

## EDITOR'S NOTE

Welcome to the first Issue of Volume 66 of the *Federal Communications Law Journal*, the nation's premier communications law journal and the official journal of the Federal Communications Bar Association.

This Issue explores a number of important topics in the communications sector, from cutting-edge regulatory problems to perennial constitutional quandaries. The Issue opens with an Article on usage-based broadband pricing by Daniel Lyons, an assistant professor of law at Boston College Law School. After walking through the rise of usage based pricing in the broadband market and the justifications for adopting such a pricing model, Professor Lyons concludes that broadband service providers should be free to experiment with alternative pricing mechanisms, absent anticompetitive concerns.

Next, the Issue presents an Article by Samuel L. Feder, a partner at Jenner & Block LLP and former General Counsel of the FCC, Matthew E. Price, an associate with the same firm, and Andrew C. Noll, a J.D. candidate at Stanford Law School. They discuss the Supreme Court's recent decision in *City of Arlington v. Federal Communications Commission*, which upheld the FCC's shot-clocking rules, framing the majority opinion as a departure from the Court's previous decisions and asking how *Arlington's* reasoning might be applied to litigation over the FCC's Open Internet Order.

The Issue also features an Essay by former FCC Chairman Reed Hundt and Gregory Rosston, former FCC Deputy Chief Economist. In this piece, the authors explore the competition policies that the Commission has used in the past and how those regulatory models might be applied to different industries under the FCC's purview.

In addition to these pieces, this Issue contains three student Notes. In the first Note, Holly Trogdon discusses the potential for reducing infrastructure build-out costs through federal-state coordination, analyzing Google's deployment of fiber to the home in Kansas City as a case study. In the second Note, Darrel Pae takes a hard look at retransmission consent negotiations, arguing for expanding the FCC's role in overseeing the substantive aspects of such negotiations. In the third Note, Mary Shields addresses the interference problems that arose in the LightSquared-GPS dispute and proposes principles for resolving similar disputes based on the law of public prescriptive easements.

The *Journal* is committed to providing its readership with substantive coverage of relevant topics in communications law, and we appreciate the continued support of contributors and readers alike. We welcome your feedback and submissions—any questions or comments about this Issue or future Issues may be directed to [fclj@law.gwu.edu](mailto:fclj@law.gwu.edu), and any submissions

for publication consideration may be directed to [fcljarticles@law.gwu.edu](mailto:fcljarticles@law.gwu.edu).  
This Issue and our archive are available at <http://www.fclj.org>.

Andrew Erber  
*Editor-in-Chief*