppositions may be filed within 15 days after the appeals is filed, and must be served on the party(ies) appealing the rate decision. Replies may be filed 7 days after the last day for oppositions and shall be served on the parties to the proceeding.

(c) An operator that uses the annual rate adjustment method under Section 76.922(e) may include in its next true up under Section 76.922(e)(3) any amounts to which the operator would have been entitled but for a franchising authority decision that is not upheld on appeal.

[58 FR 29753, May 21, 1993, as amended at 59 FR 17974, Apr. 15, 1994; 60 FR 52121, Oct. 5, 1995]