

FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN  
CHAIRMAN

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA  
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS  
**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE  
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115  
Majority (202) 225-2927  
Minority (202) 225-3641

February 11, 2014

The Honorable Richard E. Wiley  
Chairman  
Wiley Rein LLP  
1776 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Chairman Wiley:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology on January 15, 2014, to testify at the hearing entitled “#CommActUpdate: Perspectives from Former FCC Chairmen.”

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on February 25, 2014. Your responses should be mailed to Charlotte Savercool, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to [Charlotte.Savercool@mail.house.gov](mailto:Charlotte.Savercool@mail.house.gov).

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Greg Walden  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Communications and Technology

cc: Anna Eshoo, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology

Attachment

## **Attachment —Additional Questions for the Record**

### **The Honorable Anna Eshoo**

1. In your testimony, you emphasized the importance of having communication laws that treat functionally equivalent services in the same manner, regardless of who provides them or how they are delivered to consumers. Under the 1992 Cable Act, cable providers are prohibited from taking down broadcast signals during a Nielsen ratings "sweeps week," yet there is no such prohibition for a broadcaster that pulls their signal during a retrans dispute. Do you support updating the law to ensure parity between broadcasters and cable providers?

2. I know that states are often closest to the ground and have significant experience dealing with competition and consumer protection activities. At the same time, I recognize that there is not always the jurisdictional distinctions as there were in the days of local and long distance phone calls. How should the FCC work with the states to ensure that consumers are protected in a broadband era?