```
1 {York Stenographic Services, Inc.}
2 RPTS BROWN
3 HIF044.160
4 ``SATELLITE VIDEO 101''
5 Wednesday, February 13, 2013
6 House of Representatives,
7 Subcommittee on Communications and Technology
```

Committee on Energy and Commerce

Washington, D.C.

Pallone, and Matheson.

8

9

10

16

in Room 2322 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Greg
Walden [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Walden, Latta, Shimkus,
Terry, Scalise, Lance, Gardner, Pompeo, Kinzinger, Long,
Ellmers, Barton, Upton (ex officio), Eshoo, Welch, Lujan,

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:32 a.m.,

```
17
         Staff present: Gary Andres, Staff Director; Ray Baum,
18
    Senior Policy Advisor/Director of Coalitions; Sean Bonyun,
    Communications Director; Andy Duberstein, Deputy Press
19
20
    Secretary; Neil Fried, Chief Counsel, C&T; Debbee Hancock,
21
    Press Secretary; Nick Magallanes, Policy Coordinator, CMT;
22
    David Redl, Counsel, Telcom; Charlotte Savercool, Executive
23
    Assistant, Legislative Clerk; Lyn Walker, Coordinator,
24
    Admin/Human Resources; Roger Sherman, Democratic Chief
25
    Counsel; Margaret McCarthy, Democratic Staff; Patrick
26
    Donovan, FCC Detailee; and Kara Van Stralen, Democratic
27
    Special Assistant.
```

28 Mr. {Walden.} Okay, we will call to order the 29 Subcommittee on Communications and Technology for our hearing on Satellite Video 101. I know we had to move this hearing 30 31 up from an earlier scheduled time because of some shifts in 32 our scheduling, so we appreciate your response to this 33 hearing on such a short time notice. And again, this is 34 meant to be an educational hearing, meant to be Satellite Video 101. There will be other hearings where I am sure 35 there will be a lot of vibrant discussion about what we 36 should do going forward. But I thought it was important for 37 38 the subcommittee to be able to understand the issues and intent with this legislation, and what we should or should 39 not do going forward. So we welcome certainly all of our 40 witnesses today and appreciate your willingness to come on 41 42 short notice. SHVA, SHVIA, SHVERA, and STELA. This law has been known 43 44 by a lot of different names, and many of those acronyms, I am 45 told, strike fear into the hearts of some, and some, I am sure, wish they could turn back to Punxsutawney Phil after 46 47 seeing his shadow. I prefer to see, as Phil did this year,

- 48 signs of an early spring. 49 We have an opportunity with our partners in the Judiciary Committee to examine whether the satellite law is 50 51 still serving its purpose in a video market that, frankly, would be unrecognizable to those who worked on the original 52 53 legislation back in 1988. I won't ask for a show of hands of 54 those who did that, but I know at least somebody at the FCC 55 has been involved in all of these. Broadcasting has gone 56 digital. Satellite television is no longer a nascent 57 industry. Phone companies, wired and wireless, are in the video business. Consumers can stream and download their 58 59 favorite shows over the Internet. Viewers have more choices, and more expectations, than ever before. Companies are 60 61 trying to keep up: launching new services; embarking on spin-62 offs, mergers, and partnerships. We have read in the last 63 day or so, Comcast, NBC Universal, all coming together. 64 Intel proposing a new service of video, and experimenting 65 with new business models to meet consumer demand in a new and
- 68 that emanate from them seem increasingly strained.

66

67

competitive reality. Our laws are also trying to keep up in

a world where traditional classifications and regulations

69 The goal, of course, is to provide consumers more of what they want while ensuring companies have the investment 70 71 resources to get it to them. Can we better ensure television viewers have access to the broadcast programming of their 72 choice while respecting the rights of stations that transmit 73 74 it over the air and the networks that create it? Would 75 finally letting the law expire help that cause? Is it better 76 to reauthorize it as is, or are revisions called for, either 77 narrow or sweeping? Is there something we can do to address the ongoing frustration viewers have who find themselves 78 assigned to ``local markets'' that are outside their states 79 80 or who live in places that don't have a full complement of 81 network affiliates? 82 Today we are going to set the table for this discussion 83 by examining the current state of satellite television law. 84 This is perhaps the most arcane and complicated area of law 85 we confront in this subcommittee, other than Universal Service Fund reform, of course. That is why I thought it 86 87 wise to start early, giving us ample time to hear from all parties in advance of the December 31, 2014, sunset that 88 89 applies to some of the existing provisions. Rest assured, we

```
90
    will have several more hearings, providing additional
91
     opportunity to consider not only the satellite issues
92
    directly before us, but also affording time to those who
93
    would ask us to take this opportunity to revisit other areas
94
    of communications law.
95
          I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today.
96
    am particularly pleased to welcome Eloise Gore, associate
97
    bureau chief of the FCC's Enforcement Bureau. And as I said,
98
    my understanding is this could be your fourth reauthorization
99
    while at the Commission, if we do in fact reauthorize the
100
          I want to thank you for you willingness to share your
101
     expertise. It is most helpful. I also want to set some
102
    ground rules. Ms. Gore is in a position to share her
103
    considerable knowledge on how the law operates and perhaps
104
    even on what may be working and may not. She will not,
105
    however, be making policy recommendations on how the law
106
    should change, so please don't ask her to do that. That is a
107
    pleasure reserved for us on this dais and in the Congress, in
108
    consultation with our constituents back home and those in the
109
     television business who can help us create an environment
     that entertains, informs, and creates jobs.
110
```

```
Mr. {Walden.} I would turn now to the vice chairman of
113
114
     the committee, Mr. Latta, for the remaining amount of my
115
    time.
116
          Mr. {Latta.} I appreciate the chairman for yielding,
117
     and I also thank our distinguished panel for being here
118
     today.
119
          I believe that today will be the beginning of a
120
     thoughtful and productive policy process. We have important
121
     issues in the satellite TV industry, as the chairman said,
    before us, which we all know need to be addressed by the end
122
123
     of next year when the Satellite Television Extension Localism
124
    Act of 2010, STELA, expires. I also look forward to a
     thorough discussion among our subcommittee members,
125
126
     stakeholders, and consumers as we grapple with the issues in
127
     STELA and others stemming from our decades of communication
128
    and cable laws.
129
          Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the hearing today and
130
    hearing from our witnesses on this subject, and I yield back
     the remainder of my time.
131
132
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Latta follows:]
```

133 ********* COMMITTEE INSERT **********

```
Mr. {Walden.} Thank the gentleman.
134
          I now turn to the distinguished ranking member of the
135
     subcommittee, Ms. Eshoo, for 5 minutes in an opening
136
137
     statement.
138
          Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to
139
    you, to all the members of the subcommittee, and most
140
     importantly, our witnesses. I might note that in my memory,
141
     I think this is the first time I am looking at a panel where
142
     the majority of those that are testifying are women.
     congratulations, and welcome.
143
144
          Mr. Chairman, less than 3 years ago, Congress passed and
     the President signed into law the Satellite Television
145
     Extension and Localism Act of 2010, STELA. Ms. Gore, maybe
146
147
     that is your -- we should rename you, give you that as your
     first name. I am pleased, as the chairman is, and other
148
149
    members, that we are starting this discussion of
150
     reauthorization early, and only to ensure that adequate time
151
     so that we have the adequate time to work through all the
     relevant issues, the new ideas that come forward, but also
152
     for the benefit of the several new members of our
153
```

subcommittee, and that is very important so that the level of 154 155 understanding is brought up, so that we are all up to speed 156 on this. 157 The estimate of one analyst today is that because of STELA, between one and one and a half million satellite 158 159 subscribers who live in areas where a signal from the local 160 network affiliate is not possible now have access to 161 broadcast programming. These satellite subscribers also 162 enjoy the benefits of public television stations, multidigital signals, as well as their HD transmission, ensuring 163 that consumers from all states have the opportunity to view 164 165 publically funded programming, one of my all-time favorites, so I am--I think that it is important to underscore that. 166 167 While my preference is to pursue a clean reauthorization 168 of STELA, there will no doubt be other video-related topics 169 raised over the course of this Congress, and chief amongst my 170 concerns are the programming disruptions that consumers 171 experience when retransmission disputes break down. 172 put, consumers should not be held hostage when negotiators fail to come to an agreement. These high profile disputes 173 have impacted millions of Americans, often prior to or during 174

- 175 highly watched programming, such as the 2010 World Series.
- 176 That simply is not acceptable. I mean, where are the adults
- in the room kind of thing. Our constituents all pay the
- 178 price for it.
- I am fascinated by the emergence of new video services,
- 180 such as Skitter and Sky Angel. These companies challenge
- 181 existing business models, which is disruptive but very
- 182 important, and they provide a new means of delivering
- 183 traditional broadcast or cable content into the homes of
- 184 consumers. I think these services can contribute to the
- 185 establishment of a vibrant video marketplace that promotes
- 186 both consumer choice and competition.
- 187 So today's panel of witnesses offer, and will offer, a
- 188 wealth of knowledge to us, spanning from the FCC to a cross
- 189 section of impacted industries, including broadcast,
- 190 satellite, and content. I thank each witness in advance of
- 191 their testimony, and for working with us to reauthorize
- 192 STELA.
- 193 I yield back the balance of my time, and thank you, Mr.
- 194 Chairman.
- 195 [The prepared statement of Ms. Eshoo follows:]

196 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT *********

197 Mr. {Walden.} Thank you. I now recognize the 198 distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman 199 from Michigan, Mr. Upton. The {Chairman.} Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. 200 201 hard to believe that the time has already come to revisit the 202 satellite TV legislation. For members on this committee, it 203 has almost become a right of passage. 204 Americans now have an endless amount of content available to them and the technology at their fingertips to 205 watch it at almost any time, anywhere, and on any device. 206 207 Our job is to create an atmosphere where they can do so in a way that respects the investments of the companies that 208 create and distribute that content, as well as the underlying 209 210 economics necessary to make those businesses work. We need 211 to do our very best to make sure that our laws don't prevent 212 willing producers of programming to strike arrangements with 213 willing distributors to reach interested viewers. 214 Issues surrounding this particular law are by no means easy to grapple, but it is important that we do so. 215 competitive landscape has evolved significantly in the video 216

```
217
    marketplace, and we must ensure our laws are having their
218
     intended effect. If they are no longer needed, they need to
219
    be eliminated. If they are missing the mark, they should be
220
    revised. If they are working well, we should leave them
221
    alone. But periodic oversight is essential to make that
222
    determination. It is particularly true of all laws in the
223
     communications sector. Technology is changing this industry
224
     at an astonishing rate, and we must work to ensure that our
225
     laws keep pace, fostering continued growth, particularly in
226
     the innovation area. Indeed, while it certainly makes for
    more work, we should consider using the sunset provisions
227
228
    perhaps a little bit more often.
229
          I look forward to the testimony and the interaction, and
230
    yield and offer my time to Mr. Scalise.
231
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Upton follows:]
```

******** COMMITTEE INSERT *********

232

Mr. {Scalise.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding, 233 and I will just make a couple of observations at the outset 234 235 of the hearing. It is clear that based on some of today's written 236 237 testimony that as much as somewhat a focus only on the 238 expiring narrow satellite provisions, there is also an 239 interest in raising other interconnected issues, like 240 additional compulsory licenses, retransmission consent rules, 241 and regulations that govern negotiations between broadcasters and pay TV providers. If stakeholders want to describe the 242 243 various compulsory copyright licenses of 1976 and 1988 as 244 relics or anachronistic, which I will be the first to agree 245 with, then I am sure they would also agree that the same is 246 true of the 1992 Cable Act. The truth is that there is a 247 litany of regulations still burdening the video marketplace 248 that have been piled one on top of the other over the years. 249 So much has changed in the video distribution since the days 250 before the commercialization of the Internet, and it is time that we recognize this fact. 251 252 So I welcome this expanded conversation, appreciate our

257 Mr. {Walden.} You said Mr. Barton wanted some time? Mr. {Barton.} Well, I have been here long enough to 258 259 remember before we had the Satellite Home Viewer Act. I just purchased a new home down in Texas. It was -- if it was a car 260 261 dealer, it would be a pre-owned home. And back in the back 262 yard is one of these huge satellite dishes that could get the 263 signal from the satellite directly, not through Dish or 264 anything like that. I have no idea what it is worth. I have tried to figure out a way to salvage it and perhaps sell it 265 for scrap. But I bet when that satellite dish was purchased, 266 267 they probably paid 5,000 to \$10,000 for it. Well today we don't need it, and we are here for the 268 second or third reauthorization of the Satellite Home Viewers 269 270 It is good we are doing this ahead of time. I want to 271 commend the subcommittee chairman and the full committee 272 chairman for moving to reauthorize something before it is 273 That is a good thing. It appears we are going to expired. 274 have a bipartisan hearing and a bipartisan reauthorization. I supported the original legislation. I have supported all 275 the reauthorizations, and I look forward to a similar 276

```
281
         Mr. {Walden.} Gentleman yields back. Anyone else on
282
    Republican side seeking time? If not, we will move on then
283
    to our witnesses.
         Before we do that, Mr. Waxman is not able to be with us
284
    at this hearing this morning. I do have his opening
285
286
    statement which I would ask unanimous consent to be allowed
287
    to be put into the record. Without objection, so done.
288
         [The prepared statement of Mr. Waxman follows:]
     ******* COMMITTEE INSERT *********
289
```

290 Mr. {Walden.} Now we will turn to our witnesses. 291 Again, we want to thank you for putting together your testimony and being able to be here on short notice. We are 292 going to start with Ms. Eloise Gore, the Associate Bureau 293 294 Chief of the Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission. Ms. Gore, thank you very much for being here. 295 296 Slide that microphone close and turn it on, and the show is 297 yours for the next 5 minutes.

```
^STATEMENTS OF ELOISE GORE, ASSOCIATE BUREAU CHIEF,
298
299
     ENFORCEMENT BUREAU, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; R.
300
     STANTON DODGE, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL,
301
    DISH; JANE MAGO, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL
302
    COUNSEL, LEGAL AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
303
    OF BROADCASTERS; JENNIFER KIELEY, DIRECTOR, GOVERNMENT
304
    RELATIONS, ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC TELEVISION STATIONS, ON
305
    BEHALF OF LONNA THOMPSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, CHIEF
306
    OPERATING OFFICER AND GENERAL COUNSEL, ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC
    TELEVISION STATIONS; AND MICHAEL O'LEARY, SENIOR EXECUTIVE
307
308
    VICE PRESIDENT, GLOBAL POLICY AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, MOTION
309
    PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
310
    ^STATEMENT OF ELOISE GORE
         Ms. {Gore.} There we go.
311
312
          Mr. {Walden.} There we go.
313
          Ms. {Gore.} Very good. Chairman Walden, Ranking Member
     Eshoo, and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the
314
     opportunity to appear before you today. I am currently the
315
```

Associate Bureau Chief for the Enforcement Bureau at the FCC, 316 317 but for most of my FCC career, I was in the Media Bureau, 318 where my responsibilities included the Satellite Home Viewer 319 Act, SHVA, and its progeny, SHVIA, SHVERA, and STELA. 320 pleased to provide technical assistance to Congress on these 321 reauthorization bills, as well as spearheading the 322 implementation of the enacted laws. I appreciate the chance 323 to participate with the subcommittee and my fellow panelists 324 this morning in Satellite Video 101 to refamiliarize ourselves with the legislative and regulatory structure we 325 326 have in place. 327 My written statement provides a board overview of the statutory changes made by the previous reauthorization and 328 329 the expiring provisions. I would like to spend my brief time 330 this morning outlining how the current rules apply to 331 consumers. 332 As noted in my written statement, my views are my own, 333 and I am very happy to provide technical assistance, but will 334 respectfully decline to provide any opinions on suggested 335 modifications. 336 STELA and its predecessors govern satellite delivery of

broadcast television to satellite subscribers and treat local 337 and distant broadcast stations in different ways. Local 338 339 channels are the stations that are assigned to the designated market area, DMA, in which the subscriber resides, based on 340 341 designations by the Nielson Media Company. My outstanding 342 colleague, Laurie Robier, will hold up the map, which is a 343 precious commodity, I must tell you. Thank you, Laurie. 344 Nicely done. 345 Distant signals are those stations that are assigned to a different DMA from the one in which the subscriber resides. 346 SHVIA created local into local service in 1999. Initially, 347 348 the two satellite providers offered the local stations in 349 fewer than 40 out of the 210 DMAs. Now they have increased their local market offerings so that nearly all subscribers 350 351 in the 210 designated market areas have access to the local 352 station package from one or both satellite carriers. DISH 353 provides service to all 210; DirecTV, I believe, provides 354 service to 196 of the markets. 355 The local stations available to satellite subscribers 356 are essentially limited to the stations designated for the 357 DMA, although there are some additional options in certain

circumstances, such as significantly viewed stations or 358 distant stations that can be used to fill in what we call a 359 360 short market, where there are not four of the top four 361 networks available over the air. There are certain areas in 362 the country in which Congress provided a special exception to 363 allow carriage of additional signals in the local market. 364 Distant signals are generally available only to 365 satellite subscribers who are unserved by an over-the-air 366 signal and for whom the local into local stations are not available. We call this no distant where local. This being 367 101, I will try to describe some of the little terminology 368 369 that you will hear us use. Local into local, no distant 370 where local, DMA. Unserved means that the subscriber's household cannot receive the over-the-air signal of a local 371 372 network station with sufficient signal strength. 373 Notwithstanding the principle of no distant where local, some 374 subscribers have been statutorily grandfathered as the 375 eligibility rules have changed in successive 376 reauthorizations. Some of the grandfathered subscribers may keep the distant signals, others may, at some point, be 377 required to relinquish the distant signals, and some 378

379 subscribes who are outside the satellite's spot beam, and therefore unable to receive the local package, may also be 380 381 eligible for distant signals. Distant signal subscribers are 382 limited to no more than two network affiliated signals from each broadcast network, and time shifting may be limited 383 384 based on the subscriber's local time zone. The subscriber 385 cannot specify which distant signals he or she wishes to 386 receive. Further, the satellite carrier is only permitted to 387 provide distant signals if it complies with the requirement to provide the networks with lists of the subscribers who are 388 receiving distant signals. 389 If the local stations are not available to a subscriber 390 391 via satellite, the subscriber may request distant signals through his or her satellite carrier. The carrier determines 392 393 whether the subscriber is considered served or unserved by 394 using a computer model that predicts the signal strength at the subscriber's household. Satellite carriers use a 395 396 computer model designed by the Commission. It is called the 397 ILLR computer model, but the Commission is not involved in making individual predictions. If the model determines the 398 399 household is unserved, that is, the signal strength is too

```
low from the broadcast station, the satellite carrier is
400
401
     permitted to provide distant network signals to the
402
     household. If the model predicts that the household is
     served by a particular local network station over the air,
403
     the household is not eligible for distant signals for that
404
405
     network. The subscriber may request waivers from each of the
     local stations that are predicted to serve the household in
406
407
     order to be eliqible for distant signals. Waivers are
408
     requested through the satellite carrier and the local
409
     broadcast station must accept or reject a waiver request
     within 30 days. If a local station denies the waiver
410
411
     request, the subscriber can request a signal test to measure
412
     the actual signal strength of the over-the-air signal.
413
          Finally, the law allows satellite carriers to provide
414
     distant signals to subscribers in some other situations, such
415
     as recreational vehicles, commercial trucks, or C-band
416
     satellite receivers. Mr. Barton, your C-band may be useful
417
     yet.
418
          Thank you for inviting me to participate in today's
     hearing. I look forward to assisting the committee as it
419
     begins this reauthorization process, and would be happy to
420
```

```
Mr. {Walden.} That is the best news Joe has gotten all day.

We now turn to our next witness, Mr. R. Stanton Dodge,

who is the Executive Vice President and General Counsel of

DISH. Mr. Dodge, thanks for joining us this morning. We

look forward to your testimony.
```

```
^STATEMENT OF R. STANTON DODGE
430
          Mr. {Dodge.} Chairman Walden and Ranking Member Eshoo,
431
     Chairman Upton, and members of the subcommittee, I very much
432
433
     appreciate the opportunity to testify today. My name is
434
     Stanton Dodge, and I am the Executive Vice President and
435
     General Counsel of DISH Network, the Nation's third largest
436
     pay TV provider with over 14 million customers and 25,000
437
     employees nationwide.
438
          This morning, I would like to highlight the benefits
439
     that STELA and its predecessors have conferred upon
440
     consumers.
441
          STELA provided two big wins for consumers, giving them
442
     access to more programming than ever before. First, it
     challenged DISH to offer local stations in all of the
443
444
     Nation's 210 television markets. We embraced that challenge,
445
     and today we are the only pay TV provider to offer local
446
     channels in every market. Plus, we are the largest
     distributor of PBS nationwide. Second, STELA allowed us to
447
448
     give consumers in short markets access to all the big four
```

449 networks. And for those of you who don't know, short markets are markets that lack one or more of the big four stations, 450 451 and they tend to be small, rural communities. Thanks to STELA, consumers in 21 short markets across 19 States can 452 453 watch the valued network programming that the rest of the 454 country has long enjoyed. So how did we get here? Well, let us start with the 455 456 basics. We all know that broadcast stations are important to 457 consumers. They are freely available over the air, but even after the digital transition, many households cannot get a 458 signal, especially in large western markets. Over-the-air 459 460 reception often just cannot match the coverage and 461 consistency of satellite and cable television. The first incarnation of STELA, the Satellite Home 462 Viewer Act of 1988, created a statutory copyright license 463 464 that enabled satellite carriers to provide consumers with 465 broadcast signals originating outside of their home markets. 466 This copyright license came with an important restriction. 467 It only allowed network transmissions to ``unserved households,'' households that cannot receive a strong local 468 signal using an off-air antenna. In exchange for the 469

470 license, satellite carriers paid a monthly per-subscriber fee 471 to the copyright office. That fee was set either by private 472 negotiations, or by an administrative proceeding, and the revenues were then distributed to the mosaic of copyright 473 474 This copyright fee structure remains in place 475 today. 476 Congressional legislation evolved further in 1994, 1999, 477 and 2004, and throughout this time, technological advances 478 prompted significant updates to the law. For example, with 479 the advent of spot beam technology, satellites can target signals into individual local markets, rather than the whole 480 481 country at once. This led Congress to add the so-called 482 local into local license, which allowed for satellite retransmission of local broadcast signals back into their 483 484 local markets. Satellite carriers seized that new 485 opportunity. They built and launched spot beam satellites 486 and they started providing local stations almost immediately. 487 AS a result, satellite providers emerged as a key competitive 488 force in the pay TV market. I am going to ask you to please refer to my written 489 remarks for a more comprehensive summary of the various 490

491 satellite television bills over the years. 492 As many of you are aware, DISH was--from providing 493 distant network signals to subscribers in 2006, after a 494 decade-long court proceeding. Among other things, the injunction prevented us from filling up short markets, 495 496 because we needed a distant signal license to import the out-497 of-market stations to replace the missing local affiliates. 498 Through STELA, Congress presented an incentive for DISH to 499 receive a waiver of that injunction if we offered local 500 stations in all of the Nation's 210 markets, then they would allow us to win back our distant signal license. Working 501 502 cooperatively with the NAB, we followed the path precisely as 503 Congress envisioned. The result, on June 3, 2010, we initiated service to all local TV markets, becoming the 504 505 first, and to date, the only pay TV provider to offer local 506 service in all 210 DMAs. 507 And so, STELA stands as an example of how targeted 508 legislative solutions can work to everybody's benefit. It 509 should be reauthorized before December 31, 2014, but there is much more that Congress can do through STELA to expand 510 consumer's access to local programming. In an era of fast-511

```
changing technology and the explosion of video on the
512
513
     Internet, we believe that Congress should take this
514
     opportunity to look at ways that the current statute can be
515
    updated to better reflect consumer expectations and desires.
516
          We look forward to a dialogue addressing those options
     in the months ahead, and I thank you again for the
517
518
     opportunity to testify here today, and look forward to
519
     answering any questions you might have.
520
          [The prepared statement of Mr. Dodge follows:]
     *********** INSERT 2 *********
521
```

Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Mr. Dodge. We appreciate your being here, and your testimony.

We will now go to the Executive Vice President and

General Counsel for Legal and Regulatory Affairs, the

National Association of Broadcasters, Jane Mago. We are

delighted to have you here this morning, and look forward to

your comments.

529 ^STATEMENT OF JANE MAGO 530 Ms. {Mago.} Thank you, Chairman Walden--Mr. {Walden.} Go ahead and turn that on. 531 532 Ms. {Mago.} Turn on the microphone. Thank you, 533 Chairman Walden, and thanks to Ranking Member Eshoo and 534 Chairman Upton, and all the members of the subcommittee for 535 having me here to speak with you today. As Chairman Walden just said, I am the Executive Vice President and General 536 Counsel of the National Association of Broadcasters. 537 538 Now over the next 2 years, this subcommittee, as well as your colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, will consider 539 whether certain provisions of the legislation that is 540 541 affectionately known to all of us as STELA should be allowed 542 to sunset. The narrow issue that is before you is whether 543 the legal framework that permits the country's two satellite 544 providers to retransmit our stations continues to be in the 545 public interest. As the committee begins this dialogue, your broadcast constituents as you to be mindful of two 546 principles that are at the core of STELA and all its 547

548 predecessors that we have heard about today. 549 First, free over-the-air local television should remain widely available to American households, and second, the 550 551 government should not interfere with the contractual 552 relationships that promote broadcasting's local focus. 553 Adherence to these principles will help ensure that the 554 public benefits from free over-the-air broadcasting. 555 Now, the bedrock principle of the American broadcast 556 system continues to be this localism. Whether it is local 557 news, emergency alerts, weather information, election coverage, or sports, local television broadcasters provide 558 559 these services and programming for free to communities across the country. Broadcasters support charities, civic 560 organizations, and community events, and our locally tailored 561 562 advertising provides the opportunity for your hometown 563 businesses to promote their goods and services. Simply put, free local service is our focus. It is what differentiates 564 565 American broadcast television from others around the world, 566 and from every other medium. Broadcasters have invested billions of dollars in recent 567 568 years to improve the quality and reach of our service.

digital television transition allowed us to proliferate high 569 definition programming, launch mobile D-TV service, and offer 570 571 multiple program streams. These innovations enable our viewers, who are also your constituents, to receive higher 572 quality and more diverse programming on many platforms. 573 574 Now as you have heard, in the beginning the satellite 575 acts were crafted to help the satellite companies become 576 competitive with cable services, and ensure that satellite 577 subscribers could access network programming. It was always a concern, however, that the service should not undermine 578 579 local broadcast stations. And so specifically, Congress 580 prohibited a satellite provider from importing a network 581 signal from a distant market to households that could receive 582 that network's programming from a local station. 583 provisions were and remain essential to prevent diversion of 584 local station viewers and reduction in the advertising 585 revenue that is needed to provide vital local services. 586 even as it created this distant signal license, Congress 587 foresaw that one day technological advances might make that license unnecessary, so it included a 5-year sunset 588 589 provision. That premonition was really correct. Technology

has evolved so that satellite companies could provide each 590 591 market with the market's own local signals. As Stanton just 592 told us, today DISH provides its local service into all 210 593 television markets, and DirecTV is in either 195 or 196, that is not somewhat clear, but thus the need to import distant 594 595 network signals has dramatically diminished. Only a small 596 percentage of the 34 million satellite subscribers receive 597 network programming via this distant signal. Indeed, over 98 598 percent of all U.S. television viewers have the option of 599 viewing their local networks. So accordingly, this subcommittee may want to consider whether the public interest 600 601 would be best served by allowing the distant signal and 602 related communications act provisions to sunset, as Congress 603 originally intended. 604 Because local viewers are best served when they receive 605 local service, every satellite and cable subscriber should receive this local into local service. 606 607 Now alternatively, if STELA is reauthorized, 608 broadcasters urge a clean, minimalist approach targeted to 609 the problem to be solved. Efforts to graft unrelated and 610 unnecessary issues onto this narrow legislation would be

617 Mr. {Walden.} Ms. Mago, thank you very much for your 618 testimony. We will now go to Jennifer Kieley, and before we do, I 619 should point out that she is a fill-in witness this morning. 620 621 Lonna Thompson was supposed to testify but fell ill last 622 night, and so be kind to Jennifer. She is the Director of 623 Government Relations, Association of Public Television 624 Stations, and Lonna is the Executive Vice President, Chief 625 Operating Officer, and General Counsel for Association of Public Television Stations, so today we have the Director of 626 Government Relations, Jennifer Kieley. Jennifer, thank you 627 for joining us, and we look forward to the testimony of the 628 public television stations. 629

630 ^STATEMENT OF JENNIFER KIELEY Ms. {Kieley.} Thank you, Chairman Walden and Ranking 631 Member Eshoo, members of the subcommittee. I greatly 632 633 appreciate the opportunity to substitute in Lonna's place 634 today on this very important issue to the Association of 635 Public Television Stations. 636 This issue is of great importance to our 368 local public television stations throughout this country. It has a 637 tremendous influence on the services that are available to 638 639 your constituents, our viewers, nationwide, but particularly those living in rural America that are often limited to their 640 641 paid television programming options and disproportionately 642 depend on satellite services. 643 First and foremost, we would like to thank this 644 committee and the Congress as a whole for the passage of 645 STELA which recognized the critical services that local 646 public broadcasting stations provide their communities nationwide. Because of that legislation, viewers in even the 647 648 most remote corners of this country that receive local

649 satellite HD service, have access to the best that public television has to offer in the full splendor of HD. 650 651 also appreciative of the language that was included in STELA which allows satellite carriers to carry local public 652 television statewide licensees' signals throughout the entire 653 654 state where DBS providers have the bandwidth to do so. 655 provision removed statutory roadblocks that restricted the 656 ability of residents and tax payers in states to receive the full benefits of their state's public television statewide 657 658 network. Public broadcasting is charged by the Public 659 Broadcasting Act with providing universal service to every 660 corner of this country, and STELA has enabled us to help meet 661 this mission and provide the highest quality of services to 662 663 our satellite viewers. 664 As Congress looks to reauthorize STELA, public 665 television proudly highlights the private carriage agreements 666 that we have been able to negotiate with almost all major Rather than rely on Congress to work out these 667 carriage agreements, which can admittedly be challenging, we 668 pioneered our own private agreements with cable, Verizon and 669

- 670 DirecTV. Before the passage of STELA, we were still hopeful that 671 we would be able to negotiate a similar carriage agreement 672 with DISH. Unfortunately, after years of unsuccessful 673 negotiations, we were never able close a deal with DISH that 674 675 would have quaranteed carriage of all of our stations' HD 676 signals. As a result, before STELA was signed into law, DISH 677 was not carrying a single HD signal of any local public television station, but STELA mandated the carriage of local 678 public television stations' HD signals by any carrier that 679 had not entered into private carriage negotiations with 680 681 public television. And now, DISH is required by law to carry the local HD signals of public television stations in all 682 markets where they offer local HD service. 683 684 This provision was included in STELA because Congress 685 recognized the unique educational mission of local public 686 television stations and the void that was felt by citizens 687 that were previously denied access to these critical services. We were also pleased that when DISH challenged us 688 all in the courts, the courts upheld STELA. 689 As a result of STELA, viewers in Oregon are able to 690
 - 44

watch Oregon Field Guide, a valuable source of information 691 692 about outdoor recreational issues, ecological issues, natural resources and travel destinations in the full detail of HD. 693 In the San Francisco Bay area, subscribers to satellite have 694 access to the HD version of Quest, KQED's award-winning 695 696 multimedia science and environment series. And in Michigan, 697 Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, and communities 698 nationwide, Americans can travel the galaxies with NOVA, tune 699 in for a live performance at the Met, celebrate the 4th of 700 July with a front row seat at the Nation's Capital, catch up on the latest drama of Downton Abbey, all this and so much 701 more, in the sunny display of high-definition television. 702 703 This is public television as it is meant to be seen and 704 appreciated. 705 Public television is in the business of providing local 706 public service. We treat our viewers as citizens, not consumers. Our stations provide over 98 percent of Americans 707 708 with the highest-quality, free, educational media available. 709 And in addition to all the great broadcast services that 710 local public television stations offer, our stations are also 711 providing cutting edge public services to communities beyond

```
the broadcast, from educational services to public safety, to
712
713
    veterans job retraining, these services and so much more are
714
    part of the vibrant public service media that this country
715
    has invested in and we are proud to deliver to your
716
     constituents. Because an investment in public media is truly
717
     an investment in the unique needs of local communities
718
    nationwide.
719
          Again, we would like to thank this committee, and
720
    particularly Representative Eshoo, who authored the amendment
721
    which guaranteed our HD carriage, for all your work in
722
     crafting legislation that recognized the incredible value and
723
     critical services that are provided by local public
724
     television stations.
725
          Thank you for inviting us to participate in today's
726
    hearing. We look forward to continuing to work closely with
727
    you as prepare to reauthorize this legislation.
728
          [The prepared statement of Ms. Kieley follows:]
729
     ********** INSERT 4 *********
```

```
730
          Mr. {Walden.} Thank you, Ms. Kieley, and I can assure
731
    you, we are not going to get between your viewers and Downton
732
    Abbey.
          Ms. {Kieley.} Good plan.
733
          Mr. {Walden.} That would not be good.
734
735
          Let us go now to Mr. Michael O'Leary, Senior Executive
736
    Vice President of Global Policy and External Affairs, the
737
    Motion Picture Association of America. Mr. O'Leary, thanks
738
     for joining us this morning and rounding out our panel.
739
     look forward to your testimony, sir.
```

```
740
     ^STATEMENT OF MICHAEL O'LEARY
741
          Mr. {O'Leary.} Thank you, Chairman Walden, Chairman
     Upton, Ranking Member Eshoo, and members of the subcommittee.
742
743
     Thank you for inviting me to testify this morning on behalf
744
     of the Motion Picture Association of America. I also want to
745
     acknowledge my fellow panelists. It is an honor to be on the
746
     panel with the folks today, and to provide our perspective on
747
     the potential reauthorization that this subcommittee is
748
     undertaking.
749
          My message on behalf of the industry that creates much
     of what you see on television is very simple and very
750
751
     straightforward. The satellite and the cable compulsory
752
     licenses are historically anachronistic that are no longer
753
     justified in today's television programming marketplace. If
754
     those licenses were to be retained, however, they should not
755
     be expanded in our view. Program owners should be more
756
     fairly compensated, and a direct marketplace should be
757
     encouraged.
758
          I want to be clear at the outset that we share the goal
```

that was articulated by the chairman in his opening remarks, 759 and I believe by everyone on this committee, and that is to 760 761 provide consumers with the highest quality entertainment and 762 informational experience possible, and to expand choices available in television in new and innovative ways. At the 763 764 same time, it is imperative that the hardworking men and 765 women who invest their talent and capital to create the 766 programming receive fair market compensation, and that the 767 law promote marketplace innovation. 768 Mr. Chairman, there is no better time to be a consumer of content than today, and we are confident that the future 769 770 will bring even more high quality entertainment to viewers 771 around the Nation, and frankly, to those around the world. 772 The studios I represent create much of the programming that 773 we all enjoy today. We have an incentive to get those 774 programs in front of as many viewers as possible, and we 775 believe that the marketplace can have a big role in making 776 that happen. 777 Just as the television landscape will continue to evolve in the months and years ahead, it has changed dramatically 778 since the enactment of the compulsory licenses being 779

780 discussed here and in the coming months. The market 781 conditions that led Congress to create the cable and the 782 satellite compulsory licenses have long since disappeared. 783 Congress decided, as you know, in 1976 and again in 1988 to introduce compulsory licenses to help what were then 784 785 fledgling cable and satellite industries acquire 786 retransmission rights in television programming. Government 787 intervention in the marketplace was deemed necessary at those times to ensure the viability of what were then new services. 788 Today, the overwhelming majority of programming being offered 789 by cable and satellite is licensed through marketplace 790 791 transactions. There is simply no justification in today's 792 market for a satellite compulsory or cable compulsory 793 There is certainly no justification for retaining licenses. 794 a license that imposed below market rates for the acquisition of that programming. 795 796 As my written testimony notes, the royalty rate paid by 797 satellite carriers under Section 119 today is roughly the equivalent of the market rate paid for programming in 1999, 798 799 almost 15 years ago. At the same time, in that same period of years, the cost of producing programming has continued to 800

801 increase. Today, the cable and satellite industries are, to 802 their credit, very successful. They have over 90 million 803 subscribers and report a combined revenue in excess of \$80 804 billion. The compulsory license royalty fees paid, however, equal less than one half of one percent of their combined 805 806 revenues. One can not help but ask how government 807 intervention in licensing of retransmitted programming by 808 these industries can be justified in today's marketplace, and 809 we believe this should be a threshold consideration for the 810 committee as you move forward over the next 2 years. 811 Should Congress, however, as a result of these 812 proceedings determine that compulsory licenses should be 813 prolonged, we would strongly urge the committee not to expand 814 either license to new market entrants. Congress should not 815 further impede the ability of program owners to obtain the 816 true economic value of their work, and instead should 817 encourage development of marketplace regimes. 818 On behalf of our members, Mr. Chairman, I again want to 819 express our sincere gratitude to you and this committee for holding this hearing, for getting, as you indicated, an early 820 821 start. This is a complicated issue. It is a difficult

```
issue, and we are confident that this will be the first of
many conversations over the next few months, and we welcome
and look forward to the opportunity to be a part of that.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. O'Leary follows:]
```

```
Mr. {Walden.} Thank you very much, Mr. O'Leary. You
828
    are absolutely right. We will have additional hearings, and
829
     I am sure a lot of conversations in the months ahead.
830
831
          That concludes our panelist's testimony. We appreciate
832
     all of your words and your comments.
833
          I will start out with questions this morning. This one
834
     is for the entire panel. I have read reports that -- to the
835
     extent they are able to answer. I have read reports that
    between 1 and 1.5 million subscribers still receive distant
836
837
    signals. Is that accurate? Are those households
838
    predominantly rural, urban, or evenly distributed? And if
839
    Congress were to let the retransmission consent exemption and
840
     the distant signal compulsory license expire, would those
841
    households lose access to all local broadcast service? So
     first, is the million to million and a half number correct,
842
843
    where are those households, and what happens if we allow the
844
    distant signal compulsory license and retransmission consent
845
     exemption to expire?
         Ms. Gore, can you tackle any piece of that?
846
847
         Ms. {Gore.} The only piece of that that I can tackle,
```

```
we do not keep figures on how many distant subscribers there
848
849
    are out there. I believe my colleagues on the panel here may
850
    be able to help you out there. I am aware that the distant
851
    signal license is used, as I think we all touched on, in many
    different circumstances. Sometimes is someone who doesn't
852
853
    have access to any local broadcast stations, and so they are
854
    receiving what I tend to call a truly distant signal, which
855
    would mean perhaps from New York or Los Angeles, when they
856
    are not at all in that area.
857
          There are other situations where the distant signal
     license, I gather, is used for filling in a short market,
858
859
    which we have talked about, and there the signal is coming
    from generally a more nearby area. What would happen if the
860
    distant signal license were let to expire, I cannot say. I
861
862
    know that the copyright office studied this and I know that
863
     the GAO looked into what the copyright office had reported,
864
     so they probably can speak for themselves. But it is a
865
     complex intertwining.
866
         Mr. {Walden.} All right. Mr. Dodge?
          Mr. {Dodge.} I am not exactly sure, I must admit, where
867
     the 1 million to 1.5 million number came from. I know at
868
```

```
DISH, we actually don't keep track, although we may be able
869
870
     to get you that information, so we will take an action item
871
     to try to do that. But certainly, I believe it is a bigger
     issue for DirecTV today, because with the utility, the
872
     license is a little different for each of us. Where DirecTV
873
874
     still has some grandfathered subscribers, I believe, from
875
    years gone by and they are not in all 210 markets today, they
876
     still use a true distant license there for, I believe,
877
    providing programming to unserved households in the markets
    where they don't offer local programming, but how many
878
     customers that might impact, I don't know.
879
880
          Mr. {Walden.} Okay.
881
          Mr. {Dodge.} With respect to DISH, we use a license
    primarily for three purposes, the largest of which is to fill
882
883
     in short markets, as Ms. Gore noted, so you know, for example
884
     in a market where someone doesn't have a FOX station, we
885
     import a FOX so that they are able to watch American Idol and
886
     similar programming, just like all other Americans, and
887
    without the license we would have to shut those people off.
          Similarly, we provide service outside the spot beam to
888
889
     certain customers, which allows to a safer state, like Utah,
```

```
890
     which is largely rectangle, our spot beams are round, and so
891
     the corners get cut off. And unless those folks are able to
892
     get local programming via an off-air antenna, we would have
     to shut those folks out as well, and RVs and commercial
893
894
     trucks, too.
895
          Mr. {Walden.} All right. Ms. Mago?
896
          Ms. {Mago.} I think what you have heard here is that
897
     there is getting to be fewer and fewer of these people that
898
     use the distant signal license, and I think it is -- the exact
899
     number would be in the hands of the carriers to know that
     number, and I don't know that we have it. But even those
900
901
     instances that Mr. Dodge just talked about, they are becoming
902
     fewer and fewer as well, because as you provide local into
     local service into all 210 markets, it is relatively easy to
903
904
     provide that local signal to the -- to anyone within that spot
905
     beam, and that seems to be a logical thing to do. Short
906
     markets are also disappearing as a result of the digital
907
     television transition. A lot of stations are able to use
908
     their multicast capacity to provide a second networks signal
909
     within the market.
```

So I think the key point for us continues to be our

910

- 911 focus on localism, and making sure that we recognize how much
- 912 fewer there are.
- 913 Mr. {Walden.} All right, and I am going to go to Ms.
- 914 Kieley and then Mr. O'Leary, but I am running out of time, so
- 915 sorry.
- 916 Ms. {Kieley.} My answer will be easy. We unfortunately
- 917 do not track that at the Association of Public Television
- 918 Stations, and defer to our friends in the satellite industry
- 919 to help us get a better handle on that, but I will echo what
- 920 Ms. Mago has said, that localism is, you know, a top priority
- 921 for us in public television.
- 922 Mr. {Walden.} All right. Mr. O'Leary?
- 923 Mr. {O'Leary.} I will be brief. I know I can't
- 924 validate that number. I have no way to dispute it. It
- 925 ultimately would lie with the carriers. I agree with the
- 926 comments of Ms. Mago. I would also note that even if it is
- 927 retained, the distant signal license is still woefully under
- 928 market--the rate is still woefully under market.
- 929 Mr. {Walden.} Okay. I thank you all for your answers,
- 930 and now turn to the ranking member of the subcommittee, Ms.
- 931 Eshoo, for questions.

```
Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you
932
     again to the panel for your very helpful testimony. I have a
933
934
     whole list of questions and I think that I will submit them
935
     in writing, but I want to ask you, with the exception of Ms.
936
    Gore, since she put it right out there that she was not going
937
     to recommend any kind of policy--no policy recommendations.
938
    To the four of you, starting with Mr. Dodge, so I have got 5
939
    minutes with four people, so about a minute and a half. If
940
    you were going to choose your top policy preference in the
941
     reauthorization of STELA, what would it be? So that is to
942
     each one of you, starting with Mr. Dodge.
943
          Mr. {Dodge.} It would be to ensure that consumers are
     able to continue to receive network programming during
944
945
     retransmission disputes.
946
          Ms. {Eshoo.} Very good, thank you.
947
          Ms. {Mago.} As I said in my opening testimony, our top
948
    policy preference is to preserve localism and allow
949
    broadcasters to continue to provide the service to their
950
     communities.
          Ms. {Eshoo.} Great. Ms. Kieley?
951
          Ms. {Kieley.} We just hope that any reauthorization of
952
```

```
STELA continues to recognize the unique services of local
953
954
    public television stations, and how we are different in the
955
    marketplace.
956
          Ms. {Eshoo.} Well, I am here.
          Ms. {Kieley.} We do appreciate that.
957
958
          Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank God we got that one worked out.
959
    Thank you, Mr. Dodge. Thank you for your advocacy.
960
          Ms. {Kieley.} And that would be our top priority, as
    well as maintaining vibrant local service for our public
961
962
     television stations.
          Ms. {Eshoo.} Great, thank you. Mr. O'Leary?
963
          Mr. {O'Leary.} Sure. I think that our top priority, as
964
     I outlined, is to get the content that we make in front of as
965
    many people as possible. That is our business model in
966
967
     simplest terms, and I think that we would advocate that the
968
     committee do that by one of two ways. One would be to step
969
    back and look at the entire context and see if the current
970
     regime continues to make sense, and if it ultimately comes to
971
     the conclusion that there needs to be some type of regime in
972
    place, to make sure that it is updated to reflect the times
     in which we live, and it is not necessarily bound up in the
973
```

```
974
     past.
975
          Ms. {Eshoo.} Thank you very much. I think that we need
976
     to know more from you about--you referred to content, and I
977
     think there is an old context, an older context to it, and I
     think that there needs to be a new appreciation on the part
978
979
     of members of what you mean exactly by content and the Motion
980
     Picture Industry Association and in the 21st century. I
981
     think there are so many exciting things, but I would just
982
     make that as a recommendation.
983
          Mr. {O'Leary.} Absolutely, and we would be happy to
     provide that to the committee.
984
          Ms. {Eshoo.} That members really be instructed and be
985
     brought up to snuff on what you are referring to.
986
987
          Well, that is great. We have got--I like all of your
988
     answers. Thank you very much. I yield back.
989
          Mr. {Walden.} Gentlelady yields back the balance of her
990
     time.
991
          Chair now recognizes Mr. Barton for 5 minutes.
992
          Mr. {Barton.} I am here.
          Mr. {Walden.} I was looking down my list and others
993
     weren't, but you were here at the gavel dropping, so--
994
```

```
995
          Mr. {Barton.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
996
          Mr. O'Leary, I want to make sure I understand.
997
      testimony is not that these acts should not be reauthorized,
998
      it is that certain parts of them should be allowed to expire.
999
      Is that correct?
          Mr. {O'Leary.} I think there is--that that is something
1000
1001
      that should be part of the consideration that you undertake
1002
     over the next 2 months is whether or not it is essential to
1003
     reauthorize all aspects of this, yes.
1004
          Mr. {Barton.} Okay, so I want to make sure I understand
     before I go to Ms. Mago. You--the motion picture industry is
1005
1006
     not advocating allowing them to expire, it is simply saying
1007
     we should think about it? So you are a little bit--you are
     not a hard-hard, you are kind of a medium-soft, am I right?
1008
1009
      I mean, I am not being funny, I am just--
1010
           Mr. {O'Leary.} No, I understand. I think that we
1011
     believe that, as I said in my testimony, that certain
1012
     provisions here are anachronistic, and that they do not
1013
     necessarily need to be--they could be allowed to expire.
1014
     Having said that, we are also mindful, as has been alluded to
1015
      in the comments made by members of the panel and members of
```

```
this panel, this is an incredibly complex web of pieces that
1016
1017
     all kind of fit together. And so what I am trying to portray
1018
      to you--I am not trying to be soft and squishy and in the
1019
     middle, but the truth of the matter is, I am trying to be
1020
     realistic. We think that some of these things are woefully
1021
      outdated and could be allowed to expire. We think that is--
1022
           Mr. {Barton.} But that is different than supporting the
1023
      expiration. So you are -- let me ask you a straight question,
1024
     yes or no.
1025
           Mr. {O'Leary.} Sure.
           Mr. {Barton.} If this subcommittee and the full
1026
1027
     committee were to support a clean straight reauthorization,
1028
     no changes except the date, would your industry support that?
1029
     Yes or no?
1030
           Mr. {O'Leary.} I am not in a position to say right now
1031
     what they would support. I do think that that would be
1032
     preferable, frankly, Congressman, to expanding the license in
1033
     any way.
1034
           Mr. {Barton.} I am going to go to Ms. Mago, since I
1035
     have gotten a pretty squishy answer from Mr. O'Leary.
1036
           Would your trade association support clean
```

```
reauthorization with no changes except the dates?
1037
1038
          Ms. {Mago.} I am sorry, Mr. Barton, I have to frustrate
1039
     you as well. We are so early in this process that at this
1040
     point, we are still considering where the marketplace is, as
1041
      I indicated, and while we see that there are anachronistic
1042
     pieces and we think that expiration should be on the table,
1043
     we haven't formed a final position.
1044
          Mr. {Barton.} So if we put your group with Mr.
1045
     O'Leary's group, you all will hug each other and then talk
1046
     around each other for as long as we allow you to.
1047
          Ms. {Mago.} We would all hug each other on this panel.
1048
     We are like that.
1049
          Mr. {Barton.} Anyway, I yield back, Mr. Chairman. I
     would definitely vote for a clean reauthorization. If there
1050
1051
      is a meeting of the minds from the stakeholders, I would
1052
      certainly take a look at that. My guess is that the
1053
     stakeholders have different views, and as they should,
1054
     because of the economic consequences, and it is probably not
1055
     as much peace and love at that table as they are portraying
1056
      this morning.
          Mr. {Walden.} And we could bring some other folks up
1057
```

```
and there would be real fireworks.
1058
1059
           Mr. {Barton.} Right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1060
           Mr. {Walden.} We might do that today.
1061
           I thank the gentleman and now we go to Mr. Lujan from
     New Mexico for questions.
1062
           Mr. {Lujan.} Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.
1063
1064
           To Ms. Gore, there are some questions that I have for
1065
     you which maybe aren't appropriate for this hearing, but we
1066
     will be working with the FCC to look into the equitable
1067
     treatment of tribal communities as well, as we talk about
     some of the rulings and renderings and many of the very
1068
1069
      complex world, so I will get those to you and submit them
1070
      into the record.
1071
           But for today's hearing, I am interested with all the
1072
     witnesses, should Congress consider the changes in the
1073
      competitive landscape for video services as we examine STELA,
1074
      and especially with the question that Ranking Member Eshoo
1075
      asked, content is very much different now. We are getting
1076
      content in many different areas, and how far reaching should
1077
      this be, or what should be included in that? Ms. Gore?
1078
           Ms. {Gore.} Well, I think I have mentioned that I am
```

```
not going to give too many opinions. I will note one factual
1079
1080
     point, and that is that one of the things that expires is the
1081
     requirement in Section 325 of the Communications Act for good
1082
      faith negotiating, so that is one of the expiring provisions
1083
      that perhaps you might want to consider.
1084
          Mr. {Lujan.} Thank you. Mr. Dodge?
1085
          Mr. {Dodge.} I guess what I would say policy-wise is we
1086
      think that the law needs to be improved to address the
1087
      interest of consumers in two key areas, which are, one--I
1088
     mean, really, in the spirit of localism that consumers should
1089
     be able to get network programming during takedowns, and two,
1090
     folks in orphan counties, which are counties that actually
1091
     are in a state but don't receive signals from a DMA in that
1092
      state, should be given the opportunity to get local network
1093
     channels from their state.
1094
           Mr. {Lujan.} I would agree with that. Ms. Mago?
           Ms. {Mago.} First of all, let me say for the record
1095
1096
      that broadcasters are always in favor of good faith. We
1097
     negotiate in good faith all the time and will continue to do
1098
      that, as appropriate, to make sure the consumers are able to
     receive our signals, because that is very important. It is
1099
```

```
important for us to reach every single member of our
1100
1101
     audiences that we can.
1102
           I think as we look at this legislation, as I indicated
1103
      earlier, you have got to look at localism. Providing that
1104
      local into local service in all 210 markets is a very
1105
      important goal.
1106
           Mr. {Lujan.} I appreciate that.
1107
           Ms. {Kieley.} I would just say on behalf of public
1108
      television, that we recognize that these are very complex
1109
      issues, many of which are intertwined, and we are very
1110
     appreciative of the chairman and the leadership of this
1111
      committee for taking an early look at this piece of
1112
      legislation. And what we continue to look forward to working
1113
     with Congress as you look at these issues, we too are looking
1114
     at them, or early into the implementation, it feels, from the
1115
     passage of STELA, and we are looking closely--as I mentioned
1116
     to Ms. Eshoo's question, we first and foremost would want to
1117
     make sure that any type of legislation that looks at the
1118
      overall video competition would recognize a unique role that
1119
      local public television stations play in that marketplace and
     preserve some of the unique protections that have been in
1120
```

```
place for our local public television stations.
1121
1122
          Mr. {Lujan.} I appreciate that. Mr. O'Leary?
1123
           Mr. {O'Leary.} Congressman, I don't know that I have a
1124
     whole lot to add at this point. I don't disagree with
1125
     anything I have heard.
1126
          Mr. {Lujan.} That is a good answer.
1127
          Mr. {O'Leary.} All right, I will stop.
1128
          Mr. {Lujan.} Ms. Gore, does the FCC have information on
1129
     how many consumers are receiving distant signals, how many of
1130
     those households are receiving distant signals because
1131
     Congress has grandfathered them in during previous satellite
1132
     authorizations?
1133
          Ms. {Gore.} No, Mr. Lujan, we do not have that
      information. That is not provided to us. We don't track how
1134
1135
     many distant signal subscribers--
1136
           Mr. {Lujan.} Does anyone have that information?
1137
           Mr. {Dodge.} We don't actually have any grandfathered
1138
     subscribers at DISH.
1139
          Mr. {Lujan.} Okay. Anyone? No?
           Ms. {Mago.} I think it is uniquely in the hands of the
1140
1141
     carriers.
```

1142 Mr. {Lujan.} Okay, maybe we can go to the carriers and 1143 chat with them. Mr. Dodge, do you agree with Mr. O'Leary's 1144 statement that the current satellite royalty rates under 1145 Section 119 are only equal to the market rate from 1999? 1146 Mr. {Dodge.} Well, I agree with Mr. O'Leary on one key 1147 point. We certainly are all for fully compensating artists, 1148 you know, as they well deserve, and we are all for paying the 1149 market rate, so I guess in our view, the devil is in the 1150 detail of what a market rate should be. And if the proxy for 1151 that are retransmission rates today, we would argue that that 1152 is not a fair market rate, because it is not a fair fight 1153 today. In each DMA, you have got one broadcaster who 1154 effectively has been given a monopoly and plays all of the 1155 distributors off each other, and the rates are just going up 1156 100 percent each year. And we would put forth that those are 1157 not comparable market rates. 1158 But we also think the system today works where we sit 1159 down with the interested stakeholders, the MPA, the sports 1160 leagues, and negotiate what the rate should be after each 1161 reauthorization. And if we don't reach an agreement, then I believe it goes to the FCC or the copyright office to 1162

```
actually arbitrate that, and we have been able to reach
1163
1164
     agreement every reauthorization to this point.
1165
           Mr. {Lujan.} I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, and as I
     yield back, you know, it has been brought up about the
1166
1167
     economic consequences and whether there is a permit or a
1168
     reauthorization or STELA is not reauthorized, Mr. Chairman, I
1169
     hope that we are able to explore what the economic
1170
     consequences are one way or another, and what those impacted
1171
     parties will fully realize.
1172
           So thank you, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
          Mr. {Walden.} Gentleman yields back the balance of his
1173
1174
      time. Chair now recognizes the Vice Chairman of the
1175
      Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, Mr. Latta.
1176
          Mr. {Latta.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and
1177
     again, thanks very much to our panel for being here. You
1178
     know, these are really important questions. You know, I
1179
     represent what you might consider a suburban, rural-type
1180
     district, and when we had the switchover to digital, I knew
      it was going to--we got a lot of phone calls from people
1181
1182
      about--because, you know, TV viewing is something that is
      important to a lot of folks out there. I can remember one
1183
```

day I was doing courthouse conferences, and I think I had 1184 1185 five people in a row that came in and sat down and asked the 1186 exact same question about what was happening to their TV 1187 viewership, and so I know that these are very important 1188 questions to folks out there. 1189 And if I could, Ms. Gore, I would like to start with you 1190 with this question. Do television viewers--and this could be 1191 maybe a loaded question. Do television viewers understand 1192 how the current law works, and following up with that, what 1193 kind of complaints about satellite law does the FCC receive 1194 from viewers? Ms. {Gore.} Mr. Latta, we looked into that and I am 1195 1196 happy to report that the number of complaints that we got 1197 over the past year, 2012, was about--between 60 and 70 1198 complaints that were catalogued as in this category. They 1199 have shifted, over my experience with this subject area, from 1200 a focus on concern about distant signals, and now the 1201 questions are more about local stations. The questions--I 1202 can't break them down into individual categories, but 1203 basically there are some situations where a consumer is getting the local package and then for some reason, they are 1204

```
suddenly getting a different local package. And so they
1205
1206
     contact us to understand why that was changed, and there were
1207
     different reasons why it was changed. Sometimes it is an
1208
      error on the part of the satellite operator, and sometimes it
      is because that DMA map may have changed, and so it is
1209
1210
      something that is accurate.
1211
           The essence of those complaints actually seems to be
1212
      that consumers would like to choose the local stations that
1213
      they are offered, as opposed to being confined to those
1214
     within the DMA. I am not expressing an opinion, I am
1215
     reporting what their complaints are.
1216
           Mr. {Latta.} Let me just follow up with that just a
1217
      little bit. When you do get those complaints, how long does
      it take for the turnaround time for the FCC to get back to
1218
1219
      the consumer with those answers?
1220
           Ms. {Gore.} Well actually, typically we have our
1221
     wonderful call center folks who take a call, and they talk to
1222
      the person on the phone and they explain it to them. If they
1223
      submit a complaint in writing, then someone gets back to
1224
      them, and oftentimes, if it is a complaint that is
1225
      specifically about a particular satellite carrier, they will,
```

```
I believe they use the term ``serve'' that complaint on the
1226
1227
     satellite carrier in order to get a response. So there is a
1228
     process in place that has a certain time frame for the
1229
     satellite carrier to respond in that case. Every once in a
1230
     while, a consumer finds his or her way to me and we get to
1231
     have a lesson in copyright.
1232
          Mr. {Latta.} Well following up with that, if we could,
1233
      on the predictive model indicates that if a viewer can get an
1234
     adequate signal over the air, and is ineligible to receive
1235
     distant signal service, the law allows the viewer to
     challenge that finding on a location test. Do the viewers
1236
1237
     ever request such tests, and if so, what happens?
1238
           Ms. {Gore.} The tests would be requested from the
      satellite carrier, not from us, so I do not have data on
1239
1240
      that. I do not know how often it happens. It used to be an
      issue before. That used to be the topic of some complaints
1241
1242
      and inquiries. As I said, over the past year, we have not
1243
     heard any of those so--but I can't speak to that.
1244
      satellite carriers would know whether they are being
1245
      requested to arrange for tests.
          Mr. {Latta.} Well, I guess if I could then turn to DISH
1246
```

```
then to maybe answer that question. Do you get those types
1247
1248
      of questions that come in from the consumers, Mr. Dodge?
1249
           Mr. {Dodge.} Since today we provide local channels in
1250
     all 210 markets, we don't provide traditional distant
1251
     service, if you will, where that would really come into play,
1252
     but my understanding is historically, very few, you know,
1253
     back when we did provide those services.
1254
          Mr. {Latta.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
1255
     yield back.
1256
          Mr. {Walden.} Thank you. I thank the vice chairman for
     his work on this and other issues. I now recognize the fill-
1257
1258
      in ranking member from the great State of Vermont, Mr. Welch.
1259
          Mr. {Welch.} Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
1260
           Many of us on this committee represent rural areas, both
1261
     Republicans and Democrats, and many of the challenges that
1262
      folks face in rural areas, both consumers and some of our
1263
     broadcasters, seem to be different than some of the
1264
      challenges that urban areas face for consumers and
1265
     broadcasters. I really would be interested in the view of
     you who have so much experience about how you would describe
1266
     some of the particular challenges that tend to face folks and
1267
```

1268

broadcasters in rural areas. Ms. Gore, could I start with

```
1269
     you?
1270
           Ms. {Gore.} As I mentioned, the complaints that we get
1271
      or the inquiries that we get are often about the local
1272
     package, and sometimes, very often, that is a rural area
1273
     where consumers want to be able to get, perhaps, more of the
1274
     stations that are from their own state. I know that that has
1275
     been an issue in Vermont, historically, and in other places
1276
     as well.
1277
          Mr. {Welch.} But not just Vermont, right, I mean, that
      is a rural area as a whole?
1278
1279
          Ms. {Gore.} It is a rural area issue all across the
1280
      country. That was what we were talking about, which we
1281
      sometimes informally call the orphan county issue where the
1282
     country is in one state, but it is part of a DMA that is
1283
      located predominantly in another state, and so there are not
1284
     a lot of or perhaps any in-state stations available to those
1285
      consumers. It is a small problem, but it is a big problem
1286
      just in the way it is reported to me for those areas where
1287
      that occurs.
1288
          Mr. {Welch.} Thank you. I would like to really get the
```

```
benefit of each of you telling us your thoughts on the rural
1289
1290
     challenges. Mr. Dodge?
1291
          Mr. {Dodge.} Sure, and so I would echo everything that
1292
     Ms. Gore said. It is really the short market problem, it is
1293
     areas outside of our spot beams, as you would imagine, you
1294
     know, using Utah as an example. The corners of the state are
1295
     very rural, and then also the orphan county issue is a
1296
     predominantly rural issue, and that occurs in 40 states
1297
     today.
1298
          Mr. {Welch.} Do you have any suggestions on addressing
1299
      that?
1300
          Mr. {Dodge.} Yes. What we have historically proposed,
1301
     which I think is pretty darn fair, but let us use Colorado as
1302
     the example where we have two counties in the southwestern
1303
     portion of the state that are actually in the Albuquerque
1304
     DMA. Our proposal has always been that we will provide those
1305
      folks Albuquerque locals, but let us also give them one in-
1306
      state signal of their choice, preferably Denver, because our
1307
      spot beam covers down there, and ultimately let them choose
1308
     which they prefer.
1309
          Mr. {Welch.} Ms. Mago? Thank you, Mr. Dodge.
```

```
1310
          Ms. {Mago.} From the broadcaster's perspective, one of
1311
      the key challenges they face in the rural areas is making
1312
      sure they have enough revenues so they can continue to
1313
     provide the quality programming that they need to. But let
1314
     me address the DMA issue for just a moment, if I could,
1315
     please, because DMAs are not just sort of random boxes that
1316
     are put around. They are designed by the Nielsen Company to
1317
     reflect where viewers are actually listening to the stations,
1318
     and that is why they shift, as Ms. Gore was explaining.
1319
     shift when viewer patterns change. But for the most part,
     providing the local into local DMA market signal is going to
1320
1321
     address the needs of the county. There are a few places
1322
     where that becomes a little bit more challenging, and one of
      the things that the carriers can do is to provide the in-
1323
1324
      state programming that is not duplicating that network prime
1325
      time programming, and they can do that, and it has been done
1326
      in several areas to address the issue of making sure that
1327
      those that are in-state are able to receive their in-state
1328
      information.
           Mr. {Welch.} Thank you. Ms. Kieley?
1329
          Ms. {Kieley.} Congressman, I would say from public
1330
```

television's perspective, serving rural areas is a top agenda 1331 1332 item for us. We have a universal service mission, as I 1333 mentioned earlier, and we take that mission very seriously. 1334 I think part of our challenge, and with any paid television 1335 provider, is that on a broadcast--from a broadcast 1336 perspective, we serve over 98, close to 99 percent of this 1337 country with a free over-the-air signal, and it has been very 1338 costly to do that, and from a public television perspective, 1339 particularly in these rural areas. Rural areas, such as 1340 Vermont, often--your state, you would know quite well, can be 1341 mountainous and the terrain can be difficult, and for public 1342 television to serve those areas, we do that with a series of 1343 expensive equipment, many translators to fill in those 1344 coverage areas, and of course, in those areas we also have 1345 limited populations from which we can derive, you know, local 1346 support for our stations. And so we have a very robust 1347 broadcast presence in rural areas, from a public television 1348 perspective, and we very much appreciate the local into local 1349 that is part of the satellite bill that helps us to mimic 1350 that presence in satellite legislation. 1351 I would say, touching a little bit one other special fix

that public television has that was in the STELA law, we have 1352 1353 a unique situation where a handful of our states, about 21 of 1354 them, have statewide licensees are--the licenses are issued 1355 from the state to serve the residents of the entire state. 1356 Many of those rural, not all of them, but many of them are 1357 rural and so we were appreciative of the language in STELA 1358 that allows the satellite carriers, should they get the 1359 capacity, to serve those statewide licensees with the signal 1360 originating out of their state public television networks. 1361 Mr. {Welch.} Okay, thank you very much. I yield back. Mr. {Walden.} Just for the record, my district is seven 1362 1363 times the size of Vermont, plus, so--1364 Ms. {Kieley.} Many translators. 1365 Mr. {Walden.} District of many translators. We go now 1366 to Representative Shimkus from Illinois. 1367 Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of course, a 1368 great committee, great issues, a lot of fun. I have been on 1369 it a long time. 1370 I think every member should be issued a teenager in this digital age, because then you are up-to-speed on the new 1371 technology and how they watch, how they view movies. I was 1372

talking to my son just before we came out, and he is 1373 1374 watching--I have never seen it--``The Walking Dead'' and he 1375 can get first 2 years, I guess, he watches on the Internet, 1376 and then, of course, the third year, he can't. He has got to 1377 wait for the broadcast or whatever. And it just reiterates 1378 the difference of how people are viewing content and how they 1379 go about it, and so there is one benefit of a teenager. 1380 There are some disadvantages. I can talk about those later. 1381 So it is very exciting, and again, we want to support 1382 all of the work you do, and--but we are talking locally, too, and I was trying to--using my new technology and all this 1383 1384 stuff, figure out my DMAs. I think I got five, Springfield, 1385 Champagne, Decatur -- that is the only one that is in Illinois--St. Louis, Cape Gerardo, Paducah, and Terre Haute. So I 1386 1387 border three states, so we have this issue of the DMA and 1388 bleed over and the like, and we have just got to be careful, 1389 because in a congressional district that has any size, 1390 sometimes the folks will not want an Illinois signal. 1391 will want the St. Louis DMA and they want to be there, where 1392 there may be others who will say well, can't we get Illinois news, because we are in a part of the state where they are 1393

```
receiving Indiana station. So there is not a hard and fast
1394
1395
     rule of when you, you know, you want to default to one or the
1396
      other, based upon the citizens of that area, so it is very
1397
     tricky. I am just laying that out. We have experienced
1398
      that.
1399
           Let me ask a question on--does anyone know how many
1400
      actually short markets there are?
1401
           Mr. {Dodge.} There are 21.
1402
           Mr. {Shimkus.} And are there any in my--no, I mean,
1403
     because -- and so since there are 21, what is a way that we can
1404
     kind of fix that problem, and is that -- is this an avenue in
     reauthorization to try to do that?
1405
1406
           Ms. {Mago.} To some extent, the market is fixing
      itself. As I noted earlier, the -- with digital technology,
1407
1408
      stations are able to have multiple streams that they can put
1409
      out over their signal and they are, in fact, carrying--
1410
           Mr. {Shimkus.} Let me ask again, because I like that,
1411
      the digital answer, so I don't know the answer now, but the
1412
     digital cliff that we had initially, you know, the analog
1413
      signal went a long ways, and then we have digital TV and we
     have the digital cliff. Has technology pushed that digital
1414
```

```
signal back further out to meet the analog broadcast, or do
1415
1416
     we still struggle with that?
1417
           Ms. {Mago.} You know, the Commission did a lot of work
1418
      in terms of trying to raise power levels to make sure that
1419
     you were, in fact, duplicating those coverage areas that had
1420
     been there before, and we are about to face it again as we
1421
      look at the repacking that may happen as a result of the
1422
      incentive auctions and reclamation of some of the broadcast--
1423
           Mr. {Shimkus.} Voluntary incentive auctions.
1424
           Ms. {Mago.} Voluntary incentive auctions that will be
     part of that. The repacking part has never been voluntary.
1425
1426
     They hate it when I say that, but the repacking is not--has
1427
     never been voluntary, and that is going to cause some issues,
     but I think for purposes today, the spot beams that are
1428
1429
     provided on the satellite can help to bring in some of that
      service as well.
1430
          Mr. {Shimkus.} Okay, let me finish up. I have got 1
1431
1432
     minute left, and I agree with a lot of folks who are talking
1433
     up here. Everyone views that there is some anachronism in
1434
      the law, so that could be dealt with, so going--starting with
     Mr. Dodge, what would be anachronism that you would like to
1435
```

```
get solved in a reauthorization or a rewrite in the law?
1436
1437
     Anything?
1438
          Mr. {Dodge.} I would--
1439
          Mr. {Shimkus.} This is trying to smoke you out to say,
      okay, what is your problem? What do you want fixed? I am
1440
1441
     using a big word. I usually don't use them that much.
1442
          Mr. {Dodge.} Sure. I would say the anachronism writ
1443
      large in all these laws is the fact that it is an unfair
1444
      fight in retransmission consent negotiations today, and the
1445
     people that suffer are the consumers, because there are more
1446
     and more takedowns occurring. I think in 2010, there were
1447
      roughly 10, 2011, there were 50, last year there were 100,
1448
     and it is the consumer that is paying the price. So I thin
      that needs to be fixed. Consumers need to keep getting the
1449
1450
      signal during the -- you know, while we work it out with the
1451
     broadcasters, so to speak. And I would also say the orphan
1452
      county issue is an anachronism of the whole system that needs
1453
      to be worked out, and I think you raised a very good point.
1454
      I mean, it may very well be that folks in southwestern
1455
     Colorado prefer watching Albuquerque stations because they
     buy their Chevys in Albuquerque and they want to see those
1456
```

```
advertisements. But I think we should give them the
1457
1458
      opportunity to make that decision for themselves.
1459
          Mr. {Shimkus.} Okay. I am going way over my time. If
      I can get, Mr. Chairman--so why don't we just go down the
1460
1461
      line? Thanks.
          Ms. {Mago.} First of all, you may have seen me kick Mr.
1462
1463
     Dodge under the table. We think that the retransmission
1464
     consent negotiations are going forward. There have been a
1465
     few--
1466
          Mr. {Shimkus.} This is what we want. I have been
      trained by Billy Tozan to get the fight going, so--
1467
          Mr. {Walden.} Maybe this was the education--you missed
1468
1469
      the previous.
1470
          Ms. {Mago.} DISH Network has been involved in a number
1471
     of those disputes, but we all try to work them out together
1472
     and will continue to do that. I will note also, Mr. Shimkus,
1473
     that I determined that there are no short markets in your
1474
     district--
1475
          Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you.
           Ms. {Mago.} --so that is an issue that you don't need
1476
1477
     to worry about.
```

```
Ms. {Kieley.} I would just echo my earlier comments and
1478
1479
      say we think this is a very complicated process and we
1480
      appreciate being included from the very beginning, and we
1481
     will be looking for those anachronisms in the law along with
1482
     you.
          Mr. {O'Leary.} The only thing I would say, it goes back
1483
1484
      to what I said at the outset which I think that as a
1485
      threshold, the committee, the subcommittee should look at
1486
     whether or not the role of government, as it was originally
1487
     constituted, you know, 20 years ago, 30 years ago, what have
     you, is still applicable in the current state that we are in
1488
1489
      right now. I think that is the single biggest issue that
     needs to be addressed.
1490
1491
          Mr. {Shimkus.} Thank you.
1492
          Mr. {Walden.} Okay. We now turn to the former vice
1493
      chair of the committee, Mr. Terry, for 5 minutes if you have
1494
     questions.
1495
           Mr. {Terry.} Sure, why not. It has been asked several
1496
      times before, but I haven't asked it. I am slightly confused
1497
      on the local into local, and here I will just lay out the
     scenario. In the Sand Hills area in the middle of Nebraska
1498
```

1499 where very few reside, the only option is satellite. In an 1500 area that is right outside of -- in Nebraska, pretty good size 1501 town that has their own TV stations, in North Platte, 1502 Nebraska, but yet the satellite for that area, even just 1503 barely outside of the signal range from those stations, they 1504 get Denver. And the networks that cover--if you are cable or 1505 in the signal, get the Husker games and the Husker news, and 1506 people around Plattsmouth that get their satellite get Denver 1507 Broncos news, they don't like that. They like the Broncos, 1508 but they want the Huskers. So what is the technology issue here? What is forbidding the satellite companies from being 1509 1510 able to put in the local TV that is an hour drive, hour and a 1511 half drive from these areas? Mr. Dodge, since you are a 1512 satellite guy, I will let you try and answer that. 1513 Mr. {Dodge.} I am indeed. Well, with all due respect 1514 to what Ms. Mago said about the DMA system, I think it is 1515 largely a DMA system issue. We view it largely as a system 1516 that was set up in the 1950s based on what people were 1517 watching back then, and although theoretically DMAs shift 1518 over time based on actual viewership, there really is no way to change that viewership if you can only provide the local 1519

```
signal authorized for each DMA into that DMA. If, for
1520
1521
      example, we were allowed to do what I proposed for
1522
      southwestern Colorado, which is give people the choice
1523
     between Albuquerque and Denver, then over time, it may switch
      to Denver, but to Congressman Shimkus's point, it may not
1524
1525
     because those people may actually be interested in
1526
     Albuquerque. Our view is let them decide and then maybe the
1527
     maps shift.
1528
          Mr. {Terry.} How about if the people in the area have
1529
     actually received a letter from the FCC saying that they
     should be getting the North Platte TV stations? Is there a
1530
1531
      technical reason why the satellites couldn't do that area?
1532
           Mr. {Dodge.} I think what you are referring to is a
     case of significantly viewed, perhaps?
1533
1534
          Mr. {Terry.} Yes.
1535
           Mr. {Dodge.} I am not sure what their specific reason
1536
      is in that particular area, but generally speaking, the
1537
     problems we have had with significantly viewed are
1538
      technology-wise, the signal that is significantly viewed may
1539
      or may not be on the same spot beam as the local channel,
     which makes it very difficult to provide, and then there are
1540
```

```
also contractual issues sometimes where the station being
1541
1542
      invaded, so to speak, might condition their retransmission
1543
      consent unless not importing a signal, but similarly, we have
1544
      to get the consent of the station we want to import to
     actually do the importation, and they may not grant us that
1545
1546
      consent.
1547
           Mr. {Terry.} Okay. I don't know if that is the issue.
1548
      I would think that would be odd that they don't want somebody
1549
      100 miles away from their station not to see their station.
1550
     But the answer is the technology changes would be too costly,
     and I just didn't understand what that entailed, the
1551
1552
      technology changes.
1553
           Mr. {Dodge.} Yeah, typically the issue is that the
      station that folks desire to import or that is significantly
1554
1555
     viewed is not on the same spot beam as the local market.
1556
           Mr. {Terry.} How much generally does that cost a
1557
      satellite company?
1558
           Mr. {Dodge.} It depends. Satellites cost typically
1559
      these days about $350 million a piece, so--
1560
           Mr. {Terry.} Okay, so you would have send up a whole
1561
     new satellite to bring that--
```

```
Mr. {Dodge.} In certain cases, yes.
1562
1563
          Mr. {Terry.} Okay, interesting. Well, my time is
1564
     almost up, but I am not done yet.
          Mr. {Dodge.} We would be happy to get the specifics of
1565
1566
      that particular issue for you.
1567
          Mr. {Terry.} You have them. You may not, personally,
1568
     but your company does.
1569
          Mr. {Walden.} Gentleman yields back the balance of his
1570
      time. Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr.
1571
     Scalise, for 5 minutes.
          Mr. {Scalise.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the 101
1572
1573
     hearing we are having to start getting into this. Of course,
1574
      the reason we are here is because STELA expires. The laws
1575
      that we are discussing today have sunset provisions and that
1576
      is why we get to these various iterations, and it forces
1577
     Congress to come back and look and work with industry and say
     what works, what doesn't work, and you know, hopefully when
1578
1579
     we are going into the next iteration before the expiration of
1580
     STELA at the end of next year, we address the problems and
1581
      the changes in the marketplace. It is a very dynamic
     marketplace. A lot of you have done some wonderful things to
1582
```

allow and bring high definition and great programming to more 1583 1584 people, and so that sunset provision allows that to happen. 1585 Now, you know, as we look at the broader marketplace of 1586 video regulations, most of them do not have sunsets, and I would be curious to take--it is more a policy question, so 1587 1588 Ms. Gore, I will hold you harmless on this one, but I would 1589 be curious to see what the rest of the panel, what your 1590 thoughts are and not just looking at Section 119, but having 1591 sunset provisions on all of these laws that we would then 1592 force Congress to go back and say what is working, and what isn't, not just in the satellite arena, but in the others? 1593 1594 I will start with you, Mr. Dodge. 1595 Mr. {Dodge.} And I think since 119 is the actual statute that is expiring at the end of 2014, people tend to 1596 1597 look at just that and say I like this or I don't like that. 1598 It should sunset, it shouldn't. And our view of the world is 1599 if you are going to consider letting that sunset, it is a 1600 much broader discussion. We do think there are problems with 1601 I have mentioned a bunch of those today. 1602 are going to let that sunset, then I think you have to look at the entire mosaic, if you will, or quilt of all the 1603

```
statutory copyright licenses, 122, the cable licenses,
1604
1605
     because in my view and as long as I have been involved in
1606
      this, they are all interrelated, and you can't just throw out
1607
      119 and not look at things like must carry, retrans, et
1608
     cetera, et cetera. And I think it is a discussion that is
1609
     worthy of having.
1610
          Mr. {Scalise.} Maybe another day we will have that
1611
     discussion. Ms. Mago?
1612
           Ms. {Mago.} Well, if you letting me go outside of the
1613
     realm of the specific hearing that we have here, I mentioned
1614
      the broadcast ownership regulations are ones that we have
     advocated for some time need to have some relook at them.
1615
1616
           Mr. {Scalise.} I agree with you there. Thank you. Ms.
1617
     Kielev?
1618
          Ms. {Kieley.} Thank you. I would echo, it is very
1619
      complicated and very intertwined. Many of these pieces are
     very intertwined and we do just hope, you know--public
1620
1621
      television are must-carry stations and doing things like
1622
     doing away with the compulsory license could actually -- even
1623
      though we aren't involved in retransmission consent, could
      impact public television stations and so we are just
1624
```

appreciative that the committee is taking an early look at 1625 1626 this and hope that they will continue to look at how 1627 intertwined these issues are, and what the unique needs of 1628 local public television stations are. Mr. {O'Leary.} Congressman, I would agree with what you 1629 1630 said. I think it is never a bad idea to have Congress go 1631 back and see what is working and what is not working. I 1632 think implicit in your question is the simple fact that these 1633 thing are intertwined and that if you look at them 1634 collectively, you are more likely to have a better view of what works for the consumer in the long run and so I would 1635 1636 agree with what you are saying. 1637 Mr. {Scalise.} Thank you, and I think you had talked in your testimony about, you know, what is it that consumers 1638 1639 really want? Consumers, you know, they want content. 1640 want the entertainment. They are not--they don't necessarily 1641 want to have--they don't want to buy a satellite dish, they 1642 want to have the content and the entertainment that comes 1643 with it. They don't want cable or fiber optic, that is not 1644 why they are paying the monthly bill. It is because of what comes in, and so when you look at what they are really 1645

```
interested in, is it the broadcast signal that they are
1646
1647
      interested in or is it the content that comes with that
1648
     broadcast signal?
          Mr. {O'Leary.} Well, I think quite honestly it is a
1649
      little bit of both. I think that there is--you know, people
1650
1651
     want local broadcasters for news and things like that. I
1652
      think they want content. I think the short answer,
1653
     Congressman, is consumers want everything right now, and the
1654
     good news is that they are living in an era where you have
1655
     got a better chance of getting everything than you did
     before. You look at the television as it existed when we
1656
1657
     were children and you look at the television that our
1658
     children are growing up with, those are vastly different
     platforms, frankly, and in the future, it is going to be even
1659
1660
     more. I think the real question and the question which is
1661
     underlying the entire discussion today is what is the proper
1662
     role of the government in terms of facilitating that
1663
     happening? And my focus, frankly, is on the compulsory
1664
      licenses because we think they unnecessarily dampen the
     development of that market. But to your question, it bears
1665
      looking at all of the different issues that are before us.
1666
```

```
Mr. {Scalise.} Okay, last question before I run out of
1667
1668
      time. Ms. Mago, when you look at what has happened with--of
1669
      course, DISH is here, DirecTV, the ability to negotiate with
1670
     cable companies for their copyright content, we have seen in
     a real dramatic expansion of cable companies, you have got
1671
      the Food Network, Nickelodeon, a lot of these other pay TV
1672
1673
     companies that have seen real expansion in their viewership
1674
     because of their ability to negotiate in a more open
1675
     marketplace. Would you say that the same kind of marketplace
1676
     should exist with the retransmission consent, with
     compulsory, with--
1677
          Ms. {Mago.} For local stations, the signal that they
1678
1679
     put together is the amalgamation of all of the programming,
1680
     and there is many, many different kinds of authorizations,
1681
      licenses, that one needs to get in that area. Our members
1682
      continue to be concerned that trying to put that together on
1683
     a local station basis is one that is a difficult process.
1684
           Mr. {Scalise.} Thank you. We can continue that
1685
      conversation and look forward to it, but I appreciate all of
     your input today for being here. I yield back.
1686
          Mr. {Walden.} Thank the gentleman. Chair now
1687
```

```
recognizes the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Gardner, for 5
1688
1689
     minutes.
1690
           Mr. {Gardner.}
                           Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for
1691
     holding the hearing today. I just wish my colleague from
     Nebraska was still here so we could give him a hard time for
1692
1693
     wanting to watch Nebraska football.
1694
           Mr. {Walden.} He may be watching on a distant signal
1695
      somewhere in an orphan area.
1696
           Mr. {Gardner.} I don't have much room to talk, though,
1697
      according to some of the performance we have seen the past
      couple years out of some Colorado teams, so I will just stop
1698
1699
     with that.
1700
           But I wanted to particularly welcome Mr. Dodge to the
1701
      committee today. As a result of redistricting, DISH is a
1702
      constituent company and I am glad that you could be here
1703
      today, and all the witnesses, thank you for your time.
1704
           I wanted to just talk briefly about some of the issues
1705
      that most of you have touched on already at various times
1706
      throughout the testimony and so to Mr. Dodge, can you just
1707
      give me a quick explanation -- the committee a quick
      explanation, what would happen if STELA were to expire and
1708
```

```
1709
     what would that effect be on consumers across the country?
1710
          Mr. {Dodge.} Yeah, with respect to DISH particularly,
1711
      it would mean that the short markets I described, those folks
1712
     would no longer be at level playing field with folks in other
1713
     markets around the country, because they would lose whatever
1714
     affiliates are not represented in their particular DMAs.
1715
     They would lose the ability to access that programming.
1716
     Similarly, folks who are outside of our spot beams would lose
1717
      their local channels. RVs and commercial trucks would no
1718
      longer be able to get network programming via satellite. And
1719
     with respect to DirecTV, who doesn't provide local service in
1720
     all markets, they would lose the ability to provide network
1721
     programming to folks who are unserved by their local
1722
     broadcast stations, and presumably, they would lose
1723
     subscribers who have been grandfathered from prior Satellite
1724
     Home Viewer Act reauthorizations.
1725
           Mr. {Gardner.} Ms. Gore, would you add anything to
1726
      that, or want to add anything to that, if you can?
1727
          Ms. {Gore.} No, I think that covered the list that I am
1728
     aware of.
          Mr. {Gardner.} Ms. Mago?
1729
```

```
1730
           Ms. {Mago.} Only to note that I think, again, as I said
1731
      in my testimony, that that is a diminishing number as we go
1732
      through the various fixes that are happening, including
1733
      addressing the issues in short markets through the stations,
1734
      channels, and such things.
1735
           Mr. {Gardner.} Okay, and then I wanted to take another
1736
      opportunity at Mr. Dodge to perhaps have you respond to
1737
      something that was in Ms. Mago's testimony, and I believe it
1738
     was stated on page seven, ``That today over 98 percent of all
1739
     U.S. television viewers have the option of viewing their
1740
      local network affiliates by satellite'', and then goes on to
      say ``With few exceptions, there are no unserved viewers in
1741
     areas in which local into local satellite transmissions are
1742
1743
      available, and that accordingly, no public policy justifies
1744
      treating satellite subscribers in local into local markets as
1745
     unserved and therefore eligible to receive distant network
1746
      signals.'' It talks a little bit about viewing that language
1747
      as perhaps a loophole, but I was wondering if you could
1748
     respond to that assertion and whether or not you view that as
1749
      a loophole, and what would happen to your customers if that
1750
     were to change?
```

```
1751
          Mr. {Dodge.} Yes, we don't view that as a loophole.
1752
     view that as exactly what the law says, which is if there is
1753
     a retransmission dispute, then we are no longer offering a
1754
      local affiliate related to that network, and we are allowed
      to import a distant signal to folks who are unserved in the
1755
      traditional sense, meaning they don't get an off-air signal
1756
1757
     of decent quality.
1758
          Mr. {Gardner.} Okay, and then to both you and Ms. Mago
1759
     as well, conditions in the law sometimes prevent viewers from
1760
     getting access to the programming they really want.
      talked about that here. Broadcasters can waive some of these
1761
1762
      conditions on a case-by-case basis, and do they ever, and if
1763
     not, why not? I guess Ms. Mago, I will start with you.
1764
           Ms. {Mago.} I think Mr. Dodge said a little while ago
1765
     that that doesn't really happen on the DISH Network, as I
1766
     understood it. If I misunderstood your question, I am sorry,
1767
     but in terms of the broadcasters, what broadcasters are
1768
      looking for is to make sure that they are able to serve their
1769
     audiences and continue to be able to do that by having local
1770
     viewers. We are able to do that, maximize the amount of the
     revenues that we can then plow back into the better service,
1771
```

and that is why we look at those markets and make sure that 1772 1773 the local into local service is there. It helps the viewers 1774 themselves because they are able to get whatever local 1775 weather information and other things that are important to them, and that is why we continue. 1776 1777 Mr. {Gardner.} Do broadcasters ever do the waiver, 1778 talking to--1779 Ms. {Mago.} There are a few that I know of that have 1780 done that. I think it is becoming less now because one of 1781 the concerns that was waivable for a while was that the high definition programming wasn't available through the 1782 1783 satellite, and we are now getting to the point where that is 1784 always going to be available for the local stations as well. 1785 I am aware of a marketplace in Wilmington, North Carolina, and the local station there, in fact, had granted a waiver to 1786 1787 allow the distant signal to come in because it was more--it 1788 was high definition when the local signal was not. I am 1789 hoping that has been corrected. 1790 Mr. {Gardner.} And the good news for Mr. Terry is that 1791 in a couple of years, the Cornhuskers and the Buffalos will be playing again, so he will be able to at least watch that 1792

```
1793
     game, even if it comes from Colorado.
1794
           Ms. {Mago.} That sounds like many--
1795
           Mr. {Gardner.} To that point, the discussion that we
1796
     have had, we have talked about the markets and I quess for
1797
      the entire panel as I run out of time here, do we know how
1798
     many viewers are assigned to a designated market area that is
1799
     not within their state? So I know we have identified the
1800
     number of areas, but do we actually know or have an idea of
1801
     how many viewers are there?
1802
           Ms. {Mago.} I am sorry, I don't.
1803
           Mr. {Dodge.} I do know in Colorado I believe it is
      10,000 folks or TV households--
1804
1805
           Mr. {Gardner.} The southwestern part?
           Mr. {Dodge.} Yes, in those two counties, but
1806
1807
     nationwide, I don't have the number off the top of my head.
1808
           Mr. {Gardner.} Okay.
1809
           Ms. {Kieley.} From a public television perspective, I
1810
     know we had about 21 of our statewide licensees that were
1811
      impacted by that, with some states it being a much bigger
1812
     problem. For instance, in Wyoming, I believe that -- I think
      it was close to about 75 percent of viewers in that state
1813
```

```
resided outside of--from a public television perspective, the
1814
1815
     DMA where our public television station had all three of its
1816
      transmitters located, so it varies from state to state, but
1817
     for public television, some of those areas out West and in
1818
      smaller parts of the East were problematic.
1819
           Mr. {Gardner.} Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your
1820
      leniency with the time.
1821
           Mr. {Walden.} No problem. We are going to move now to
1822
      the gentlelady from North Carolina, a new member of our
1823
     subcommittee. We are delighted to have Renee Ellmers with
     us, and we look forward to your questions as we wrap up this
1824
1825
     hearing.
1826
           Mrs. {Ellmers.} Great, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am
     happy to be here. I apologize for being late. I had dueling
1827
1828
     subcommittees going on, so thank you to our panel for being
1829
     here as well.
           Ms. Gore, I have a question for you. Are there
1830
1831
      instances where the local broadcaster as defined by the
1832
      statute is not actually carrying news, alerts, closings,
1833
      sports, civic affairs, and other content in the viewer's
1834
     state?
```

1835

```
Ms. {Gore.} Yes, I believe there are those situations.
1836
     That plays into what we have been talking about as the orphan
1837
      county situation, so that technically on paper it may appear
1838
     that there is an in-state station in the DMA, but it may be a
     station that its programming does not include news or weather
1839
     or traffic or public affairs of that sort. I am sure they
1840
1841
     are meeting their public interest requirements that Ms. Mago
1842
     would know about.
1843
          Ms. {Mago.} Yes, they are.
1844
           Ms. {Gore.} But they don't necessarily have the kind of
     newsroom, staff, or situation to cover breaking weather
1845
1846
     events or something of that sort.
1847
           Mrs. {Ellmers.} Thank you, and I have question, and I
     would like for each one of the panel to give a guick, you
1848
1849
     know, brief response. You know, because this is kind of our
1850
      introductory hearing on this issue, we are not yet debating
1851
     on how to change the law, so to speak, but we do need to know
1852
     what the main problems are. So if every panelist could just-
1853
      -without, you know, giving us a solution, so to speak, just
1854
     kind of touch on the problems that we need to be aware of,
     what your main issue is with the law and how we can be
1855
```

```
looking towards the future. And I will start with Ms. Gore.
1856
1857
          Ms. {Gore.} Well, as I mentioned, I am not here to talk
1858
     about any problems we have with the law. I will only say
1859
     that there seem to be some circumstances where perhaps the
     hope was that the availability of significantly viewed
1860
1861
      stations might help to alleviate of the concerns that some
1862
     consumers have had, and I am not sure if the significantly
1863
     viewed option is being taken advantage of as often as it
1864
     might be. My colleagues would know more about that, and also
1865
     would know more about why that might be.
1866
          Mrs. {Ellmers.} Okay. Mr. Dodge?
           Mr. {Dodge.} I would say the biggest thing we would
1867
1868
     like to see remedied is having the retransmission consent
     process be put on a more level playing field between the
1869
1870
     broadcasters and the distributors, and fixed in such a manner
     that consumers don't inevitably lose access to network
1871
1872
     programming during disputes.
1873
           Mrs. {Ellmers.} Perfect.
1874
          Ms. {Mago.} And I, of course, disagree with what Mr.
     Dodge just said, but I would also say that our biggest issue
1875
      is that we want to encourage local into local service.
1876
```

```
Mrs. {Ellmers.} Okav.
1877
1878
          Ms. {Kieley.} And I would say we are taking an early
1879
     look at the law and its implementation, and looking for any
1880
     problem areas that are there, but I will reiterate that we
1881
     were quite pleased with the process. We trust the process.
1882
      It worked quite well last time, and we are very appreciative
1883
      that our unique needs were addressed the last go around with
1884
     STELA, and we hope that if we come upon any of those issues
1885
     again, that we can again work with this leadership of this
1886
     committee and Congress.
1887
          Mrs. {Ellmers.} Excellent.
           Mr. {O'Leary.} From our perspective, it is very simply
1888
1889
      that the committee step back and take a look at the law and
1890
     determine, you know, we believe there are pieces of it that
1891
     are trying to solve a problem which no longer exists, and so
1892
     we would ask them to look at those, and then at a minimum, to
1893
     not expand those areas where we believe that the government
1894
      intervention has, you know, reduced our ability to be
1895
      compensated fairly for the work that we create.
1896
           Mrs. {Ellmers.} Well thank you. Thank you very much
      for your responses, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing
1897
```

```
me to wrap up this hearing, and I yield back.
1898
1899
           Mr. {Walden.} Thank the gentlelady from North Carolina
1900
     for her participation.
1901
           And I think we should have an online contest to name
1902
      this one ELOISE, but I have been struggling trying to figure
1903
     out how we would do that, so we will welcome your
1904
     suggestions.
1905
           Ms. {Mago.} Please just don't name it Stanton.
1906
           Ms. {Gore.} I actually worked on that the last time, so
1907
      I will get that back to you.
1908
           Mr. {Walden.} You would get that to me. I know it is
1909
     not weighing in on any policy, but the name is important, and
1910
     given four reauthorizations you have lived through.
1911
           We want to thank our panelists for testifying today. We
1912
     appreciate your input as we begin down this path. We will
1913
     have, obviously, additional hearings going forward, and I am
1914
     sure all of us will have lots of individual meetings going
1915
      forward to have these discussions. And so thank you all for
1916
     your participation, and with that, the committee stands
1917
     adjourned.
           [Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the Subcommittee was
1918
```

1919 adjourned.]