

FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN  
CHAIRMAN

FRANK PALLONE, JR., NEW JERSEY  
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH 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

June 1, 2015

The Honorable Mignon Clyburn  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Commissioner Clyburn:


Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology on March 19, 2015, to testify at the hearing entitled "FCC Reauthorization: Oversight of the Commission."

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 Monday, June 15, 2015. 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 Greg Walden

1. I understand that Ethernet and fiber services are better, faster technologies rapidly displacing demand for special access services. A recent analyst report points out that there are many Ethernet providers, and cable companies are major competitors. Time Warner Cable, Comcast and Cox are three of the top seven Ethernet providers – and they specifically market their services as replacements for special access. Doesn't this demonstrate a healthy, competitive market?

2. I understand that the Commission recently denied a waiver for an FM translator to be used by an AM station in Tell City, Indiana. The FCC cited a pending AM Revitalization proceeding as one of the reasons for denying the waiver; you thought that it would be better to deal with that waiver as part of the larger proceeding.

But in another and similar situation, the Commission was willing to grant Grain Management LLC a waiver of the designated entity requirements, even though the Commission had announced it would re-examine the requirements as part of a broader review of the designated entity program through rulemaking and the Chairman circulated that rulemaking to the commissioners shortly after the Commission granted the waiver. This doesn't seem consistent, and I'm not entirely sure why the one company got its waiver in the face of the large rulemaking while the other is left to wait.

What is the status of the AM Revitalization docket? Doesn't this apparent inconsistency seem like it sends mixed messages to small businesses?

3. The January 31, 2012, Lifeline reform Order states the Commission will determine an appropriate budget for the Lifeline program within a year of order. It has been over three years since this Order was adopted and the Commission has yet to adopt a budget for the Lifeline program. When will the Commission follow through on its order and adopt an appropriate budget for the program and what will that budget be?

### The Honorable Brett Guthrie

1. A concern has been raised with me by some of my local video distributors about the definition of the term "buying group" as it relates to program access rules. As a result of the restrictive definition, I understand that many multichannel video programming distributors are unable to avail themselves of the program access protections intended by statute since they negotiate the bulk of their programming agreements through their buying group, the National Cable Television Cooperative.

My understanding is that the Commission has been reviewing for a few years now a pending Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, which contained a tentative conclusion that the definition of buying group should be updated as it applies under the program access rules. Since no final decision has yet been rendered, what is the status of this rulemaking? Will the Commission take up this issue by the end of the summer?

### **The Honorable Mike Pompeo**

1. Section 224 of the Communications Acts establishes two formulas for determining the rate carriers pay utilities to attach their lines to utility poles – the cable rate and the telecommunications rate. While the FCC’s 2011 reforms attempted to equalize the rates produced by these two formulas, under certain circumstances the telecommunications rate formula may still produce significantly higher rates. Reclassifying cable broadband services as telecommunications services will subject cable operators to these higher rates. NCTA estimated the annual cost of these increased fees could be as high as \$150-200 million. This will have a detrimental effect on deployment, especially in rural areas where there are many more poles than in urban areas, and on adoption, as the higher rates will ultimately be borne by consumers.

- Commissioner Clyburn, you voted for the 2011 pole attachment rate reform – aren’t you concerned the reclassification walks those reforms backwards?

### **The Honorable Anna Eshoo**

1. Opponents of net neutrality suggest that the recently adopted order would lead to regulated rates for broadband. At last month’s Commission meeting you pushed back on that rhetoric. Can you point to an example of the FCC ruling that a rate is unreasonable in a context other than inmate calling or a tariff investigation?

### **The Honorable John Yarmuth**

1. The free exchange of information is at the heart of our democracy. All of us are well aware that television and radio political advertisements have saturated the airwaves since the Citizens United, SpeechNow, and McCutcheon decisions. Our constituents deserve to have as much information about these ad buys as possible. First, I want to commend the Commission for their ongoing work to expand the online public political file.

The FCC’s online political ad files have received approximately 5 million views, which shows that the public clearly has an interest in seeing who is spending money in politics. However, much of the data in the political ad files is not sortable/searchable. While projects like Political Ad Sleuth have done an effective job at making the data more accessible, I believe the FCC could significantly improve the usability of the files so that millions of Americans could more easily view the information.

- Will you commit to improving the political ad file to ensure that its data is fully searchable and sortable so that the public knows who is trying to influence them during election season?

### **The Honorable Yvette Clarke**

1. Commissioner Clyburn, I applaud your efforts to re-direct the conversation back to universal service reform and to the people who are not benefitting from this 21<sup>st</sup> century pathway,

particularly the incarcerated and their families. I want to hear more about your ideas to reform the inmate calling fees process.