| 1  | NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.                                     |
|----|---|
| 2  | RPTS JACKSON  |
| 3  | HIF082160   |
| 4  |   |
| 5  |   |
| 6  | OVERSIGHT OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS                       |
| 7  | COMMISSION  |
| 8  | TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 2016                                       |
| 9  | House of Representatives                                      |
| 10 | Subcommittee on Communications and                            |
| 11 | Technology  |
| 12 | Committee on Energy and Commerce                              |
| 13 | Washington, D.C.  |
| 14 |   |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 | The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:15 a.m., in     |
| 18 | Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Greg Walden     |
| 19 | [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.                     |
| 20 | Members present: Representatives Walden, Latta, Barton,       |
| 21 | Shimkus, Blackburn, Lance, Guthrie, Olson, Pompeo, Kinzinger, |
| 22 | Bilirakis, Johnson, Long, Ellmers, Collins, Cramer, Upton (ex |
| 23 | officio), Eshoo, Doyle, Yarmuth, Clarke, Loebsack, DeGette,   |

Butterfield, Matsui, McNerney, Lujan, and Pallone (ex officio).

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

Staff present: Gary Andres, Staff Director; Ray Baum, Senior Policy Advisor for Communications and Technology; Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director; Leighton Brown, Deputy Press Secretary; Rebecca Card, Assistant Press Secretary; Gene Fullano, Detailee, Telecom; Kelsey Guyselman, Counsel, Telecom; Tim Pataki, Professional Staff Member; David Redl, Chief Counsel, Telecom; Charlotte Savercool, Professional Staff, Communications and Technology; Dan Schneider, Press Secretary; Dylan Vorbach, Deputy Press Secretary; Gregory Watson, Legislative Clerk, Communications and Technology; Christine Brennan, Minority Press Secretary; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director; David Goldman, Minority Chief Counsel, Communications and Technology; Jerry Leverich, Minority Counsel; Lori Maarbjerg, Minority FCC Detailee; Ryan Skukowski, Minority Policy Analyst; and Andrew Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach and Member Services.

Mr. Walden. I call the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology to order and welcome our distinguished panel, the chairman and Federal Communication Commission commissioners, thank you for being here this morning. Good morning Chairman Wheeler. Commissioners, thank you all for joining us.

I want to start this morning with two points of personal privilege. First, would you all join me in wishing Commissioner Clyburn a very joyous and happy birthday? It is not every day you turn 30, including today. But, oh, well. We know you think of it as a present to be here with us today.

Thank you for your great service to the country and may you have many, many more wonderful birthdays ahead, not necessarily celebrated with us.

Second, today is the last hearing that my good friend of nearly 30 years, an extraordinary counselor, Ray Baum will serve as a member of our committee staff. As fate would have it, our parents were friends back in the 1930s. Ray and I won back the seats that our fathers had both held and both had been defeated by Democrats in, when we were elected to the Oregon legislature in 1988. He followed me as House Majority Leader and then later served as a member of the Oregon Public Utility Commission, appointed by a Democratic governor. And then another Democratic governor appointed him to serve as chairman of the Public Utility

Commission and he served as the chair of the state Federal-State

Joint Board on Universal Service as well. A really exciting

topic, if anybody wants to get too deeply into, Ray can take you

there.

He has given us more than the 5 years he committed, when I convinced him and his wife to come to Washington and I hope we all wish him well as he begins a new journey with the broadcasters. Ray, thanks for decades of strong, fair, and effective public service for Oregonians and all Americans. Godspeed on your new journey.

Ms. Eshoo. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Walden. I would yield to my friend from California.

Ms. Eshoo. I thank the chairman. We all wish Ray the absolute best because he has given his best here. He has always been a gentleman. He is a public policy expert. He has given his all to the committee and during times when it was difficult for him to do that because he was battling something in terms of his health but he never missed a beat. And I call that real dedication, dedication to not only our committee and the work and the responsibilities of this committee but ultimately for the American people.

So, God bless you, Ray. We are going to miss you a great deal. Thank you for everything that you have done on behalf of

87 | all of us.

Mr. Walden. The gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Lujan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And Ray, this is a surprise to me, sir, but I also had the honor of working with Ray Baum and learning from Ray Baum back when he was a utility commissioner and I was on the New Mexico commission as well. And it has been an honor working with you, Ray. Many successes and I look forward to continuing to work with you. You are a great, great person and you truly are an asset to America. I look forward to learning from you and working with you in your future endeavors.

Mr. Walden. Thank you. Now, on to our hearing.

We are entering what will most likely be, if tradition holds, the final chapter in the history of the FCC under Chairman Wheeler's leadership. As the record clearly shows, while we have worked together on many public policy issues, we have also been at odds at times on process and policy.

While the Commission began with a commitment to reform the agency from within, we know that the Commission has implemented only half of the recommendations of the 2014 FCC Process Reform Working Group. This is why I believe true reforms require changes in law that can transcend any particular chairman or any particular commission. The public deserves no less.

Unfortunately, sharp divisions within the Commission are widely

reported. With the rapidly changing communications marketplace, we have never needed this independent agency to work together for the public interest more than now.

And I have to admit there are times when I have expressed my displeasure with the FCC's actions and its failure to adhere to the will and intent of Congress. For example, notwithstanding passage of the bipartisan legislation requiring that existing JSAs be grandfathered from the FCC's controversial revisions to the ownership rules, the FCC's media bureau recently terminated a JSA in spite of this restriction, evoking a strong bipartisan rebuke. And the recent Senate report on how the chairman and his general counsel capitulated to the White House demands regarding net neutrality proceeding illustrates, without question, the willingness of agency leadership to subvert what I would call fair and open process to political pressure from the White House.

But that is not all. I am concerned about the FCC's actions regarding set top boxes and what that means for copyrighted programming and consumer privacy. While the FCC has wrapped its proposal in pro-competition and pro-consumer bunting a broad range of stakeholders, including content providers, program distributors, large and small, and civil rights groups have emerged pointing out that the proposal raises serious concerns about its downside. I am sure that we will hear more about that

from our other committee members today.

Meanwhile, the chairman has circulated a proposal to impose privacy rules on ISPs modeled on those for the old telephone network. Instead of making the proposal public for all to see, all the public gets is a fact sheet. Words matter, to quote others on this committee. Mr. Chairman, I call on you to make that proposal available for all to see, including for commissioners to comment upon. And I think that would be helpful and important.

And the chairman has circulated his plan to expand the Lifeline program to subsidize mobile and fixed broadband internet access and contemplates increasing spending by \$750 million. Again, because this proposal is not public, we have only the FCC's fact sheet to guide our understanding. While it appears the chairman has proposed a budget mechanism, certainly a necessary step, and reforms to combat waste, fraud, and abuse, which we support going after all of that, the devil is in the details as to whether they are meaningful details which we cannot see until the item is adopted and released. Notably absent from the FCC's marketing materials is a discussion of the financial impact of the proposal on the families that pay each month through fees on their phone bills to support the program.

These are all significant matters that will define how we communicate for years to come. It will not serve the American

people if they are resolved in a manner that ignores opposing views, discredits opposing input on its face, and gives short shrift to collaboration in favor of expediency. Good process -- openness, transparency, and accountability -- honest policy debate, and compromise are the catalyst for balanced, sustainable outcomes.

Finally, let me end with this. If all goes as planned, and it appears that it will, the incentive auction will begin on March 29th. And I commend the Commission and its staff and the chairman for moving this process along. It has been a very difficult road, never traveled before. I consider the legislation that got us here some of the most important work to have come out of our subcommittee, legislation that reflected bipartisan agreement, reached through debate and compromise. I think it is something we can all be proud of.

We all hope the auction is a success. And, of course, only time will tell. But, Mr. Chairman, you have recognized this is only the beginning of a very complex endeavor. I was pleased to see that your staff has already turned to the post-auction repack issues. There are, of course, controversies about the sufficiency of the 39-month time line and the \$1.75 billion set aside fund to fund it. In addition, I remain concerned about keeping translators and low-power television stations on the air

as appropriate under the rules. I remind the FCC of the age-old requirement that licensed stations supersede unlicensed uses of broadcast spectrum. Know that we take these issues seriously, and I know you do, and will continue to work closely with you and your team as this phase of the post auction proceeds to make sure that the intent of the law is followed and that free over-the-air broadcast programming is not adversely affected.

Again, thank you for your good work on the auction.

I guess I have used up all the time I had. So, with that,
I would recognize the gentlelady from California for opening
remarks and again thank the chairman of the Commission for the
work you do and for being here today.

Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to you. And welcome back to the chairman and each of the commissioners. It has been 4 months since you have been here. I think that you have made optimum use of the 4 months since you were last here because there are a series of actions that are being taken up at the Commission that I think put consumers first, strengthen competition and advance innovation.

At the top of that list is the agency's vote last month that would make it easier for consumers to buy a set top box or an app from someone other than their cable company. This technology neutral proposal means that any company will be able to

manufacture a set top box or design an app and sell it to consumers. Should a consumer wish to continue renting their set top box from their pay TV provider, they can. No one is going to take it away from them. I don't know if there is that much of a love affair with the set top box but if they want it they can keep it. Very importantly, the FCC's proposal is an opportunity to enhance access to independent and minority programming, giving consumers the ability to choose between set top boxes or apps with improved search functionality and user interfaces.

Nearly 50 years ago, the FCC took action to give consumers choice as to whether they wanted to rent their landline telephone from Ma Bell. Consumers not only saved money but innovation thrived in the telephone market.

The FCC is also busy in its efforts to modernize its Lifeline program to make broadband more affordable to low-income

Americans. This has long been the goal of, I think, the entire committee, certainly huge support on our side of the aisle. Under the proposal to be voted on next week for the first time ever, for the first time ever low-income consumers will be able to use the \$9.25 per month Lifeline support towards stand-alone broadband service. Access to broadband is the 21st century's lifeline providing a pathway to jobs, education, healthcare and so much more.

The FCC's action will further our nation's progress toward bridging the digital divide that has really haunted our country. We have looked for ways, talked about it, dreamed about it, hoped for it, and I think that this is a major step forward of reaching the goal, the President's goal of bringing high-speed broadband to 20 million more Americans by 2020.

In just a matter of days, the FCC will begin its first voluntary incentive spectrum auction with global mobile traffic expected to increase nearly eight-fold, eight-fold between 2015 and 2020 and wireless carriers taking steps to deploy 5G. I think it is critical that we continue efforts to free up more spectrum for both licensed and unlicensed use.

At the same time, the FCC will take critical action at its March meeting to protect the privacy of broadband consumers, efforts to continue to reform the special access mark. And Mr. Chairman, I hope this is just closed, done, accomplished at the end of this year.

Transition to Next-Gen 911 and ensuring the internet remains open and accessible to all Americans.

None of these are small tasks but taken together, not only individually, but taken together I think that this will leave a remarkable imprimatur on the country of this commission's work.

So, I thank you. I look forward to a lively discussion and

questions that you are going to be asked. And again, thank you for being here and the work that you are doing. And I yield back.

Mr. Walden. The gentlelady yields back the balance of her time. The chair recognizes the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Upton.

The Chairman. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to echo the words for Ray Baum and I would say, with apologies to the rest of the staff, I don't know of a more professional hard-working leader that we have had in Ray over the last 5 years. He has helped set the standard. We work as a team on both sides of the aisle. Yes, of course, we disagree from time to time on certain issues but we are not disagreeable and he has set that bar and we really appreciate his very hard work. I knew about his background before and he has been an integral cog in all that we have done and we all appreciate that friendship and professionalism from Day 1.

Chairman Wheeler and members of this committee, welcome back for sure.

Last November, the House did pass by a voice vote H.R. 2583, the FCC Process Reform Act, a testament of our bipartisan commitment to solidify the FCC as a model of openness, transparency, and collegiality. This committee has pursued FCC process reform on a bipartisan basis, going back to the 112th

Congress, and I am proud of our continued efforts to improve the function and transparency of our government.

2.77

Underscoring the need for this legislation are, of course, the continued reports of process failures and divisive partisanship at the FCC. The FCC is the steward of one of the most vibrant and innovative sectors of our national economy. Significant matters remain before it and the stakes are certainly high. The communications and technology sectors are among our nation's most precious economic assets, the pinnacle of innovation and something that we should be rightly so proud of.

Given the stakes, two of our FCC's most recent proposals are cause for concern. The Chairman recently presented his colleagues with a proposal to impose new requirements on the video subscription market and a new privacy regime for internet service providers. These proposals have the potential to harm the very sectors that they are attempting to preserve and stimulate. The Commission should look with a skeptical eye at calls to regulate part of a market at the request of competitors.

And as the chairman seeks to implement what is likely the final year of his agenda, it is no less important now that matters are addressed through a process that is open and transparent, informed through robust debate, and resolve through bipartisan compromise. These were procedures that once set the FCC apart

and should be returned to. It is only through this approach that we can avoid uncertainty and the threat to investments.

And I yield to Mr. Latta, Blackburn, and Cramer.

Mr. Latta. With that, I appreciate the chairman for yielding and I also want to thank the Commissioner for being with us today.

I am always continually amazed by the success and the productivity of the communications and technology industry. This dynamic sector is a bright spot in our economy, as it rapidly advances and evolves to meet consumer demands. Given the Federal Communications Commission's integral role in this marketplace, it is critical that Congress monitor its regulatory policies that impact the industry's success.

With that said, I am concerned with some of the actions and proposals emerging from the Commission. Take for instance, the set top box Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which seeks to replace the failed cable card regime with yet another government-dictated standard. And Congressman Green and I worked together to get our bill language inserted into stellar to eliminate the integration band, we intended to rid the marketplace of an outdated technological mandate. However, rather than allowing consumer demands and competitions to shape the industry, the FCC has placed it upon itself to inhibit the future of pay TV with unnecessary

government involvement. The NPRM will surely impede innovation and limit consumer choice.

With that, I look forward to today's hearing and I will yield back to the chairman. Thank you.

Mrs. Blackburn. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding. We are appreciative of the Commissioner's time in coming here before us this morning. There are concerns, as you have heard from some of the policies that you have moved forward with, net neutrality, municipal broadband. The actions that were taken in North Carolina and Tennessee in muni broadband were so radical that even DOJ didn't support what you were doing.

We also have concerns pertaining to AllVid and lessening of the protections that are there for patent holders and copyrights.

So, lots to discuss today. So, we thank you for your time and your preparation in being here. And I yield to Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Cramer. Thank you for yielding. Thank you to all three of you.

I guess I would just associate myself, as much as anything, with the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and put a finer point, perhaps on the set top box rule. While I have all the same concerns they have, I have a special particular concern about its impact, the disproportionate impact it would have on smaller video providers, rural video

providers, and a number of us are always looking out for the smaller, rural providers.

And then I would just one other issue and that is that I continue to hear from especially my rural telephone cooperatives of call dropping issues. And if maybe after the hearing somebody could hook up with my staff, I would like to get the latest from you all. Because we just heard from Tyler Kilde of Griggs County, for example. They are having as many as five complaints a month and that still seems awfully high. And I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. Walden. The gentleman yields back.

Mr. Cramer. And I love Ray, too.

I, too, served as a public service commissioner. He was legend then, too.

Mr. Walden. I thank the gentleman for his comments. And all time has been consumed. So, now we go to the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone of New Jersey for opening comments.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and also Ranking Member Eshoo. And thank you to all five commissioners for testifying today.

Anyone who thought the FCC would slow down this year certainly underestimated the agency. The Commission has teed up an impressive number of important issues, including the incentive

auction set to launch next week. The auction counts as one of the most ambitious efforts the agency has ever undertaken. The air waves that can be freed up through this auction, both licensed and unlicensed, will ensure consumers feel the full power of the mobile revolution.

But as important as it is to help consumers of mobile services, the auction can also be considered successful if it works for broadcast viewers as well. Back in New Jersey, we understand the importance of a seamless transition after the auction because disasters like Hurricane Sandy can strike at any time and when they do, viewers depend on their local broadcasters.

Fortunately, all five FCC commissioners have committed to ensuring viewers do not lose signal as a result of the repacking process. That is why I drafted the Viewer Protection Act to give them all the tools they need to keep this commitment. This bill will prevent viewers' TVs from going dark, while also ensuring consumers of mobile broadband benefit from the incentive auction as soon as possible.

Hurricane Sandy also showed the importance of phones in an emergency. When the hurricane hit New Jersey, we did not just watch our TVs or listen to our radios but we also looked to our mobile phones. Unfortunately, too many of those devices let us down when we needed them the most. And that is why I introduced

the Sandy Act so that we are better prepared the next time disaster strikes.

The Sandy Act has a number of common sense proposals to improve access to communications in a disaster. For instance, the Sandy Act would help ensure the customers of any wireless carrier can get signal, even if their own carrier service goes down. No one should be left without any bars on their phone when a compatible network is still working.

The bill would also create a database of critical personnel to keep public safety officials and the carriers in better touch during an emergency when every second counts.

I have been in close contact with both Chairman Wheeler and the carriers to talk about how to get this done and I want to thank them both for taking these issues so seriously. I am optimistic that we are close to a breakthrough that would put us in a better position for when the next disaster strikes.

And again, I think the chairman, Ms. Eshoo, and the commissioners for being here today. I look forward to today's discussion.

I have about 2 and 1/2 minutes left. I would like to split that between Mr. Doyle and Mr. Butterfield and yield first to Mr. Doyle.

Mr. Doyle. Thank you. I appreciate you yielding to me.

And I want to thank the chairman for holding the hearing. And to our witnesses, this is like deja vue all over again. These guys are here all the time. But welcome back. We are glad to see you.

The Lifeline program connects millions of people around the country to their only source of communication and I just wanted to take a minute to congratulate Commissioner Clyburn for her leadership on this issue and the efforts of the full commission to modernize this program and bring it into the 21st century.

I also want to commend the Commission on moving forward on broadband privacy reform. I agree that it is critical for FCC rules to be updated to suit our modern needs and that these rule recognize the privileged position ISPs hold in acting as gatekeepers for the rest of the internet.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say and I would be happy to yield back to you so that you can yield to our other colleague.

Mr. Pallone. I yield -- oh, yes. Thank you.

Mr. Doyle. It is just a matter of time.

Mr. Pallone. Oh, my God, we started out all right. I yield the rest of the time to Mr. Butterfield. Thanks.

Mr. Butterfield. Thank you, very much, Mr. Pallone. Let it be said that our colleague from Pennsylvania set a record today.

Thank you, Mike Doyle. I thought you were going to eat up all of that time.

But thank you, Mr. Pallone. Let me begin by sharing with my colleagues and thanking the commissioners for their incredible work and thank you for coming today.

I join my many other colleagues in applauding the Commission for expanding the Lifeline program to subsidize broadband services but I am afraid one of the unintended consequences of the current proposal would be the creation of a co-pay requirement on low-income participants of Lifeline, as well as a phase out of voice-only.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Commission to preserve a no-charge option for Lifeline participants who may not be able to afford even a modest co-pay and to maintain a voice-only option. It is crucial. It is crucial for Lifeline beneficiaries in my congressional district and across the country that the expansion of the program to include broadband will not be at the expense of essential voice services.

Regarding the set top box proposal, I am also concerned with the potential for many unintended consequences like many of those raised in the Op Ed written by Henry Waxman, including the ability to enforce copyright protections for content creators and distributors as well as the potential negative impact the proposal

455 could have on diversity and inclusion of minority voices. 456 Along with other stakeholders, I am concerned that the proposal could lead to a new forum of digital redlining. 457 Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include three 458 459 items into the record. Very briefly, the first letter is addressed to Chairman 460 461 Wheeler signed by ten civil rights organizations urging the 462 Commission to postpone the set top box proposal until a study can 463 be conducted. 464 [The information follows:] 465 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT 1\*\*\*\*\*\*\* 466

| 467 | Mr. Butterfield. Second, is an Op Ed from our good friend,       |
|-----|--|
| 468 | Henry Waxman, that cautions the Commission to explore the myriad |
| 469 | of unintended consequences that could arise from the set top box |
| 470 | proposal.  |
| 471 | [The information follows:]                                       |
| 472 |  |
| 473 | **************************************                           |

Mr. Butterfield. Finally, the third is a copy of comments filed by the Center on budget and policy priorities, which urges the Commission to not require any -- any cost sharing in order to participate in the Lifeline program because evidence shows that doing so would dampen low-income household's ability to participate.

[The information follows:]

| 483 | Mr. Butterfield. Thank you.                                     |
|-----|---|
| 484 | Mr. Walden. Without objection.                                  |
| 485 | Mr. Butterfield. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.                       |
| 486 | With that, I yield back and I thank you.                        |
| 487 | Mr. Walden. The gentleman's time has expired. All times         |
| 488 | has expired for opening statements. I want to again welcome the |
| 489 | chairman and the commissioners here this morning.               |
| 490 | And Chairman Wheeler, obviously, we are going to start with     |
| 491 | you this morning. Welcome back and I look forward to your       |
| 492 | comments.   |

STATEMENT OF TOM WHEELER, CHAIRMAN, U.S. FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION; MIGNON CLYBURN, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION; JESSICA ROSENWORCEL, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL
COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; AJIT PAI, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL
COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION; MICHAEL O'RIELLY, COMMISSIONER,
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

## STATEMENT OF TOM WHEELER

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the -- Mr. Walden. But we would ask you to pull that microphone pretty close. Thank you.

Mr. Wheeler. Let me start off with the topic that many of you were addressing and that is the upcoming spectrum auction. It is only going to be a week -- is it not coming through?

Mr. Walden. Yes, you have got to get it really close. Really close. There you go.

Mr. Wheeler. You know I have seldom been accused of not projecting and I will --

One week from today the green flag goes down on the incentive spectrum auction. As the committee has noted, this is the first time this has been tried in the world.

This committee developed the authorizing statute and you all have been very involved in the intervening years as the pieces

of the puzzle were being built. I would be terribly remiss if I didn't mention the incredible work of Gary Epstein and the Incentive Auction Task Force at the FCC in this regard. Gary and Howard Simons, along with an A plus team have rustled wrestled with issues that no one ever before has had to deal with and it brought us to the threshold of this historic auction.

Now, many have asked about the impact of the D.C. Circuit's decision that Latina Broadcasting should be provisionally certified to participate in the auction. That decision will not delay the March 29th start date for participating broadcasters to make their initial commitments.

After March 29th, as we always planned, the auction team will analyze the initial commitments and calculate the initial clearing target. We had said this process would take 3 to 4 weeks. The late hour inclusion of Latina will require us to update our data files and ensure that the auction system is properly functioning with the updated data prior to circulating the initial clearing target.

Staff is working through the operational effects of including Latina so that we can make those updates. But we have always planned the auction bidding in the reverse auction will begin in May and we still expect that will happen.

Insofar as the forward auction, in which the wireless

carriers participate, we will proceed with the previously announced schedule. There are 104 parties that have expressed interest, a 50 percent increase over the number of qualified bidders in the record-setting AWS-3 auction. Of course, not all applicants may become qualified bidders but we are currently working with them and plan to have a final list by April 6th. The forward auction, of course, will follow the close of the reverse auction.

In the coming weeks, we will continue our bidding education and training activities so that both reverse and forward auction bidders have plenty of time to become familiar with the bidding systems before the respective auctions begin.

We are finally at the point where we move from the theoretical to the real world. For months, various hypotheses have been put forward predicting one effect or another to happen in the auction. Next week, the wisdom of this committee in creating a marketplace that will begin to deliver market-driven decisions to replace all those studies and theories with real marketplace conclusions will begin.

I look forward to discussing this and other issues with you today. But before I conclude, I want to once again reiterate the need for Congress to become involved in the ability of Next-Generation 911 to protect Americans. Twenty-first century

lifesaving is being blocked by the realities of getting beyond 20th century technology. We at the FCC have done all in our power on this topic, including convening a year-long task force to report on the challenges being faced. That report is now complete and has been submitted to this committee. We look forward to working with you on this important priority.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wheeler follows:]

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 4\*\*\*\*\*\*

572 Mr. Walden. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And now we go to Ms. Clyburn for your opening statements.

Commissioner, go ahead.

573

574

STATEMENT OF MIGNON CLYBURN

Ms. Clyburn. Thank you.

Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, distinguished members of the subcommittee, please allow me to begin by offering my thoughts and prayers to the families and victims of this morning's attacks in Brussels.

I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before you this morning.

Competition, competition, competition. I tis a phrase we have heard Chairman Wheeler repeat time and time again but today, I wish to preview an axiom of my own: community, community, community.

In communities across this nation, be they urban or suburban, rural or tribal, there is a communications divide, a divide when it comes to broadband access, affordability and infrastructure and a divide when it comes to the speeds necessary to take advantage of all the internet has to offer.

This lack of connectivity has disadvantaged so many of our communities that Congress and the Commission wisely decided to act by taking a few simple steps to help bridge these chronic divides.

First, allow me to applaud the leadership of this

subcommittee as you consider commonsense proposals to streamline and lower costs associated with the deployment of broadband. I stand ready to work with you in support of bipartisan proposals that will speed the deployment of broadband to more Americans.

Second, I am pleased to have work collaboratively with my colleagues Chairman Wheeler and Commissioner O'Rielly to create a blueprint for rate of return carriers so that rural communities are not left behind.

Third, and this is critical, once connected broadband service must be affordable. The Commission has a statutory duty to ensure that services are affordable and that low-income consumers have access to advanced services comparable to those available in urban areas. But for far too long, the Commission has fallen short of this directive. We have the capacity, however, to change this.

The chairman has circulated an order that, if adopted, would put Lifeline on the soundest footing of all of our universal service programs. The proposal seeks to achieve this by declining support to providers, unless a neutral third party has determined that a household is eligible, eliminating duplicates, and requiring minimum standards.

Now, my office has been inundated with concerns about the call for minimum standards, particularly for mobile voice, but

the strongest part of the FCC's process, one that is the envy of regulators from across the globe is that our process enables parties to give and receive feedback. If parties believe that the current proposal does not strike the right balance, I have been clear from the beginning that I am open to taking and making appropriate adjustments and I plan to live up to that promise. I am committed to providing qualified Lifeline consumers with choice and competitive 21st century options. And I am committed to addressing those outstanding concerns that reflect the input of our state regulatory partners, as well as those forward-looking providers who are engaged and committed to real reform.

Finally, I am excited about the possibilities of 5G and its ability to fundamentally transform the way we live and interact with each other. I believe that the best way to deploy spectrum and the infrastructure required to deploy those 5G services is for the industry to talk with local governments and communities, for them to find out what the specific needs of the communities are and coordinate with them on how a 5G future can actually help those communities address their short- and long-term needs. Working together on these and other initiatives will bring communities closer together, ensuring that they are better connected and ready for the challenges facing them.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to speak with you this

morning and I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Clyburn follows:]

|| \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 5\*\*\*\*\*\*

645

646

| 647 | Mr. Walden. Thank you, Commissioner. We appreciate your   |
|-----|---|
| 648 | service on the Commission and your comments this morning. |
| 649 | Now, we go to Commissioner Rosenworcel. Good morning.     |

650

651

Now, we go to Commissioner Rosenworcel. Good morning. Welcome. We are glad to have you here. And please go ahead with your testimony.

STATEMENT OF JESSICA ROSENWORCEL

Ms. Rosenworcel. Good morning, Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, and members of the committee. Thank you for having me here today. And let me add my best wishes to the chorus for Ray Baum.

Last week I had the privilege of speaking in Austin, Texas at South by Southwest. It is a festival for the connected, a place to get a glimpse of the future. From virtual reality to robotics, it is all there on the streets of Austin.

Last week I also spent time in California in a rural farming community in the Coachella Valley. It is a place where most roads lead to fields but where broadband has not made its way to most households.

Now, I can say with confidence I am probably the only person who was in both of those communities last week. But as dissimilar as they seem, they have something in common. They both know that future lies in connectivity. They both know that access to modern communications is no longer a luxury. It is where we create. It is where we innovate. It is a necessity for full participation in civic and commercial life.

Now expanding this access is front and center at the FCC. We will shortly begin work on the world's first spectrum incentive

auction. We will have work to do to repack our nation's broadcasters. We are updated our universal service policies and we are exploring spectrum frontiers for 5G wireless service.

But I want to focus on two things we can do right now that will make a difference for the least connected and most-connected among us. We can make more space for Wi-Fi and we can help bridge the Homework Gap.

First up, Wi-Fi. The 2.4 gigahertz band, where Wi-Fi makes its primary home is getting mighty crowded. The demand for 5 gigahertz Wi-Fi is also growing. So, before we overwhelm Wi-Fi as we know it, we need more efforts to secure more unlicensed spectrum. There is no shortage of reasons why this is a good idea. Wi-Fi democratizes internet access. It helps wireless carriers manage their networks through the offloading of traffic and it encourages permissionless innovation, just like what I saw all last week on the streets of Austin. And it is responsible for more than \$140 billion in economic activity every year.

But historically, the legislative process has overlooked the value of unlicensed spectrum because it gets low marks in the scoring process at the Congressional Budget Office. Yet, this accounting misses the mark. It is outdated because the broader benefits of unlicensed spectrum to the economy are so great. So in any effort to increase the licensed spectrum pipeline, we need

to explore a cut for unlicensed. Call it the Wi-Fi dividend.

And right now at the FCC, we have a golden opportunity for a Wi-Fi dividend in the upper portion of the 5 gigahertz band. We have a consensus framework for testing this band for unlicensed use, while also protecting incumbent efforts to use it for vehicle safety. So, we need to work now with our colleagues at the Department of Transportation and the Department of Commerce and get this testing underway.

We also have unlicensed opportunities in the guard bands in the 600 megahertz band and millimeter wave spectrum at 64 to 71 gigahertz. We need to seize all of them.

Second, I want to talk about another issue that matters for the future of connectivity and that is the Homework Gap. Today, roughly seven in ten teachers assign homework that requires access to the internet but FCC data suggests that as many as one in three households in this country do not subscribe to broadband service. So, think about those numbers and where they overlap. That is what I call the Homework Gap.

So, if you were a student in a household without broadband, just getting homework done is hard. Applying for a scholarship is challenging. And while some students may have access to a smartphone, let me submit to you that a phone is just not how you want to research and type a paper, apply for jobs, or further your

721 | education.

That is why the Homework Gap is the cruelest part of our new digital divide. But it is within our power to bridge it and more Wi-Fi can help. In fact, in Coachella Valley, where I was last week, they are using Wi-Fi on school buses and turning ride time into connected time for homework. But more can be done. And modernizing a Lifeline program to support online access in households with school-aged children is critical. And I think the sooner we act, the sooner we bridge this gap and give more students a fair shot at 21st century success.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Rosenworcel follows:]

735 Mr. Walden. Thank you.

736

737

Now, we will go to Commissioner Pai. We are honored to have you before the panel again this morning. So, please go ahead.

STATEMENT OF AJIT PAI

Mr. Pai. Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, members of the committee, and the indefatigable Ray Baum, thank you for holding this hearing and giving me the opportunity to testify.

I want to focus this morning on two issues where this subcommittee has led and where, unfortunately, the FCC is falling behind: FCC process reform and broadband deployment.

I first want to begin by thanking the subcommittee for its long-standing focus on FCC process reform. While I firmly believe that the agency is at its best when it operates in a bipartisan, collaborative and transparent manner, unfortunately, the agency has not lived up to that standard recently. First, the FCC continues to be run in a partisan fashion. Since December of 2013, there have been 20 separate party-line votes at our monthly meetings. That is twice as many as under Chairmen Martin, Copps, Genachowski, and Clyburn combined.

Second, collaboration has fallen by the wayside. During my first 18 months on the job, Chairman Genachowski and Chairwoman Clyburn led us to consensus 89.5 percent of the time on FCC meeting items. Over the past 2 years, that number has dropped precipitously to 56.4 percent.

Reflecting this shift, the Chairman's Office frequently

shares non-public information with the press and select outside parties, while leaving commissioners in the dark. For example, 2 weeks ago, FCC leadership shared the chairman's Lifeline proposal with the New York Times and promoted it on a call with reporters before sharing it with my office. That is hardly an opening for good faith collaboration and it epitomizes how business is now done at the agency.

Third, the FCC continues to shun transparency. Just last week, the chairman's office denied a request from me and Commissioner O'Rielly to release the Rating Return Form Plan before we vote. Even though Commissioner O'Rielly helped write it and even though real advocates have told us that, quote, it is absolutely essential to see the written words on the page to understand the actual effectiveness of the reforms.

Or take the idea of being more transparent with our enforcement process. The FCC has had success in recent years proposing headline-grabbing fines but its follow-through has been abysmal. Since 2011, the FCC has proposed over \$374 million in fines but it has collected only \$7.8 million. That is a meager 2 percent recovery rate. Only with additional transparency can the public and this subcommittee hold the FCC accountable for this colossal failure.

Now, none of this has to be this way. When I testified before

this subcommittee a year ago, there was widespread agreement that the FCC's process was broken. The chairman, himself, acknowledged that legitimate issues had been raised. And he announced a process reform task force.

I took this project seriously and I suggested reforms.

Among other things, I suggested that the chairman provide final versions of an order a set time before we vote. I proposed that every commissioner respond when one of us proposes edits. And I suggested that every commissioner provide his or her input by a date certain.

After participating in dozens of meetings, the chairman's task force has accomplished nothing. Not a single reform has been made one year later. Indeed, the task force has proven to be a Potemkin village designed to persuade Congress that the agency is doing something on process reform and, hence, that legislation and oversight aren't required. But at this point, the only way to ensure meaningful FCC process reform is through legislation and vigorous oversight.

I want to turn next to the topic of broadband deployment and I salute the subcommittee for its leadership in this area. For its part, there is more that FCC can and should be doing. On spectrum, we need to open the 5 gigahertz band to unlicensed innovation, as Ranking Member Eshoo and I recently called for in

807 | a joint op ed.

We need to move forward with another 12,500 megahertz of millimeter-wave spectrum and we need to launch a rulemaking to study spectrum above 95 gigahertz.

On the wireline infrastructure side, we must continue to reform our rules for pole attachments. Let's reduce the cost that utilities charge internet service providers for preparing the poles and conduit. These make-ready costs, as they are known, are a major barrier to competitive entry and the subcommittee rightly targeted them as ripe for reform.

Let's exclude a pole owner's capital costs when establishing pole attachment rates. This would reduce broadband prices and spur deployment.

And let's start adjudicating pole attachment disputes with dispatch. Although the Commission has a special enforcement docket for these cases, complaints tend to languish. We have three from 2014 and two from 2015 still pending. We need to be adjudicating those in weeks not years.

Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, members of the subcommittee, thank you once again for holding this hearing. I look forward to answering your questions and working with you to ensure a better future for all Americans and, particularly, the Kansas Jayhawks.

| 830 | [The prepared statement of Mr. Pai follows:]                 |
|-----|--|
| 831 |  |
| 832 | **************************************                       |
| 833 | Mr. Walden. Wow, that last point kind of got slipped in      |
| 834 | there!   |
| 835 | Speaking of which, Chairman Wheeler, I didn't see Ohio State |
| 836 | in the NCAA but my Ducks are certainly there.                |
| 837 | Okay, now, we will move right along to Commissioner          |
| 838 | Mr. Wheeler. Can I duck that question?                       |
| 839 | Mr. Walden. Yes, we have got a long way to get even during   |
| 840 | the anyway, back to football.                                |
| 841 | Okay, now we go to Commissioner O'Rielly. Good morning and   |
| 842 | set us back on course.                                       |

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL O'RIELLY

Mr. O'Rielly. Thank you, Chairman Wheeler, Ranking Member

Mr. Walden. I don't think your mike is on there.

Mr. O'Rielly. There we go.

Mr. Walden. There we go.

Mr. O'Rielly. Thank you, Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Eshoo, members of the subcommittee for the honor of appearing before you today. I add my comments about Ray and he knows my thoughts about him as well.

Let me start with the issue of FCC process reform, as my colleague did. I find it necessary to reiterate that my efforts are not about undermining the chairmanship. As I have previously stated, even if every one of my proposals were adopted, the chairman would still control the agenda and win every vote. Additionally, this is not a response to the process or outcome of net neutrality. These problems existed prior to that particular item and remain today. Instead, my efforts attempt to empower the public to engage with the Commission through a fair process, rather than one deeply slanted to ensure that only the right insiders get information and can influence outcomes.

At the same time, we must ensure that the rights of

commissioners are not overrun by the chairman and the entrenched bureaucracy. Take, for example, our rules prohibiting all employees, including commissioners, from releasing non-public information about our proceedings. It sounds noble until you realize that the current practice prevents testing out ideas and exchanging creative ways to consider an issue. Moreover, the rule is being applied in a discriminatory manner to ensure that the chairman and certain staff can push selected information to favored parties, while the commissioners remain muzzled.

As for the chairman's process review task force, it is important for the subcommittee to realize what is actually occurring. The chairman came before this body three times last year and essentially said that my ideas were legitimate and he was going to consider each one through a special task force. The reality is, 1 year later that task force has shown its real purpose to diffuse the debate and deflect legislation in Congress. Just Friday, ironically, the last day of so-called Sunshine Week, the message was delivered that the general counsel, chairman, and other majority commissioners, have objected to almost each and every idea I raised. My proposal is to beef up written rationales for statutory authority, provide a check for instances when delegated authority is being taken too far, represent the opposing viewpoints when allowing outside witnesses at open meetings, or

give the public more information about proposals being considered were all denied. They were even unwilling to agree to such basic courtesies as holding off on press rollout until an item has actually been circulated to commissioners.

In sum, all the chairman's leadership team can agree to do is minutia, such as setting expectations for timelines to post proposed edits on our internal email chains.

This demonstrates that there is no intention of making any real changes absent congressional directives that would improve the ability of Americans to participate in the government.

To the extent the subcommittee reads additional areas to review, I would observe that the Office of General Counsel has turned from an office focused on providing mutual legal analysis and defending Commission items before the courts into what it believes is effectively a sixth commissioner, with the ability to supersede the views of duly appointed and sworn commissioners. This is harmful to the FCC as an institution and will ensure that impartiality and rule of law are forever limited to the realm of secondary considerations.

Turning to substance, I applaud the subcommittee for its extensive efforts to increase the amount of commercial spectrum and remove barriers to the deployment of wireless facilities.

Part of my attention is focused on opening up millimeter waves

for the Next-Generation networks. Accordingly, all potential bands should be considered and simple and proven licensing frameworks should be adopted to ensure maximum investment and innovation.

The Commission also appears on track to meet its commitment to provide further relief for small cell siting but more can be done to increase infrastructure deployment, namely, concluding the decades-old twilight tower review and addressing localities that continue to hinder facility siting. In the same vein, we must increase our efforts to open up the 5.9 gigahertz band for unlicensed use. Combining these frequencies with adjacent 5 gigahertz spectrum would permit increased throughput, speed and capacity. It is not my intention to prevent or undermine dedicated short-range communications deployment, as sharing can occur without causing harmful interference to safety of life applications.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

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

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*INSERT 8\*\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Walden. Mr. O'Rielly, thank you. And we appreciate all the testimony of all the members and the chairman.

Commissioner, Pai, I have several questions about the privacy NPRM you are considering. Press reports indicate that the predicate is an assumption that ISPs have unique access to user data, thus requiring regulation. Is this true?

Mr. Pai. Thank you for the question, Mr. Chairman.

Unfortunately, under the SEC's current rules, I am prohibiting from disclosing even to you, the chairman of the subcommittee, the particular details of the proposal unless the chairman expressly authorizes it.

Mr. Walden. Seriously, you can't disclose even to us?

Mr. Pai. Under the current FCC rules, that is correct.

Mr. Walden. Chairman Wheeler, could you address this? I am confused as to why your fellow commissioners are not allowed to answer questions as to what is in the privacy proposal you have circulated but I understand you and your media team and others are free to speak about it in public.

This, to me, is an issue I think we -- I know it is running that way. Perhaps it has run that way in the past but it seems peculiar that the other commissioners can't comment but you can. Will you let them comment? Can you address this whole --

Mr. Wheeler. So, I don't think that I heard Commissioner

Pai answer the question you asked him, which was is there a difference between the data that an ISP sees and one an edge provider sees.

Mr. Walden. So, what I said is that I had several questions.

Mr. Wheeler. Answering that question has nothing to do with what any specific paragraph of a proposal might say.

Mr. Walden. Right.

Mr. Wheeler. Point one. If I may, point two: There is a full-throated, already, discussion about these kinds of concepts which don't translate into the specific language.

And three, with respect, sir, three, the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is very specific and the reason you have a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is so specific language can be put out so that it can be commented on by the public and have a full-voiced debate, which we will have on the specific language of this item starting next week.

Mr. Walden. I think it is intriguing to me and disheartening to me that the Commission is set up in a way that the chairman can propose something, the chairman can talk about something, and I am not picking on you, personally, here, but just the way the system works. It is like if I proposed a bill circulated among all of us and then my friend, Mr. Doyle, is prohibited from communicating on it publicly or Mr. Pallone, I think you would

have a different view of our process.

Commissioner Pai, is that not a corollary that, in effect, that is what happens? A chairman of the FCC, take Mr. Wheeler out of it, any chairman can propose something; that chairman or chairwoman can comment on it ad infinitum, the New York Times, anybody, but you, as a commissioner can't, even to us?

Mr. Pai. That is exactly right, Mr. Chairman. It is a bizarre state of affairs where we have to pass something before the American public is allowed to see it, with a narrow and particularly notable exception of the chairman and his staff being able to push out misleading fact sheets, do press calls, and otherwise push their agenda before this full-throated discussion has had a chance to terminate.

Mr. Walden. Commissioner O'Rielly, do you encounter the same problem?

Mr. O'Rielly. Yes, sir. I have written about this and I believe the chairman has an opportunity to write a simple letter to authorize all commissioners to speak as needed on any item through the end of his tenure. He has declined to do that, so far.

Mr. Walden. Have other chairs done that?

Mr. O'Rielly. They have provided more specifics on particular items but what I am suggesting is that the current

process is just simply broken. I am not sure that other commissioners or other chairmen have provided such descriptions as my colleague has provided where you are getting the blog, you are getting the press rollout, you are getting the fact sheets that are not accurate.

Mr. Walden. And you are prohibited from commenting?

Mr. O'Rielly. I am actually prohibiting from correcting the fact sheets when people come and meet with me. I can't say you know I know you think it is going this way but actually that is not true. I am not allowed to tell them gee, you are completely wrong; I have read the item, that is not right.

Mr. Walden. This just flies in the face of open transparent government, in my opinion and needs to change. And Chairman, I would hope you would take Commissioner O'Rielly's comments to heart. I don't know if we have to pass something here, put an appropriation bill or what, but this just -- this is 2016. This is not 1816. We want an open and transparent process so the public can comment. We do it or we try to the best of our ability here by putting bills out for discussion. We have rules that are made available. Everybody has a chance. I think it just needs to change.

I want to ask one other question in the 7 seconds I have left and it is to you, Mr. Wheeler. The quadrennial review, broadcast

| 1024 | ownership rules due by June 30th. I know you all have had a lot    |
|------|--|
| 1025 | on your plate. I have commended you for the work on the auction    |
| 1026 | and all but this one is a thorn under the a burr under the saddle, |
| 1027 | 8 years late. What is it going to take to get a quadrennial        |
| 1028 | Mr. Wheeler. I intend to have it on the floor in the schedule      |
| 1029 | that I gave you, sir.  |
| 1030 | Mr. Walden. You will get it done?                                  |
| 1031 | Mr. Wheeler. And we've been working on it for months.              |

Mr. Wheeler. I am going to put on the floor.

Mr. Walden. All right, my time has expired.

We will now go to the ranking member on the subcommittee,
Ms. Eshoo, for questions for 5 minutes.

Mr. Walden. So, it is going to be done this time by June

Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

30?

Chairman Wheeler, you have and the full commission has some huge issues before it. So, I want to go through three of them: copyright -- this all has to do with the set top box proposal -- the issue of copyright, the issue of privacy, and the issue of impact on minorities both from the professional side and from the consumer side.

First, on copyright. Copyright is important to all of us. We know that it is both the life blood of the more than one industry

1047 and they depend on it being protected.

Now, there are critics in all of this and that is not a surprise. When a major shift is proposed and disruptive, it is disruptive to a \$20 billion income to the cable industry. So, of course people are going to fight very hard because there is a lot of money on the table.

But on the issue of copyright, does anything about this arrangement and the FCC's proposal change under your proposed rules, relative to copyright?

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Ms. Eshoo, the answer is no. And let me just excerpt paragraph 71 of the proposal.

To achieve the statutory mandate, our regulations must ensure that navigation devices 1) have content protection that protects content from theft, piracy, and hacking; 2) cannot technically disrupt, impede, or impair the delivery of services. It goes on beyond that but the fact of the matter is that we have specified copyright protection is essential and can be maintained. And I would submit that there are tens of millions of examples of that called iPhones, iPads, smart TVs, where copyright protection has been maintained through set top box-like activities.

Ms. Eshoo. Now, does the FCC give away any new or unpaid rights to distribute video programming?

1070 Mr. Wheeler. No, ma'am. 1071 1072 1073 1074 1075 1076 1077 1078 1079 1080 1081 1082 1083 1084 letter to be part of the record. [The information follows: ] 1085

Ms. Eshoo. Okay, the answer is no. Now, in your first answer, are there additions to the protection of copyright or is it the same set of principles and rules that apply today?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, the interesting thing is that we actually took the language from the current cable card license, which has been very successful in protecting copyright.

Ms. Eshoo. Okay. Now, on to the whole issue of minority-focused programming. Critics alleged that the FCC's proposed rule, and you know this, would actually limit the availability of minority programming and content. Now, Robert R. Johnson and our members have a copy of the letter that I received last night. I think it is an important letter to read and I would like to ask for unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, for Mr. Johnson's

1086

1087

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT 9\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

1088 Mr. Walden. Without objection. 1089 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you very much. 1090 Now, why is this issue even being raised? There is a woeful 1091 record under what we are operating under now because the cable 1092 companies have really moved at a glacial pace in their efforts 1093 to make more minority programming available to consumers. 1094 Essentially, there are two or three large cable companies 1095 effectively determining today what the American public sees and 1096 how they see it. 1097 So, I don't know why there is a defense of this abysmal record 1098 when we have an opportunity to open new doors to diverse 1099 programming. Do you want to respond to this? 1100 Mr. Wheeler. Well, thank you, Ms. Eshoo. 1101 Ms. Eshoo. Or would you respond to this, please? 1102 Mr. Wheeler. There are four African American owned channels 1103 in the 500-channel universe on a cable system. 1104 Ms. Eshoo. Four out of how many? 1105 Mr. Wheeler. In a 500-channel universe. And most of them 1106 are on the most expensive tier, by the way. 1107 But the interesting thing here is that there are literally hundreds of programmers who are seeking to get on and they are 1108

having the door slammed in their face. So, the question is how

do you provide a way -- how do you create equal opportunity so

1109

1110

that these programmers can have an equality of standing with the few handful that are there and have competition and opportunity?

Mr. Walden. The gentlelady's time has expired.

Ms. Eshoo. Well, my time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Walden. Thank you. We will now go to the vice chair of the full committee, the gentlelady from Tennessee, Mrs. Blackburn, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I wanted to first raise an issue involving a consortium of schools in Tennessee, USAC has denied millions of dollars in E-Rate funding to the Sweetwater Consortium and many rural schools could be detrimentally impacted. And the school districts stand to be financially crippled by the denial and, of course, the education opportunities limited and suffer significantly with such a decision.

The Sweetwater Consortium just received a final decision from USAC on Friday denying their appeal and my office is continuing with other offices to gather information from the interested parties and we expect that this is going to end up with you all before very long.

And Mr. Chairman, the Tennessee delegation wrote the FCC last year and received a response on July 21, 2015. We appreciate

that. I understand that USAC needs to be a thorough watchdog of the taxpayer dollars and that the commission is not yet in a position to offer an opinion on the merits of USAC's review and you have noted that in your response to us. However, I am concerned about the amount of time that the process has taken and I know Chairman Wheeler, you also expressed that concern in our reply and I will just say that we look forward to working with you to find a resolution to this.

Commissioner O'Rielly, I want to thank you for your letter or it was your statement of dissent on the choices in the AllVid issue. And I agree with you that it is regulation by speculation.

And Mr. Chairman, you just said you know that hundreds are seeking a way to get on, talking about some of the independent producers and the content producers that are seeking an avenue for the content they produce. And I have to tell you you don't create equal opportunity by not paying people for what they have created.

And Chairman Pai, coming to you, I will have to tell you, a lot of my content producers that are there in Tennessee, they are very concerned about the set top box proposal and about honoring copyright. The text of the proposal is something that has caused them tremendous concern and they talk about it and they bring it up to me. The chairman had said oh, we are going to honor

those copyright laws but then they are reading this and they are saying I don't see how this matches because it would mandate that pay TV providers transmit to third parties all the programming the pay provider's license, allowing third parties to use that without obtaining the permission of the copyright holders or of compensating them.

And you know one of the concerns is the way the proposal explicitly declines to prohibit third parties from replacing or altering advertising or manipulating the content.

So, I would like for you to respond to me. Doesn't the proposal exceed the FCC's authority and create conflicts between commission regulations, and copyright, and contract law?

Mr. Pai. Congresswoman, I believe it does and your constituents are not alone. One of the most notable features of this proceeding is that we heard from a variety of minority programmers, networks like Ovation, individuals like Eva Longoria, minority advocates like MMTC, as well as members of this body, 30 members of the Congressional Black Caucus, for instance, who told us to a person that this would compromise the legitimate intellectual property rights of content creators and minority content creators, in particular, had in their creations.

Mrs. Blackburn. I thank you for that. I would hope that the Commission will look very closely at what some of these

innovators and content creators are pushing forward to the marketplace and protecting their copyright laws.

To do this where you are looking at the set top box proposal that is out there, I think is a dangerous step. It diminishes the value of content. It diminishes the ability of those who have created this to be appropriately paid. It undercuts and undermines contract law. And for people who are innovating in this space, as we have more delivery avenues that are opening up to us, I think that the proposal that is out there is a dangerous proposal when it comes to the validity and the value of contracts.

And I yield back.

Mr. Walden. The gentlelady's time has expired.

We will now go to the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone for 5 minutes.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to start with Commissioner Rosenworcel. I wanted to publicly thank you for coming up to my district right before that last major snowstorm to discuss the Sandy Act and how to improve communications during disasters.

One idea we had coming out of these discussion is whether we could take a city in the area impacted by Sandy, where we could work with industry and government officials to develop best practices that could be used across the country. So, I just

wanted to ask you, do you think that that would be a worthwhile experiment.

Ms. Rosenworcel. Thank you, Congressman Pallone. So, I have been in your district just after Hurricane Sandy and now I can say I have been there just before Snowstorm Jonas. So, I know that Mother Nature's wrath visits the New Jersey coastline with some frequency.

And I think that developing a smart city that is a resilient city on the coast is a terrific idea and my hope is that by preparing for the worst, we can take those best practices from New Jersey and export them all around the country.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you.

I wanted to ask Commissioner O'Rielly about pirate radio. I wanted to personally thank you for leadership in addressing this spike in pirate radio stations. And the last time you were here, we talked about how this is an important issue. And I was hoping to be able to introduce a bill that would put a stop to these illegal signals.

I know you have a long background in crafting legislation. Do you have any suggestions for what to include in a bill like that?

Mr. O'Rielly. So, one of the issues that I have been working on and the Commission has been gracious and the chairman has been

gracious in helping me facilitate is getting to some of the money side of the equation. How do we dry up money for pirate radio broadcasters. And I think that is something where we can focus in legislation and we are working with your good staff in trying to target how to get at the money part from -- we have a number of people that are advertising. We have political campaigns that are advertising on pirate radio stations. We have concert venues that are advertising. We need to figure out how best to go after the money side.

But I want to be careful on that. I want to make sure that it is narrowly targeted so that we don't go after those who are trying to a good job that are unfortunately captured in that universe, such as building owners and renters. We want to go after those that are facilitating, not those that may have provided some --

Mr. Pallone. Thank you. Well, we will work together.

Mr. O'Rielly. I would like that.

Mr. Pallone. Chairman Wheeler, I released earlier this year a discussion draft bill called the Viewer Protection Act, which we have discussed that would make sure that consumers keep access to the channels that stay on the air after the incentive auction. And while I hope this bill will be bipartisan, I have heard from some of my colleagues that they want to wait until we know how

many broadcasters will need to be repacked.

At the same time, it is critical that the bill is introduced with enough time to go through regular order. So, it is really when the repacking process begins.

So, I think it would be helpful for us to all better understand the schedule for the auction going forward. Could you walk us through your estimate of how the next few months would play out paying particular attention to when we would know how many broadcasters will need to be repacked?

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Mr. Pallone.

As I said in my statement, the reverse auction bidding will start in May. Exactly when in May, we don't know yet. It depends upon what we find out when we are sorting through all this data to come up with a channel plan.

How long it lasts after that is a function of the marketplace. If I were a betting man, and I have no insight into this because it is totally in control of the market, not in control of the Commission, but I think we are looking at, if we start in May, sometimes late summer, early football season that we have a resolution. But again, that is something that is out of my control, our control and that the market will determine.

Mr. Pallone. All right. Well, thank you all. I appreciate your input on all these questions. I yield back, Mr.

1272 Chairman.

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

1294

Mr. Walden. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, the former chairman of the committee, Mr. Barton, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Barton. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I welcome the Commission to the Energy and Commerce Committee.

So far, nobody is asking one question about your budget, which is, theoretically, why we are here. And I am going to continue that tradition and not ask you any questions about the budget.

My question, though, is extremely serious, actually. This morning we had three explosions rock Brussels airport and metro station. We think at least 26 people have been killed. There are over 100 that have been injured. The last time the Commission was before this subcommittee was just after the Paris attack and I asked Mr. Wheeler then what the committee could do in conjunction with the FCC to try to counter these terrorist attacks in the way that they use the internet to broadcast their terrorism.

Mr. Commissioner, Chairman, you mentioned that maybe the Congress needed to update the definition of what a lawful intercept is under CALEA. Have you all looked at that since you were before the committee? If so, do you have any recommendations for the committee?

And I want to be clear, I am not trying to ask the FCC to shut down the internet but I do think that in an open society you can strike a balance between openness and protecting the public good. So, I am going to ask the question to the chairman but if the other commissioners want to chime in, you are very welcome to.

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Mr. Barton. And yes, this is a tragic time and a terribly serious issue.

The Congress has said to the FCC that our responsibility, and I use that word not just our authority, our responsibility is to make sure that in the networks that we regulate there is the equipment to carry out lawful intercepts. That is the definition that Congress has given us and the scope of our authority.

The question of what is a lawful intercept is something that is beyond the statutory authority that you have given us. The discussion that we had last time was to the effect that it is up to Congress to make the determination as to what is the scope of a lawful intercept. But I will assure you, sir, that we will fully take the steps necessary to make sure that the equipment that is required to be able to make that lawful intercept is in place.

Mr. Barton. Okay. Any of the other commissioners want to comment? Okay.

Something a little bit more mundane, this issue of set top boxes, which the chairman alluded to and Congresswoman Blackburn alluded to. I am co-chair with the Privacy Caucus here in the House. And there is real concern that you are going to make it possible, perhaps inadvertently, to allow the collection of large amounts of data, perhaps even megadata without the consent or knowledge of the customer or of the client.

Mr. Chairman, you were not real forthcoming to our subcommittee chairman, Mr. Walden. Can you at least acknowledge that it is an issue and you have got very cognizant to try to whatever the Commission does, protect the legitimate privacy rights of the individual?

Mr. Wheeler. Without a doubt, Congressman. And let me see if I can be specific on this because if you say I wasn't specific enough.

Section 631 of the Act establishes privacy expectations on cable operators and satellite providers. And they then have that relationship with Roku and TiVo and folks that they are now working with to say you will, they say in their contracts with them, you will maintain the same kind of privacy protections that we do. And what we are saying is that any competitive box, set top box or app, has to be able to make the same kind of assurances and that if those assurances are not made, that the cable operator

then doesn't have to do business with that box and that just like smart TVs and tablets and smartphones, all have that same kind of ability to collect information and have the FTC oversight, that if the protections that we have put in place are still not sufficient, that the FTC has authority to do something. And as recently as last week, the FTC put out a notice to smart TV manufacturers that they intended to.

Mr. Barton. Okay, my time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Walden. Thank you, Mr. Barton.

We will now turn to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Doyle, for questions.

Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Wheeler, I want to thank you for your leadership on special access and for advancing this issue through a very thorny process. It is critical that we get this right and it is critical that we get this done. I believe your team is working diligently on this proceeding. I would only ask that as you work through this issue, you be sensitive to the harm that is being done at this moment to competition across the country and that as you proceed, you keep in mind that this is an ongoing issue that is not only hurting competitors but hurting consumers as well.

With regards to Lifeline, as you move forward with Lifeline,

I have asked you to be mindful and ensure that low-income Americans can still use this program with no additional cost. Opening up the program to more competition and enabling participants to choose how they use their subsidy is great. But I would ask you to take particular care to ensure that three options remain available and that enough flexibility exists in the program so that people don't lose their access to this critical resource.

With regards to privacy, thank you again for moving forward on this issue. I was happy to see the Commission take action in the order to prohibit super cookies, as well as the enforcement action it took on the same issue. However, I must say I was disappointed to not see a prohibition on deep packet inspection or a proposal to prohibit companies from manipulating consumers into giving up their privacy for a discount on their bills. Privacy shouldn't be a luxury for a few that can afford it.

So, as you move forward with this proceeding, I would ask the Commission ensure that it is not enabling ISPs that charge consumers for their own privacy.

And finally, on zero rating, I remain concerned about zero rating in the marketplace. Studies have shown that consumers, by far, prefer zero rated apps and services when faced with the expense of busting their data caps. This gives ISPs a natural advantage in the marketplace and enables them to choose winners

1387 and losers.

I don't think that we need a blanket ban on zero rating but when ISPs zero rate their own apps and when zero rating programs are anti-competitive, consumers are being harmed. So, I would ask, Chairman Wheeler, to encourage you to take action to police these programs.

Now, I went through all this quickly to give you some time. You and Commissioner Pai, you know Commissioner Pai said quite a few things today that I think might have hurt your feelings and I wanted to give you an opportunity to maybe comment on your stewardship of the commission.

And also there seems to be a disagreement here on whether or not on the issue of set top boxes that copyright is being protected and that whether it is true that people can take other people's content and not pay for it. So, in the remaining 2 minutes and 26 seconds, Mr. Chairman --

Mr. Wheeler. That is all I have.

Mr. Doyle. -- the floor is yours.

Mr. Wheeler. Let me see if I can kind of tick through a couple of them. Number one, on the copyright issue. You know the interesting thing is that there are today the equivalent of competitive set top boxes available in the market. For instance, Google Chrome. Now, a lot of things that we hear about oh, this

is Google's big plan to take over cable TV -- malarkey. The Google Chrome, which attaches in your port in your TV to allow you to get things off of the web, does not violate copyright, does not overlay commercials, does not do all of the horrible things that everybody said a set top box like that would do and because copyright law is sacrosanct.

The second thing is I think the people would go crazy revolt if something like that happened. So, that is on the copyright issue.

Secondly, on the process issue, there was an interesting dichotomy of criticism that we have heard this morning. One is that we have been operating in a unilateral fashion and not being collegial. And the other is that the collegial efforts that we have had to address process that hasn't resulted in a consensus being built are somehow witness of a nefarious intent. I find those two to be in conflict.

And so the other issues you raised, you are absolutely right. Lifeline, we have to make sure that Lifeline is updated and that it is available and the fast thing -- have I got time? The key thing here is that digital is cheaper than analogue voice. You notice that every single consumer who signs up to LTE service, which is 80 some percent of Americans get free unlimited voice but if you are a poor person, we are limiting what you can do.

We are saying you can't get on the internet. You can't have access. We are going to stick you in this analogue world. And that is one of the things that we are going to take on.

Mr. Doyle. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am glad you feelings weren't hurt.

Mr. Johnson.[Presiding.] The gentleman's time has expired.

I now recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Latta.

Mr. Latta. Thank you very much. And to the Commission, thanks very much for being here today. And oddly enough, Commissioner Pai, I am going to be talking to you and asking some questions about set top boxes and integration band. It seems like something that has been discussed quite a bit this morning. As you know, Congressman Green and I were able to secure language in stellar to eliminate the integration band in order to rid the marketplace of outdated technology and to foster greater competition innovation.

The FCC is now contemplating mandates that would leave multichannel video programming distributors no choice to provide a box on top of the third-party device. This would once again bring us back to the problems of integration band of higher cost to consumers for devices and higher energy costs for them as well. And in this committee room where we were having the Secretary of Energy reports, he even said that about higher energy costs.

He stated that the FCC should be seeking a boxless solution, which I believe is the feature of pay TV. Does the apps based proposal that was put forth through the Downloadable Security Technology Advisory Committee, the DSTAC, get consumers to a boxless world?

I want to ask you also, as you answer that question, what we are looking at with the FCC's proposing, are we going forward, backwards, staying static, and I think what the consumers out there want to know is where are we going to be in 10 years, not where we were 10 years ago. Commissioner?

Mr. Pai. Thank you for the question, Congressman. I think the best, if I could tackle the second question first, to encapsulate what the FCC's approach has been is back to the future. Instead of moving to an app-based world where consumers can finally free themselves of this expensive clunky equipment that consumes a lot of energy and doesn't provide the functionality they want, the FCC is doubling down on 1990s technology. And it is essentially going to force MVPDs, cable operators and the like, to do one of two things. Number one, either reengineer their entire network or number two, supply consumers with a second box.

Now, I submit to you that the natural effect is going to be the second be reengineering a network is extremely expensive, compared to simply supplying a second box. That is not what

consumers want to do. And so I would have hoped that the agency, going to the first question, would have teed up in a full and fair manner the other proposal that the Downloadable Security

Technology Advisory Committee proposed. One, to be clear, was the majority's approach, which was to have this 1990s technology embraced yet again. But the other one was an app-based approach. And instead, there is a very slanted three-paragraph discussion in this huge document asking why the app-based approach would end to the destruction of America and other things bad. And I think if we embrace this in a full and fair manner, allow the American people to comment, we wouldn't be in the pickle we are in, where the former chairman of this committee, Mr. Waxman just yesterday said that this approach is a 20th century solution to a problem the market is already solving on its own.

Mr. Latta. Why is that? Why did the FCC do that?

Mr. Pai. Well, I think frequently, the natural inclination of the agency of late has been to solve problems that don't exist. But secondly, I think that there is a recognition among some people that this marketplace hasn't developed as expected. And I completely agree with him. The reason is that this entire marketplace is the creation of a 20-year regulatory framework that is highly intrusive. And I would humbly submit that technical mandates and agency micromanagement is not the way to get us to

the next stage of the digital video revolution. Instead, we should embrace a more consumer-friendly approach, an apps-based approach, for example, and let the marketplace develop. You are free from some of these legacy regulations that have simply held us back.

The set top box is not the way of the future. My kids are not going to know what a set top box or some of this other equipment is. What they will be familiar with is being able to access the content they want on the device they want using an app or other device that they want. That is the future, not the 1990s.

Mr. Latta. Let me follow-up, Commissioner. Over the past the Congress -- I have introduced a bill that required the FCC to conduct a cost-benefit analysis at the time of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and again at the time that the final rule is issued. I think it is important for the public and the Commission to have a better understanding of monitor impact of the FCC rules.

In respect to the proposed set top box rules, I believe it would be of great value to identify the cost and benefits this rule would have on consumers and MVPDs, especially in small and medium sized providers.

Did the Commission complete a cost-benefit analysis of this rule?

Mr. Pai. It did not.

| 1525 | Mr. Latta. Why not?  |
|------|--|
| 1526 | Mr. Pai. I think, frankly, because if you objectively            |
| 1527 | tallied up the possible costs and benefits, it would be fairly   |
| 1528 | clear that the Commission's approach would have yielded,         |
| 1529 | ultimately, disadvantages to the consumer at the end of the day. |
| 1530 | Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much and, as my time             |
| 1531 | expires, I yield back. Thank you very much.                      |
| 1532 | Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. I          |
| 1533 | know recognize the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Loesback.            |
| 1534 | Mr. Loesback. I apologize, Mr. Chair. I was thinking that        |
| 1535 | I was not going to go for a little bit yet.                      |
| 1536 | But thanks to all of you for being here. I really appreciate     |
| 1537 | this conversation we are having. I was going to ask about set    |
| 1538 | top box but I think I am going to forego that one this time. I   |
| 1539 | think it has being covered pretty exhaustively.                  |
| 1540 | I do want to say, Commissioner Pai, I am all for the Jayhawks,   |
| 1541 | too because I am an Iowa State alum but, hopefully, the Cyclones |
| 1542 | are going to do well as well.                                    |
| 1543 | Mr. Pai. I didn't sign on to that, Congressman.                  |
| 1544 | Mr. Loesback. That is okay. It is all right.                     |
| 1545 | I do speak to former Congressman Jim Wright quite often about    |
| 1546 | these issues, as you can imagine.                                |
| 1547 | But at any rate, and Commissioner Rosenworcel, in                |

particular, I know you are all concerned about rural broadband, but thank you so much for your tremendous efforts on that front. I look forward to seeing you in Iowa at some point down the road as well, when we can chat with some of our folks in Iowa who are particularly concerned about this. So, thank you.

What I would like to do is first ask Chairman Wheeler about the enhanced transparency issue, having to do with broadband development and small businesses. You have your particular order that was out there but then I worked with Chairman Walden and other members recently to get a bipartisan bill passed where you know we have a different approach to that in terms of how we define small business and extend the period for the exemption, if you will, for these small broadband providers. And there is really broad bipartisan support to make sure that we provide the necessary regulatory relief to these folks so that they really can in fact expand that broadband capability to as many folks in these rural areas as possible.

And we are hopeful that the Senate will take this up and that the President would sign whatever legislation comes out of this. But if that is not the case, might it be true that the FCC does intend to further exempt small providers from the enhanced transparency rules?

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Congressman. As you know, we have

exempted them and I recently extended that exemption. Any decision -- there has been a lot of talk about the transparency of process and everything here. It is inappropriate for me to sit here and say oh, yes, there will be an extension or whatever. We will go through the process. We will build the appropriate record and act accordingly.

Mr. Loesback. Right.

Mr. Wheeler. Just like what we have done thus far.

Mr. Loesback. Right, I am recognizing that there is that bipartisan support here to extend it further, if you will.

Do any of the others here want to comment on that particular issue at this point?

Ms. Clyburn. On that particular issue, as the chairman alluded to, we are going through a Paperwork Reduction Act process, which will look at and examine the impact on those particular carriers. I think I believe it is 100,000 lines and below. I was pushed for them being exempted while we review that and see if the impact is in proportion with their capacity.

Mr. Loesback. Thank you.

And also, Chairman Wheeler, on the incentive auction, Mr. Chairman, regarding the upcoming incentive auction itself, I am concerned about the impact that the FCC's repacking plan might have on broadcasters and dealers in rural America, as you might

1594 | imagine.

If the FCC implements a regional repacking plan, will broadcasters in areas like Iowa be repacked last because there is less of a spectrum crunch? And if so, can you assure me that broadcasters in rural markets will have as much time to transition as broadcasters in areas where there is a spectrum crunch? I am concerned that there is a 39-month deadline to transition and whether broadcasters in rural areas may not be able to start right away. Can you address that issue?

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Congressman. This one of the reasons why we have now, as the chairman indicated, begun the pivot to okay, what happens after the auction. Everybody is thinking about the bidding. But okay, then you have to implement it. And we are putting together a team that will deal with that question.

One of the proposals on the table right now is some kind of regional repacking plan. We have not yet made a decision on that. There are all kinds of extenuating circumstances that exist in various parts of the country. Clearly, it doesn't make sense to have the limited assets of folks who erect antennas racing hither and you to be able to do things.

Mr. Loesback. Right.

Mr. Wheeler. We have to be able to manage that appropriately and to deal with the kinds of issues that you raise.

I can't sit here and say, sir, I have got the written out answer but I can say, sir, yes, sir, we are on top of that.

Mr. Loesback. Thank you very much.

Again, you can see the rural theme to my questions here, obviously. But I know that a lot of folks here on this panel and on the larger committee have these very same concerns that I have on a bipartisan basis. That is why I have raised those issues.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Shimkus.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It has been a good hearing. I think we have talked about a broad-range of different issues that you all are dealing with.

I have two, one has already been asked. So, that will save me a little bit of time. In the country right now, there is a revolt brewing in the country. And I attribute it to a couple of things. One thing I attribute it to is an understanding of the legislative activities of passing of bills and then the bill being signed into law, also understanding that the Executive Branch is defined by the constitution to enforce those laws.

So, when we see duly passed statutes in a law and then an agency disregard that, that is kind of leading to this revolt and this frustration out there. And I can say I mean I just came

through a primary and so I was with the public 24/7 for 2 months and it is visceral and it is real.

So, Commissioner Pai, I want to ask this question first because this is an example. I think it spreads across the agencies, not just here.

So, we passed a bill signed into law on joint service agreements that then delayed that for 10 years. It wasn't ambiguous. There weren't exceptions included. It just said all JSAs. Of course I think you were surprised. I was shocked to see that last month that the chairman's office forcing parties to eliminate JSAs through merger review.

How is this not an example of this frustration out in America of an agency disregarding the clear statute of law and congressional intent? And could you comment on that?

Mr. Pai. Thank you for the question, Congressman. I think, unfortunately, is that a paradigmatic example of the agency's disrespect for the rule of law, it is pretty rare that this body, as you know all too well, reaches overwhelming bipartisan agreement on anything. But in December of 2015, with a unified voice, both houses of Congress and the President instructed the agency to grandfather existing joint sales agreements between certain broadcast TV stations. The agency simply thumbed its nose at that statutory command and ordered the unwinding of

certain joint sales agreements, including one joint sales agreement by Entravision in my home state of Kansas, which provides the only Spanish language news in the state.

That is remarkable for two reasons. Number one, it is obviously diverse programming that I and my fellow Kansans could benefit from. But secondly, it also contradicts an express commitment to the Congress of FCC leadership last year that there is quote nothing in what we are doing that would make that, the Entravision JSA, go away. Now, that was simply flouted. And I think it is telling that a couple of weeks ago, a bipartisan group of 12 senators, led by Senator Roy Blunt, Senator Dick Durbin, including Senators Tim Scott, Charles Schumer and others told the agency that it was quote bypassing congressional will and ignoring bipartisan concerns by forging ahead with this path.

And so if the agency can't be constrained by law, then it is pretty much just the caprice of one individual, a majority of commissioners at any given point in time. And that is not how I think the agency should operate under any leadership --

Mr. Shimkus. Commissioner O'Rielly?

Mr. O'Rielly. I agree with my colleague on both the content and the point he is making and the point you made.

And I take it to another example. And I know we have talked about set top boxes in a number of different questions. But if

you look at the statute, the Commission is taking this beyond the equipment itself and taking it to applications. And the statute says converter boxes, interactive communications equipment, and other equipment. And yet we are taking it to applications. first we take equipment and interpret it to be software and then software goes to applications. So, applications have nothing to do with the set top boxes as they operate today would be covered by our rules. Mr. Shimkus. And I just want to end on this. Because this kind of also talks about this aspect. I am very concerned about the FCC process debate and the opening statements on that because maybe some of these things that have occurred, had there been an open process -- you know what? I would call on the commissioners to enact civil disobedience and disregard the chairman's edict. And if the chairman can speak to people anyplace, anytime on something coming down, I would challenge you. I did some research. No one has done that yet. But by golly, if there is ever a time to fight for transparency in the rule of law, it is now. It is in this environment. And I would encourage you to do that.

And I yield back my time.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. I now recognize the gentlelady from Colorado, Ms. DeGette.

Ms. DeGette. Thank you so much.

1686

1687

1688

1689

1690

1691

1692

1693

1694

1695

1696

1697

1698

1699

1700

1701

1702

1703

1704

1705

1706

Mr. Wheeler.

Yes.

| As a former constitutional lawyer, I was really quite              |
|--|
| dismayed to hear Commissioner's Pai's testimony about that the     |
| commissioners are prohibited from commenting on future rules.      |
| And Chairman Wheeler, someone asked you that question. I didn't    |
| quite get the answer. So, I am going to ask you a series of        |
| questions and I would like you help me clarify this.               |
| Under the current rules of the FCC, commissioners are              |
| prohibited from releasing the language of pending rules until they |
| are voted on in the proceedings. Is that right?                    |
| Mr. Wheeler. Yes, ma'am, for the final rule but under NPRM,        |
| one of the things we have done, during my administration is put    |
| out the draft language.  |
| Ms. DeGette. So, you put out draft language. Is that               |
| correct?   |
| Mr. Wheeler. The Notice of Proposed Rulemakings that we            |
| vote on always include in them a rebuttable presumption here is    |
| what we are proposing in terms of specific language.               |
| Ms. DeGette. Okay, stop.   |
| Mr. Wheeler. So, we could have the kind of debate we had           |
| today.   |
| Ms. DeGette. Stop. Stop.   |
|  |

Ms. DeGette. Now, so you do put out proposed language--

| 1732 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, ma'am.   |
|------|--|
| 1733 | Ms. DeGette in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.                |
| 1734 | Then you debate on it and you vote on it.                        |
| 1735 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, ma'am.   |
| 1736 | Ms. DeGette. And then the rule is released, right?               |
| 1737 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, ma'am.   |
| 1738 | Ms. DeGette. Now, do you have a prohibition on                   |
| 1739 | commissioners talking about the proposed rules in advance of the |
| 1740 | vote? Yes or no will work.                                       |
| 1741 | Mr. Wheeler. No.   |
| 1742 | Ms. DeGette. Thank you.  |
| 1743 | Mr. Wheeler. Because and we have these discussions,              |
| 1744 | speeches, blogs. As a person who has spent 30 years practicing   |
| 1745 | before the Commission, I can assure you that throughout history  |
| 1746 | there has been an ongoing dialogue where commissioners have been |
| 1747 | speaking out, speaking publicly, talking to the various parties. |
| 1748 | Ms. DeGette. So, under your leadership, what you are saying      |
| 1749 | is that when there is a proposed rulemaking, commissioners are   |
| 1750 | allowed to exercise their first amendment rights and speak about |
| 1751 | the pending proceedings. Correct?                                |
| 1752 | Mr. Wheeler. What I am saying is that nothing has changed.       |
| 1753 | Ms. DeGette. Can you just answer my question?                    |
| 1754 | Mr. Wheeler. I am sorry. Would you please                        |

| 1755 | Mr. Loesback. Yes. Are commissioners allowed to speak         |
|------|---|
| 1756 | publicly about proposed rulemakings?                          |
| 1757 | Mr. Wheeler. They are allowed to speak about the substance    |
| 1758 | of the rulemaking.  |
| 1759 | Ms. DeGette. Right.   |
| 1760 | Mr. Wheeler. The rule that they keep citing goes to can they  |
| 1761 | take the specific language and circulate it.                  |
| 1762 | Ms. DeGette. Right. See, that is what I am trying to help     |
| 1763 | you get out.  |
| 1764 | Mr. Wheeler. Okay.  |
| 1765 | Ms. DeGette. So, they can talk about the proposed             |
| 1766 | rulemaking.   |
| 1767 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, ma'am.                                      |
| 1768 | Ms. DeGette. But they are not allowed to release the          |
| 1769 | underlying language while it is still under consideration. Is |
| 1770 | that correct?   |
| 1771 | Mr. Wheeler. Other than the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,    |
| 1772 | where it is   |
| 1773 | Ms. DeGette. And what is the rationale for doing that?        |
| 1774 | Mr. Wheeler. It has always been that way, ma'am.              |
| 1775 | Ms. DeGette. And what is the rationale?                       |
| 1776 | Mr. Wheeler. I believe the rationale is in order to           |
| 1777 | facilitate deliberation amongst the commissioners.            |

Ms. DeGette. Great, thank you. That is all I was trying to ask you.

Now, Commissioner Clyburn, in your written testimony, you mentioned interest in how the broadband can play a role in healthcare outcomes. And as you might know, Chairman Upton and I and the whole rest of the Energy and Commerce Committee are working on 21st Century Cures. A lot of this bill relies on expansion of the ability to collect data and then to aggregate that data in clinical trials. And so I just wanted to let you know that I think what you are talking about is really important and I think we need to be working together to make sure that we can get these benefits all around the country because part of the whole process with this big data and healthcare research is to get a much bigger diversity both geographically and ethnically of people who are involved in clinical trials.

So, I would like to be able to work with you going forward to making sure that we can achieve these ends.

Ms. Clyburn. Absolutely. We have a Connect2Health Task Force and we look forward to working with your office to realize the potential that health and technology, that marriage, would bring.

Ms. DeGette. Thanks. So, you know I have got a few seconds left. Let me just go back to what I was talking to Chairman

Wheeler about because what I was trying to get out of him is this. Once it was explained to me, I can see a real reason why you would want the proposed actual language of the proposed rules to be handled through the chairman's office. And you would want to have people be able to talk internally about that and you wouldn't want people just releasing bits and pieces of that language.

So, I agree with that but I also think it is important that the commissioners can exercise their first amendment rights without releasing that language. And I think that is what is happening now. So, I think we just need to everybody take a deep breath and step back and try to have a little bit more comity on the whole commission.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding back. I now recognize Mr. Lance from New Jersey.

Mr. Lance. Thank you.

And I also practiced constitutional law in New Jersey. And so I would like to ask Commissioner Pai and Commissioner O'Rielly to comment on the colloquy between my colleague, Congresswoman DeGette and the chairman.

Mr. Pai. Thanks for the opportunity, Congressman.

It is flatly not true that commissioners have full and fair latitude to discuss what is in a commission proposal or a

1824 commission order.

1825

1826

1827

1828

1829

1830

1831

1832

1833

1834

1835

1836

1837

1838

1839

1840

1841

1842

1843

1844

1845

1846

Right now, I cannot hand you this document, which is the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on privacy. I cannot quote you anything in this document in the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

Mr. Lance. And if you were to do that, would you be subjected to some sort of legal action?

Mr. Pai. Absolutely. There are sanctions that are unspecified in our rules but I have no doubt that I wouldn't be given the benefit of the Rule of Lenity when it comes to enforcing it.

Mr. Lance. Commissioner O'Rielly, this, to me, is as clear as mud.

Mr. O'Rielly. So, I agree to the point that you may be concerned about the specific language being shared but even the ideas themselves. Nonpublic information is the term used in the So, anything that is nonpublic. So, if there is an idea rule. in here --

Mr. Lance. Presumably, that is nonpublic. I do not know what is in that document of 15 or 20 or 30 pages. And there is no way I, in the branch of government that is mentioned in Article I of the Constitution, I am not privy to that. Is that accurate?

Mr. O'Rielly. That is accurate.

1847 Mr. Lance. Commissioner Pai?

Mr. Pai. Well one thing is that the rationale for keeping all of this secret is completely baseless. I mean there is no reason why we couldn't have deliberations while still having transparency.

And first of all we don't have internal deliberations now on any item of significance. So, the suggestion is simply inaccurate. But even beyond that, there is no reason why if you propose a bill, Congresswoman, and it goes on the Web site, there is no reason why you and Congressman Lance can't sit down and hammer out agreements and have deliberations in a full and fair way.

And the agency is no different. The American public deserves to know what we are going to do before we propose to do it and I don't think that is too much to ask.

Mr. Lance. And if you were to release only a portion of it and if you were to mischaracterize a portion of it, undoubtedly, another member of the commission would say no, this is the full and fair interpretation of the larger document. And this happens in the branch of government in which we are involved and I would hope in the executive branch as well.

So, if for some reason you were to mischaracterize or not fully disclose the entire intent of the document under the

marketplace of ideas, wouldn't that be corrected by another member of the Commission? Commissioner Pai, Commissioner O'Rielly, please.

Mr. O'Rielly. Absolutely right. So, I agree with your analysis and it could be corrected by -- but it actually happens today under the current structure because the fact sheets that are being put out and are inaccurate and I don't have the right under our rules to correct them.

Mr. Lance. And you characterize them as inaccurate and that may be true, that may not be true. I tend to think it is true. But regardless of whether it is true or not, what would be wrong with a full discussion?

Mr. O'Rielly. I would be fully comfortable releasing information so we could make a judgment whether my analysis is right or wrong.

Mr. Lance. Commissioner Pai?

Mr. Pai. Nothing would be better than to avoid all this he said/she said disputes by releasing the document. That way, there is no debate about context. Everybody can see for himself or herself.

Mr. Lance. And whether or not this has been the situation over the years regarding the commission, do you believe, gentlemen that it would be better moving forward if this were to change and

1870

1871

1872

1873

1874

1875

1876

1877

1878

1879

1880

1881

1882

1883

1884

1885

1886

1887

1888

1889

1890

1891

place it in the subjunctive voice, if this were to change? And why do you think it should change?

Mr. Pai. Whoever is leading the agency, Republican or Democrat, I would hope that they would embrace the same spirit of transparency that the Congress has, in terms of making things public before they are voted upon.

Mr. Lance. Commissioner Rosenworcel, your comments on the discussion I have had with your colleagues?

Ms. Rosenworcel. Well, thank you. I have not found that our existing policies get in the way of me having substantive conversations with stakeholders of every stripe.

I am a little bit confused by the difficulties that my colleagues are having. I know that they, too, held regular meetings with public interest authorities, industry, and have general discussions about the matters before us. I am sure that every one of us here uses those discussions to inform our deliberations and our decision-making and voting.

Mr. Lance. In your opinion, do you and I have a right to go back and forth in the document that Commissioner Pai has at his desk?

Ms. Rosenworcel. I believe we have the right to go back and forth and discuss any matter that is before the agency.

Mr. Lance. I don't know what is contained in that document.

1916 Are you able to release to me what is contained in that document? Ms. Rosenworcel. I don't believe we are. 1917 Mr. Lance. And why is that, Commissioner? 1918 1919 Ms. Rosenworcel. I believe that is under our Commission's 1920 rules right now. 1921 Mr. Lance. Well, I understand what the rules are. 1922 questioning the rules. I obviously understand what the rules 1923 The rules may say that this room is painted pink. It is 1924 actually painted green. I understand what the rules are. Do you 1925 agree with the rules? I think that we can do more so that our 1926 Ms. Rosenworcel. 1927 discussions are transparent but I also think it is essential that 1928 we preserve the right to have deliberations among the five of us 1929 and actually review the text and discuss the text among all of 1930 us. 1931 So, I think we should strive to be more transparent but I 1932 think we have to preserve some space for honest deliberation. 1933 Mr. Lance. I think it is essential to the American people 1934 that we, in the first branch of government, under Article I, have 1935 the ability to review what is contained in that document. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1936 1937 Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. 1938 now the chair recognizes the gentlelady from California, Mr.

1939 | Matsui.

Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I am not a constitutional lawyer so I cannot provide any more clarity to this but I appreciate the discussion and Commissioner Rosenworcel's response.

We need to talk something I am passionate about and that is Lifeline. Access to broadband is absolutely essential for participation in the 21st century economy. We all know this that affordability has been a major obstacle for the Americans that live on the wrong side of the digital divide. We all know that broadband is not a luxury but an absolute necessity. And as Commissioner Rosenworcel always says, for parents helping kids with their homework, and for businesses in all our communities, and for every American to succeed.

I am thrilled that the FCC is finally modernizing their Lifeline program into the 21st century. It has been something I have been calling for since 2009, when I introduced I believe the first legislation to expand Lifeline to broadband.

Now, as we do so, I hope the FCC makes sure that these changes are beneficial to the low-income consumers the program is designed to help, and I believe others have brought up this concern, and does not harm the vulnerable consumers in the Lifeline program today.

What I have heard are concerns about the FCC's proposed changes to support for mobile voice service. And as we expand Lifeline to broadband, we can't forget that low-income consumers still need to be able to make voice calls, especially 911 in the event of an emergency.

Chairman Wheeler, quickly, can you explain the proposed changes you are making to Lifeline support for mobile voice services?

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Congresswoman. The goal is to create a glide path, a phase-in where over the next 3 and 1/2 years, we are moving from an all-analogue Lifeline service to a digital Lifeline service, where we can take advantage of the fact that a digital voice minute costs less than an analogue voice minute and by the sheer fact that we are now delivering things digitally, give those using their phone, in your example, access to the internet as well.

So, let me give you a specific example. We are talking about 2 gigabits of data being the minimum threshold in 2018, as we phase in. Two gigabits of data for the existing price would be giving the consumer access to 1700 web pages and 900 minutes of voice talk.

There are 50 percent of the existing Lifeline users use less than 100 minutes. Two-thirds use less than 200 minutes. So,

what we are talking about here is a quantum leap in the ability to have access to minutes and this incredible ability to access the internet.

Ms. Matsui. Okay. Commissioner Clyburn, do you think that you struck the right bands here?

Ms. Clyburn. We are still deliberating. We are listening to parties and winding up our ex parte process. When I started on this, it was a process that a lot of people did not want to take this particular journey.

Ms. Matsui. Right.

Ms. Clyburn. We are on the cusp of making a tremendous change for those 39 million households that are eligible. And I am looking forward to continuing working with you to make sure that this program is one that we can all be proud of.

Ms. Matsui. Okay, thank you. I often speak about the need for global access to spectrum to fuel our wireless economy. Spectrum is the invisible infrastructure that powers mobile networks.

As we look ahead to 5G, networks will be transporting more data than ever before. But wireless services also rely on wires, which is one of the reasons I care about special access reform.

Commissioner Rosenworcel, do you agree that we need a competitive special access market so that the United States can

2008 | continue to lead the world in 5G?

Ms. Rosenworcel. Thank you for the question. Yes, I do and I agree with your assessment that while wireless networks require wired infrastructure as well.

Ms. Matsui. Okay, thank you and I yield back.

Ms. Eshoo. Will the gentlelady yield her remaining time to me?

Ms. Matsui. So, if I may, yes, I yield.

Ms. Eshoo. Thank you. There was something that was said earlier from the panel about in search of a problem that doesn't have a solution or we don't need one et cetera, et cetera, relative to set top boxes.

And I just want to put this on the record. Since the Telecommunications Act opened everything up to competition, including set top boxes, the price of everything else has gone down 90 percent. The increase of fees for set top boxes has increased by 185 percent and it is consumers that are picking up the tab. And it is, essentially, a monopoly. It is essentially a monopoly.

In my district, talk about boxes, they say think outside the box, we don't have any boxes. I think it is about time that in the 21st century that we really open up set top boxes because --

Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady's time has expired.

2031 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you.

Mr. Johnson. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Olson.

Mr. Olson. I thank the chair and welcome to our FCC commissioners. Happy Birthday, Commissioner Clyburn.

Ms. Clyburn. Thank you.

Mr. Olson. Commissioner Rosenworcel, did you have a chance to go by the County Line Barbeque at South by Southwest out there on 2222?

Ms. Rosenworcel. No, I went to Salt Lick.

Mr. Olson. You have to come back.

And Commissioner Pai, you brought up the NCAA March Madness. And our chairman did as well. I am a proud Texan, guys. I have to tell you, the Aggies from College Station, Texas A&M University had the greatest comeback ever in college basketball. Down 12 with 39 seconds left, double overtime, we are moving on. So, we will play Kansas maybe in Houston for the final four.

My first question is about privacy for you Commissioner Pai and Commissioner O'Rielly. The purpose of the NPRM is to get input from the stakeholders before drafting and passing a rule -- before -- input before. There are no conclusions. But the Texans I work for back home say this privacy initiative of this proposed rule is full of conclusions. They say that is putting

2054 the cart before the horse.

So my question is, are there tentative conclusions in this NPRM for privacy?

Mr. Pai. There are, Congressman.

Mr. Olson. Mr. O'Rielly, are there conclusions?

Mr. O'Rielly. Yes, there are.

Mr. Olson. There are conclusions. Is there a record to base these conclusions upon, something like an NOI, a Notice of Intent that was passed this year? Is there some NOI out there to base these conclusions upon?

Mr. Pai. There is not.

Mr. Olson. And what they are based upon, any clue? I can tell the people back home yes, they are there, they got there why?

Mr. Pai. I can't tell you the motivation for any particular conclusion. But with the entire reason for this enterprise, it is important to remember that the FCC disrupted the work that the FTC had done. The FTC had regulated this entire ecosystem consistently for the past decade. Now, having disrupted that with the net neutrality order last year, it is incumbent now upon the FCC to formulate what the privacy rules will be in the internet service provider space.

Mr. O'Rielly. So to your point in terms of the cart before the horse, here is a quote from an FCC staffer working on the

issues. He said in terms of precise information about how information is being used right now, I don't know that we have that. They don't know what is being used by the ISPs today but we have a solution in the proposals.

Mr. Olson. The people back home say that does not add up. That doesn't -- well, I won't say what they will say back home. But one final question.

Has the Commission caught itself in a corner where to undo these rules, these new mandates, is that going to be really hard to do when this rule comes out? Can we stop this or is it pretty much the train has left the station?

Mr. Pai. I think, unfortunately, Congressman, the

Commission is proposing to leave the station in a certain

direction and notwithstanding what the American people might tell

us after this document finally becomes public, the Agency's

direction, as you will see is pretty clear.

Mr. Olson. Mr. O'Rielly, any comments on that, sir?

Mr. O'Rielly. I agree that it would be challenged. I

suspect it will be challenged in court. And we will see if they

survive that. And barring a change in direction of the

Commission, I think they --

Mr. Olson. The people back home are so tired of having to go to courts to get the rules enforced the way they are written.

They just say they are sick and tired of going to courts.

I want to switch gears and talk about the upcoming spectrum option in rural Texas. It is 1 week away. Now, I am talking about this issue a lot back home with the Texas Association of Broadcasters, the TAB, and they are worried about losing parts of their spectrum, the spectrum not being compensated. The towers might have to be moved and that cost a lot of money. And the FCC has not given any assurance that they will be fully reimbursed, especially in rural areas.

The example they gave me was Amarillo, Texas, a decent size town, about 2,000 people in the panhandle. They have nine TV stations there, four Spanish language stations, four. They came here to D.C., met with the FCC and their concerns were basically dismissed. They said don't worry; it will be taken care of; all will be fine. And if it is not fine, we have got your back. That was not reassuring.

Does the FCC have enough funds to cover rural TV stations if they have to build a new tower or lose their spectrum? Is there money out there to do that or is that just a wish and a prayer?

Mr. O'Rielly. Well, I will answer it this way. I don't know the answer to that and part of it is because we have a variable band plan. So, we don't know how many people -- how much spectrum we are actually selling. We are going to let the market decide

2123 some of those things through the good legislation you do.

So, we don't know how many people are going to be displaced. And so some of that will require a little bit of time to figure out. What I have said, that I would be the first one here if the 1.75 is not sufficient to advocate that Congress reconsider this number.

Mr. Olson. Thank you. Mr. Pai, anything to add about that, sir?

Mr. Pai. I would agree with Commissioner O'Rielly and I would just add that that is one of the reasons why I have consistently said that we should have treated the \$1.75 billion as a budget, rather than a soft suggestion.

Mr. Olson. Thank you. I am out of time. On behalf of the Aggies, whoop!

Mr. Johnson. The gentleman yields back with a whoop. And with that, I recognize the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Yarmuth.

Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks to all of you for being here today and for doing what you are doing to ensure that there is access to broadband throughout our country so that everyone can participate in 21st century economy.

Come November, it is estimated by some that there will have then spent somewhere in the neighborhood of \$10 billion on political advertising in this cycle. A lot of that is going to

be spent by entities, candidates, and party organizations that are required by law to disclose their donors. But a significant portion of it would be spent by front groups that are under no requirement to disclose their donors. That is why Ms. Eshoo and I and 168 of our colleagues wrote to Chairman Wheeler asking the Commission to use its authority under Section 317 to require the disclosure of donors for all of these front ads, front organization ads.

And we wrote in January. I received this response during March 10th from the chairman and it is basically a thank you for writing response, something I don't think that you would believe that we would be satisfied with. And while I don't think that necessarily we expected you to say okay, we will do that right away, I certainly expected more than this. And what particularly disturbs me is that when we talked about the basis for the Commission's refusal to do it is based on their definition of editorial -- using the standard of editorial control, based on a 1979 interpretation by staff as to what the standard for be to determine what a sponsoring organization is.

And you mentioned that in January proceedings that you expanded the requirements to cable companies and satellite providers and so forth as if that would be satisfactory to us. Personally, I think that really is a further institutionalization

of the deception of American public because this standard of editorial control is absolutely the most useless standard for the American people in trying to decide or trying to determine the credibility of political advertising.

I spent most of my career in media prior to coming to Congress and I have a little bit of an idea what editorial control is. And in these situations, these groups, Americans for Puppies and Kittens or Americans for a Brighter Tomorrow, they don't have editorial control. They may be crafting a message but they don't have control of that message.

So, if you could imagine, the American Petroleum Institute, they want to form one of these front groups and fund it. Can you imagine what would happen if they organization that they funded, America for a Brighter Tomorrow, ran ads saying we need to do away with burning all fossil fuels? Those ads wouldn't stay up very long. They don't have control. They are doing what their funders want them to do. And that is why this is such a deceit that has been fostered on the American people. They don't have any idea who is saying that puppies and kittens are great.

And until we get this kind of disclosure, billions and billions of dollars will be spent to deliberately deceive American voters. And I don't understand why the Commission would not at least enter into a review of the standard they are using, you are

using, to determine what is the most beneficial standard for deciding what is a true sponsor. A sponsor is who pays for it. And in this situation, those entities that are paying for it are not willing to be public, which is why they are using the facades that they are using.

So, in terms of the public interest, in terms of a vital and open democracy and a transparent democracy, I would request, first of all, I would reassert our request to take action. But short of that, I would hope that maybe we could meet with Commission staff to talk about this whole notion of editorial content and exactly what their perception is -- I mean of editorial control and see exactly what their perception of editorial control is. Because as a former editor, I know who has control of the editorial process and I know who has control of the advertising process. And this would be like Coca-Cola saying we are wanting an ad, put a soft drink ad and you said okay, well you have to say paid for by Ogilvy and Mather or Leo Burnett, or one of the advertising agencies, instead of Coca-Cola.

So, hopefully, we can see this decision and work with us to do something that is more sensible. I yield back.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Kinzinger.

Mr. Kinzinger. Thank you, Chairman. And thank you all for

being here. I know it is like Christmas Day for you when you get to come before us. So, I appreciate having you. Thanks for your service.

Mr. Chairman, Chairman Wheeler, we have had conversations in the past regarding the rate regulation bill that I introduced last year. And at the time of our initial conversation, there was a lot of concern regarding the authority your commission possesses but chooses to forbear for the most part in regards to rate regulation. And I appreciate the forbearance of that. I want to make that clear.

During that conversation, we talked about putting into statutory law a phrase that would ensure yours and future commissions do not have the ability to set out retail rates on broadband internet, which I think is an important role for Congress to play, to have a voice. But now since the time of our original conversation, you, along with many of our colleagues on this committee have said that the bill I introduced is far greater than what it seems and that it could end the ability of the FCC to regulate a plethora of other activities that were not in the bill. And I understand those concerns and I am willing to work with anyone that is willing to work with me to ensure that the intent of the bill is moved forward in a reasonable manner.

Following a number of conversations and negotiations with

members on both sides of the aisle, you passed what I think was an excellent amendment to the bill being a recent markup to ensure that a number of issues brought forward by our colleagues and yourself were specifically exempted from adding or detracting from the current FCC authority.

Now, not more than a few hours after we passed that bill out of committee, you were in front another committee in Congress where the same issues was brought forward. In that hearing, I have the transcripts actually, you again stated that we will not regulate broadband rates. Again, I appreciate that. And you then said that you would be willing to offer your assistance to Representative Crenshaw in developing legislative language on this topic. More specifically, you agreed to provide them with language and assistance within a couple of weeks from the date of that hearing, which was March 15th. Would you be willing to provide that language to our committee when it is completed, which will be around March 29th?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Kinzinger. Okay. I also want to clear something up. In a recent markup on H.R. 2666, a letter from you was entered into the record in which you go to great length to explain why my bill is inconsistent with your comments before a Senate approps committee. Given that I read you the text of the bill before it

was originally introduced and you stated that this is what we are trying to accomplish, I am a bit confused by your letter. So,
I just want to clear something up.

This is just yes or no. Do you believe that the FCC should

This is just yes or no. Do you believe that the FCC should have the authority to regulate rates after the fact through enforcement?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Kinzinger. Okay.

Mr. Wheeler. What I was talking about was the question of de-forbearing.

Mr. Kinzinger. Okay.

Mr. Wheeler. And I believe that in the Open Internet rule, as we did, we should forbear from rate regulation.

Mr. Kinzinger. But you believe that you should have the authority to regulate rates. Even though you choose not to at this time, the Commission should have that authority to be able to regulate broadband rates.

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Kinzinger. That is kind of inconsistent --

Mr. Wheeler. It is because here is what is the concept. So, for instance, Chairman Walden's amendment that you just referenced here, the amendment to your original idea, when she said hey, this will not have any impact on paid prioritization

because obviously, if something is paid, there is a rate being charged.

Mr. Kinzinger. Well, sir, and I appreciate it. I am willing to work with you but what I am kind of confused about is you went from saying hey, we are going to forbear it, we have no intention of regulating rates on the internet. And I liked the concept of what your bill is, even if you don't like the details. We are willing to work with you on the details but you are saying that you actually disagree that you actually should have the ability to regulate broadband rates.

Mr. Wheeler. That is what I am trying to address, the issue of rates. So, for instance, as Chairman Walden's amendment said, well, paid prioritization could be a rate. That is not what we are talking about. Throttling could be rates and we have all agreed we don't want to do throttling. Because how do you throttle? There is a rate you are paying. You are delivering less than the service that you say that you are going to offer. Therefore, there is a rate impact --

Mr. Kinzinger. And I understand. Even though there is a lot of details but we went from you saying I agree we should not be able to regulate broadband rates to now saying we should regulate broadband rates but I will forbear it for this moment. There is details and that is my point is we are willing to work

2307 | with you on a lot of these details.

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Kinzinger. And we are happy to do it with the other side of the aisle, with you all and I think that is important but maybe we made a little headlines.

To Commissioner Pai, do you believe that the Open Internet order leaves open the ability of the FCC to regulate rates in any fashion after the fact and do you believe that Congress should act?

Mr. Pai. Yes and yes. And I think the chairman's commitment should be taken at its word that rate regulation is, indeed, on the table. And I don't think -- it shouldn't be that big of a leap if the President has said when he instructed the FCC to adopt Title II, I don't want the FCC to regulate broadband internet access rates. If the chairman says I don't want to regulate broadband internet access rates and I don't have a problem with Congress codifying that, there should not be an objection when Congress actually tries to codify that commitment.

Mr. Kinzinger. That is right. And that is the role of Congress is to make these laws to make these things that we want our folks to live by or not live by and I guess I am confused but unfortunately, I am out of time.

So, thank you all. Thanks for being here.

2330 Mr. Wheeler. Thank you.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back and I recognize now Ms. Clarke from New York.

Ms. Clarke. I thank you, Mr. Chairman and I thank our ranking member. Good afternoon, Chairman Wheeler, and to the entire panel of commissioners seated before us today.

My time is short so I want to get right to my question. Mr. Chairman, as you know some of my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and I have expressed our concerns about the potential irreparable harm the set top box proposal could have on small minority programmers, content providers, and broadcasters. This concern was also expressed recently by Adonis Hoffman, a former chief of staff to a Democratic FCC commissioner and I quote, if the FCC adopts the Wheeler proposal in a final order later this year, it will embed a regime that creates more, not fewer hurdles for smaller players, new entrants, and minority content providers to pierce the Silicon curtain. End quote.

Mr. Chairman, you continue to have said that you don't believe that this disruption will harm or limit minority and independent programming. So, has the FCC gathered evidence to this effect? Has a disparity study been conducted to surface the unintended consequences of this proposal for programmers whose

viability is not only driven by increased viewership but also proven business models?

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Congresswoman. The entire NPRM is designed to elicit this kind of information and then to collect that information in the first round and then to have a rebuttal to that information or adding --

Ms. Clarke. Okay, so there has been no study. No. Okay.

Mr. Wheeler. No, what I am saying is that is the process. We are collecting that right now.

Ms. Clarke. Okay. So, I have asked the Congressional Research Service to perform a study on the impact of the set top box proposal on small and minority programmers and content providers and broadcasters. I consider this a reasonable request. Would you consider delaying the rulemaking until the report is completed and to work with the committee to address any concerns that may be raised by a report?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, we would look forward to working with you and the committee on any issues that are raised in this, as you and I have discussed previously on this.

Ms. Clarke. So you would consider a delay?

Mr. Wheeler. I don't know how long the delay would be, ma'am.

Ms. Clarke. Okay, we can talk about that.

2376

Mr. Wheeler. Yes.

2377

Ms. Clarke. Commissioner Clyburn, I want to commend and congratulate you on all your efforts on inmate calling services.

2379

2378

It has meant so much to so many families across our nation and

2380

I know it will happen.

insufficient.

2381

I have a question about the modernization of the Lifeline

2382

program. I am hearing from many constituents that they are

2383

concerned with a portion of the proposal that would start charging

2384

2385

a consistent theme here this morning. Would you further explain

2386

the proposal of the modernization of the Lifeline program?

2387

Ms. Clarke. Well, what we are attempting to do, and it was

2388

a very simple, for me, objective to ensure that the Lifeline program looks much like everyone else's offerings and options and

2389

2390

opportunities. Right now, it just goes to finance voice services

2391

and we believe in a 21st century economy world that is

2392

2393

So, we are still in a deliberative stage. I have heard

2394

concerns, as I mentioned in my opening remark from consumers that

2395

are concerned, particularly on a mobile voice problem -- a mobile

2396

voice consider it to be a problem here.

2397

But what I want to assure you is I am going to take all of those into considerations because I want, as I have the option

2398

to pay little, none, or more, depending on my ability and what I want from the market and that is what we are attempting to create all price points starting at zero.

Ms. Clarke. So, my question is related to the maintenance of the voice service for constituents that may not have access to high speed broadband or may not want to adopt the modern technology because they are seniors or disabled or perhaps less literate. Is the FCC being too presumptuous that broadband will be competitively available to all Americans in the next 3 years, as outlined in the agency's draft proposals?

Ms. Clyburn. I will answer this way and more succinctly, based on time. It is my wish that whatever your desire is from a communications standpoint, whatever your need is from a communications standpoint, that this is a program that answers your needs.

Ms. Clarke. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Thank you very much.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentlelady for yielding back. The chair now recognizes itself for 5 minutes.

Chairman Wheeler, recently, I was shown a quote attributed to a former venture capitalist, you, regarding the FCC's regulation of what was then a cutting edge innovative service.

And I quote, I would hope the Commission recognizes that despite

the fact that they have very capable and dedicated individuals, it is not smarter than the functions of the marketplace. In that regard, I would just point to the cellular industry. The reason the industry has reached the level it has is because the FCC was smart enough to know that they didn't have all the knowledge. End quote.

So, looking at the situation with Binge On and other products, you have a team scrutinizing them, notwithstanding the overwhelming consumer response. It sounds like now the FCC's Enforcement Bureau does have all of the knowledge, in your opinion. So, what has changed at the FCC since you made that statement as head of CTIA?

Mr. Wheeler. Well far be it from me to challenge the wisdom of that statement, Congressman. The model what we built for the Open Internet is based on Section 332 and what I was speaking about at that time. And the job that the Congress and the Commission did in saying it is a common carrier and here are the things from which you will forbear. And that the responsibilities of common carriage continue to obtain them. And just like the common carriage responsibilities of data roaming were applied to wireless carriers in the last several years, so, too, do we then look at other common carriage responsibilities that may fall out and be affected by internet service providers.

Mr. Johnson. Okay, well, great. So, it sounds like your position has changed, that now the Enforcement Bureau does have more of the knowledge than the private market.

Let's go on to a second question. On your watch, and one of our colleagues earlier said we are not really talking about your budget, which is what you are here to talk about but I am going to seque to that.

On your watch, average personnel costs for employees in the Enforcement Bureau have grown faster than was the case under Chairman Genachowski. Certainly average salaries for those in the enforcement bureau have grown faster during your tenure than was the case under your predecessor. How do you explain this trend toward higher spending?

Mr. Wheeler. You have given me a piece of information that I was unaware of and I will be happy to --

Mr. Johnson. Would you get back to us and take that question for the record? Thank you. We would like to know that.

Also, Chairman Wheeler, the FCC, as a matter of practice sends a contingent of Enforcement Bureau field agents to the Super Bowl. Correct?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Johnson. It is the job of these field agents to ensure that no harmful or malicious interference interrupts

| 2468 | communications, broadcasting, or public safety. Is that         |
|------|---|
| 2469 | correct?  |
| 2470 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.  |
| 2471 | Mr. Johnson. A group went this year. Am I correct, this         |
| 2472 | past January February?  |
| 2473 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.  |
| 2474 | Mr. Johnson. I assume that, given the task, that this team      |
| 2475 | is responsible for they are made up of primarily engineers that |
| 2476 | can resolve those problems. Is that correct?                    |
| 2477 | Mr. Wheeler. I don't know the answer to that, sir.              |
| 2478 | Mr. Johnson. Okay. Could you get back to us on that?            |
| 2479 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.  |
| 2480 | Mr. Johnson. Did the chief of the Enforcement Bureau attend     |
| 2481 | the Super Bowl as part of the FFC's presence this year?         |
| 2482 | Mr. Wheeler. I don't know the answer to that, sir.              |
| 2483 | Mr. Johnson. Would you get back to us on that?                  |
| 2484 | And do you know if any Enforcement Bureau chiefs in the past    |
| 2485 | have attended the Super Bowl?                                   |
| 2486 | Mr. Wheeler. I don't know the answer to that.                   |
| 2487 | Mr. Johnson. Okay, so there are three or four questions for     |
| 2488 | you, if you would get back to us on those.                      |
| 2489 | Sticking with you, Chairman Wheeler, but changing focus, as     |
| 2490 | the head of an important agency, I am sure you are aware of the |

| This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements          |
|---|
| within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the       |
| speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on |
| the Committee's website as soon as it is available.                 |

challenges that have arisen in agencies and departments like the EPA, the IRS, and the State Department with respect to the use of non-official means of communication, often to avoid or allay things like the Administrative Procedures Act or the Freedom of Information Act and the Federal Records Act.

Does the FCC have a policy that clearly requires FCC employees to comply with these rate obligations and how do you enforce that policy and ensure that personnel cell phones and direct messaging over social media platforms are not use by your employees to avoid the sunshine and openness we expect in a regulatory agency like the FCC?

Mr. Wheeler. I am sorry, let me see what I understand. You are saying what policy do we have to make sure that you don't do business on private --

Mr. Johnson. Yes, essentially.

Mr. Wheeler. That is policy.

Mr. Johnson. Do you have that policy?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Johnson. What do you do to enforce it? What kind of enforcement mechanisms do you have in place?

Mr. Wheeler. We don't go spying on our employees.

Mr. Johnson. I am sorry?

Mr. Wheeler. We don't go looking at what our employees are

.... deminen. 1 din berr

2514 doing. 2515 Mr. Johnson. How do you enforce it? 2516 We have the rule in place. Mr. Wheeler. 2517 Mr. Johnson. So you don't enforce it. 2518 Mr. Wheeler. If there is a complaint made against the rule, I am sure we will enforce it. 2519 2520 Mr. Johnson. Okay. What I hear you saying is you don't 2521 enforce it. 2522 I yield back and now I recognize Mr. McNerney from California 2523 for 5 minutes. 2524 Mr. McNerney. I thank the chair. 2525 Concerning the ISP privacy proposal, Chairman Wheeler, I 2526 believe that consumers should have control over their data, what 2527 they disclose and how their data is used. Recognizing that the 2528 average internet users may not be aware of the multiple entities, 2529 such as the ISP and Web sites, the collective data, will your 2530 proposal ensure that consumers have an understanding of what 2531 entities are collecting their information? 2532 Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir. 2533 Mr. McNerney. How will do you that? 2534 Mr. Wheeler. So, there are three legs to this stool. 2535 First, is transparency, that it must be disclosed what information 2536 is being collected and then how that information is used when it

2537 | is collected.

The second is that you must be given choice insofar as do you want that information to be collected and used.

And the third is that that information must be secured so that it does not end up violating your privacy by leaking out to some other source.

Mr. McNerney. Are you going to require opt-ins or opt-outs as part of this?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. McNerney. So the consumers will have to opt-in or opt-out, depending on what they want?

Mr. Wheeler. Any information that is collected by an ISP may not be distributed to a non-ISP, in other words, may not be sold to an advertiser or somebody like this, without the opt-in consent of the consumer.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you. Data security is a critical element of the ISP privacy proposal, at least in my opinion. One of the things you can do is called out by requiring reasonable steps but what does the Commission mean by reasonable steps? What does that constitute?

Mr. Wheeler. So, that is noticed by the absence of reasonable steps. The reality is that one company's solution may be as adequate as another's solution but what we don't want to

do is to say here is the black and white cookie cutter that everybody has to do. Let's for instance, let me give you an example.

There was one company that allowed their employees to operate

-- allowed is the wrong word -- under whose supervision where
employees sold the information for about 280,000 customers.

There must be a reasonable structure in place to prevent that kind of activity.

Mr. McNerney. So, you don't believe in establishing a standard through some process and then applying that standard.

Mr. Wheeler. We establish the expectation that you will do it but there are multiple ways that it can be accomplished.

Mr. McNerney. Okay, thank you.

Regarding set top boxes, as you know, I wrote a letter to you with Mr. Barton and Mrs. Ellmers regarding the privacy issues under your proposals. I appreciate you responded. We got that letter last week. Although, I have a few questions about the certification process.

How would consumers go about raising a potential violation of self-certification or independent certification?

Mr. Wheeler. So, the enforcement exists as it does today under Section 631 applicable to wireless carriers, that that is the expectation that applies. Their first role of responsibility

is the cable operator themselves. And the second is an appropriate complaint to the FTC or the state AG but that we have the same level of privacy protections that get put in place today with existing alternative set top boxes, such as TiVo and Roku.

Mr. McNerney. Well then who would decide an evaluation that warrants a revocation?

Mr. Wheeler. The revocation of the license?

Mr. McNerney. And the certification.

Mr. Wheeler. So, the cable operator can make that decision and there can be enforcement action taken by the FTC or the AGs.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you.

Commissioner Clyburn, I am also interested in the Lifeline but in California, our customers get a state subsidy, along with a Wi-Fi subsidy and yet, some of our providers are saying that even with that with the most generous state subsidy in the United States, they are still not able to supply, provide the basic services that are available warranted. Do you see that -- I mean how do you see addressing that problem?

Ms. Clyburn. Our universal service construct has always been viewed through a public and private lens. And we always knew that there will be certain limitations from a government standpoint in terms of allocation of resources, be it state or local. And so what we are attempting to do through our other

initiatives and conversations and partnerships that we are continuing to forge is to ensure that the market has options that would be more in line with the affordability construct in which you laid out.

And so, it is a continuing work in process and I think we are on the correct trajectory to marry and close these spots.

Mr. McNerney. So, there may be co-payments involved?

Ms. Clyburn. We always knew that \$9.25 from a federal coffer would not be enough in all cases to bridge the divide. And that is why it is so important for, as you mentioned, states like California, who recognize that, who complement the front economically and we are hoping for more interaction with the private marketplace to bring things closer to affordability for those who could use, who need broadband the most.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you, Mr. Chairman for indulging me.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Bilirakis.

Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it. Thanks to the panel for their testimony today.

I have a couple of questions. Chairman Wheeler, I understand that a lot of robocalls or automated text messages are an unwelcome part of modern life and should be limited, as they

are now, under the telephone Consumer Protection Act but in some cases, consumers, customers have a legitimate need and a real desire to receive important information from some businesses. For example, utilities may need to contact their customers with information about outages, repairs, service restoration or other important service updates. This is especially true in a situation we face in Florida when we have hurricanes and tropical storms. So, it is a public safety issue.

I understand there is a petition from electric and gas utilities currently pending at the Commission to clarify that the TCPA does not apply to non-telemarketing informational communications from utilities to their customers. Does the Commission plan to act on this or can you comment on the status of the petition, please?

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Congressman. I am unfamiliar with that specific petition. We are dealing with several issues that come out of TCPA. I would love to get back to you with an answer on that.

Mr. Bilirakis. Please do. Please do. Thank you.

I have a second question for Chairman Wheeler. We recently had FirstNet up here, along with your Public Safety Bureau. One of the things we discussed was the level of coordination between FCC and FirstNet on closing FCC field offices, since the field

agents play a critical role, I am sure you will agree in resolving interference to public safety communications. Yet, I still don't have a clear answer to my question.

Was there any consultation between FirstNet and the FCC about reducing the size of the field office presence? And a simple yes or no will do.

Mr. Wheeler. I don't believe so, sir.

Mr. Bilirakis. You don't believe so?

Mr. Wheeler. Correct.

2652

2653

2654

2655

2656

2657

2658

2659

2660

2661

2662

2663

2664

2665

2666

2667

2668

2669

2670

2671

2672

2673

2674

Mr. Bilirakis. That is probably a no. Is that correct?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Bilirakis. Yes, okay.

Mr. Wheeler. To the best of my knowledge.

Mr. Bilirakis. All right.

Commissioners Pai and O'Rielly, the market definition in the chairman's set top box proposal seems divorced from the reality of how consumers watch video today. The video market already competes for consumers getting numerous viewing options, based on single programs channels or bundles.

Isn't the FCC's market definition backward-looking, considering where the market is going? What do you think?

I can't put it better than the former chairman of this committee,

Mr. Pai. Congressman, I agree with that characterization.

I can't put it better

Henry Waxman, who said just yesterday that this is a 20th century solution to a problem that the market is already solving on its own.

Mr. O'Rielly. I agree.

Mr. Bilirakis. Mr. O'Rielly, please?

Mr. O'Rielly. I agree.

Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you.

Next question for the entire panel. Is the Commission worried about all the automated telephone dialing system cases being decided in court on a case-by-case basis? Should the Commission revisit the definition and help to bring clarity to the issue so that businesses can have clearer guidance? We will start with the chairman, please.

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, Congressman. We had a large proceeding on that within the last 6 or 8 months and what we are trying to hue to is the specific language that is in TCPA that says that insofar as wireless calls are concerned, the wireless subscriber has the right to determine whether or not you get called.

Mr. Bilirakis. Commissioner Clyburn, please?

Ms. Clyburn. So, I interpreted your -- hopefully my interpretation is in sync with the spirit of your question. One of the things that we recognize is that every situation is

different and we must have the capacity when it comes to intake of those calls and complaints, which are huge, they are a larger number, that we each have the capacity to compartmentalize them and address them. So, how we look at them in mesh.

There are a lot of commonalities to many of these calls and we will address them in such a manner that would be in sync with that.

Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you. Any other commissioner wish to comment?

Ms. Rosenworcel. As the chairman alluded to, we did address autodialer capacity in the summer of 2015, in our most recent decision under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

But if I could make one point, it would be a plea. This is a law from 1991 and one of the challenges that the agency has right now is we are taking all sorts of technologies that did not exist in the early 1990s and trying to figure out how to fit them into this old law. We are, as a result, struggling with more robocalls for consumers and more challenging lawsuits for companies that never intended to be on the wrong side of the consumers they are calling.

Mr. Bilirakis. Mr. Pai, should the Commission revisit the definition and help to bring clarity to the issues so that business have clear guidance?

Without question, Congressman. But in the absence of the Commission doing that, and I don't see any indication that it will, I think as Commissioner Rosenworcel pointed out, it would be helpful for Congress to update the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

2721

2722

2723

2724

2725

2726

2727

2728

2729

2730

2731

2732

2733

2734

2735

2736

2737

2738

2739

2740

2741

2742

2743

A number of strange situations we find ourselves in now is on one hand having perverted the definition of autodialer to include everything more sophisticated than the rotary phone, all these legitimate businesses are now seeking a special exemption from the FCC from the TCPA's strictures and the various class actions that are sure to follow.

At the same time, the administration is exempting entire categories of favored robocallers, such as government student debt collectors, the present payphone industry and others. They get a pass, whereas, a lot of these legitimate businesses don't. That is an untenable state of affairs.

Mr. Bilirakis. Commissioner O'Rielly?

Mr. O'Rielly. I will just say I agree. I think the definition was wrong at the time and we should clarify.

Thank you. I yield back, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bilirakis. appreciate it.

Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. And the chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri,

2744 Mr. Long.

Mr. Long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And before I give my remarks, I would like to just, along with many others, send out thoughts and prayers to the victims of the tragedy in Brussels today, including a U.S. service member and four of his family members that were injured and three Mormon missionaries, who were also injured, too, of which I know are Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of Oversight and Government Reform, constituents of his.

And another note, I note the passing of my predecessor's father, Roy Blount's dad. Roy Blount passed away last night and I know that a lot of folks had not heard that yet.

And I want to add to the accolades, even though he is not in the room, that everyone has been throwing out to Ray Baum today.

And you know after he wrote Wizard of Oz, I thought he would be done. I thought he could live off of his residuals.

But Ray is a great guy. And I came to Congress from a different background than most. I was an auctioneer and a real estate broker for over 30 years. I am a salesman. And a salesman has to be upbeat, optimistic, open. And Ray, I have never seen him in a bad mood. He is always upbeat, optimistic, and open, regardless of the challenge. I wish him the best of luck of the NAB. And I just realized out in the hall that he is 1 week younger than I am. Now, I know you can't tell by looking because I look

younger than him, I am sure. But anyway, congratulations to Ray on his move.

Commissioner Rosenworcel, I want to commend you on your trip down to Austin promoting the broadband to rural areas, which is a very, very key object or whatever that we have been working on, that we need to work on. I, too, spoke in Austin and participated in a panel 10 days ago today on that very subject on delivering rural broadband to the rural areas, which for the students in their studies and everything, it is critical that we get that done. So, I just wanted to congratulate you on your trip to Austin to promote the same thing.

Chairman Wheeler, in the spirt of John Dingle, I am going to ask you for yes or no answers to my questions. I have got a few here. I don't have a lot.

But Chairman Wheeler, I would like to focus this morning, or this afternoon I guess it is now, on your treatment of television joint sales agreements, known as JSAs. I don't know if you are aware but there is a JSA in my district between TV stations KSNF and KODE in Joplin, Missouri. And it was because of this JSA that KODE was able to buy Doppler radar, which, at the time, was obviously a benefit to the Joplin community. But in 2011, when the EF5 tornado ripped through Joplin, killing 161 people in a town of 50,000, so everyone knew someone from that

tragedy, when it ripped through Joplin, there wasn't anything much more important in my community than the Doppler radar, which tracked a multiple vortex tornado that stayed on the ground for six miles. And the reason KODE was able to afford this piece of weather equipment was because of the JSA.

Now, I have got to admit that I was pretty frustrated with the FCC when they made the decision back in 2014 to basically outlaw JSAs, especially when I saw firsthand the difference they can make to small and medium sized markets like Joplin. Clearly, also in my hometown of Springfield, there is a JSA operating there. Clearly, many others in Congress had the same frustration, which is why last year, we included a 10-year grandfather for JSAs created before March of 2014 in the omnibus spending bill.

Chairman Wheeler, again, in the spirit of John Dingle, yes or no answer. Were you aware of the passage of this law?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Long. Okay, good. I thought that when Congress passed the law, it would have been the end of the conversation on JSAs but, unfortunately, to my surprise, I see the FCC has decided to use the merger process to circumvent a recently passed law. In a number of instances, the FCC has not provided the law's 10-year grandfather to JSAs involved in a merger. Is that correct, yes or no?

| 2813 | Mr. Wheeler. No, sir.   |
|------|---|
| 2814 | Mr. Long. That is not correct?                                    |
| 2815 | Mr. Wheeler. That is not correct.                                 |
| 2816 | Mr. Long. I am aware that   |
| 2817 | Mr. Wheeler. Would you like me to explain?                        |
| 2818 | Mr. Long. I am aware that you argue that there is                 |
| 2819 | long-standing precedent that gives the FCC the right to modify    |
| 2820 | new licenses. Have you read the language in the omnibus bill that |
| 2821 | grandfathers JSA?   |
| 2822 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.  |
| 2823 | Mr. Long. Can you tell me if the omnibus language includes        |
| 2824 | any exceptions to the 10-year grandfather in the JSAs?            |
| 2825 | Mr. Wheeler. It talks about license                               |
| 2826 | Mr. Long. Yes or no?  |
| 2827 | Mr. Wheeler. It talks about                                       |
| 2828 | Mr. Long. Can you answer yes or no for me? Let me repeat          |
| 2829 | the question and I would like a yes or no.                        |
| 2830 | Can you tell me if that omnibus language includes any             |
| 2831 | exceptions to the 10-year grandfather in the JSAs?                |
| 2832 | Mr. Wheeler. In the definition of license                         |
| 2833 | Mr. Long. Yes or no? Can you give me a yes or no? That            |
| 2834 | is a simple question.   |
| 2835 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes.   |

2836 Thank you. Did the language include any Mr. Long. 2837 exception in the case of merger reviews or FCC precedent? 2838 or no? 2839 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. 2840 Mr. Long. And in the case where the FCC precedent that 2841 conflicts with a federal statute which trumps, isn't the statute 2842 -- it is in the statute, isn't it? 2843 Mr. Wheeler. The statute does not conflict. 2844 Mr. Long. It appears others were as surprised as I was with 2845 your interpretation of the statute. Now the statute recently, 2846 the 12 bipartisan senators representing a full political spectrum from Senators Schumer and Durbin to Senators Blunt and Wicker sent 2847 2848 you a letter telling you the congressional intent of that omnibus 2849 language, mainly to grandfather all JSAs created before March 14 and you are in receipt of that letter, yes or no? 2850 2851 Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir. 2852 Mr. Long. Okay, I yield back. 2853 Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. 2854 The chair now recognizes the gentlelady from North Carolina, Mrs. Ellmers. 2855 Mrs. Ellmers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thank you to our 2856 2857 I am going to continue the tradition that we are carrying

on here of Congressman Dingle.

And Mr. or, excuse me, Chairman Wheeler, as you know, I have legislation requiring the FCC publish any rule changes on their Web site within 24 hours, H.R. 2589. Transparency has been a priority for this administration. So, I find it strange that some have balked at this proposal. To that end, I would like to ask you a few yes or no questions.

Does the FCC have the ability to publish rule changes online within 24 hours?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes.

Mrs. Ellmers. They do. So, you confirm that within 24 hours we will be able to publish that information at the FCC?

Mr. Wheeler. You were asking the question do we have the technical ability to publish within 24 hours.

Mrs. Ellmers. And your answer is yes, correct?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes.

Mrs. Ellmers. Thank you. Now, I want to move on to another subject. Chairman Wheeler, I have been a little disturbed to read about the FCC's quote anti-business bias in a recent Hill article. The commissioner's job is to ensure that the communications marketplace is functioning to promote benefits for consumers and not to be beholden to radical special interest groups. Are you really listening to the wide range of stakeholders involved in the FCC matters or is there a real bias, as been pointed out in

| 2882 | this article?  |
|------|--|
| 2883 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes and no.                                     |
| 2884 | Mrs. Ellmers. Yes and no?                                    |
| 2885 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, I am there were two questions there.       |
| 2886 | One was am I listening and the other is there a bias.        |
| 2887 | Mrs. Ellmers. So yes, to you are listening and no to the     |
| 2888 | bias.  |
| 2889 | Mr. Wheeler. Yes, I am listening. No, there is no bias.      |
| 2890 | Mrs. Ellmers. Thank you. Okay.                               |
| 2891 | So, in 2012, there was a white paper that was created and    |
| 2892 | Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to submit this for the |
| 2893 | record.  |
| 2894 | [The information follows:]                                   |
| 2895 |  |
| 2896 | **************************************                       |

2897 Mr. Johnson. Without objection, so ordered. 2898 Mrs. Ellmers. Thank you. It was a white paper on video 2899 reform from one of these groups, a special interest group called 2900 Public Knowledge, which seems to indicate that you are listening 2901 to very few voices. I look at the executive summary and find that there are four 2902 2903 recommendations listed here that you have basically initiated by 2904 your administration. And I will go through a couple of them, as 2905 time allows. 2906 One, the FCC should issue a declaratory ruling that 2907 multichannel video programming distributors, it goes on to say, 2908 may not engage in unfair methods of competition or deceptive acts 2909 and practices with regard to online video distributors. 2910 started this process to -- to that question, have you not started 2911 that process? 2912 Mr. Wheeler. I am sorry, I am confused here. I wasn't 2913 chairman in 2012 and I am kind of --2914 Mrs. Ellmers. You were part of the FCC at that time, though. 2915 Mr. Wheeler. No, ma'am. 2916 Mrs. Ellmers. You were --Mr. Wheeler. I was a businessman then. 2917 2918 Mrs. Ellmers. Okay but basically the point I am making is

This white

that in this 2012 -- not that you were there in 2012.

paper was generated in 2012. But the point I am trying to make is that you are adhering to this white paper.

Mr. Wheeler. I am sorry, ma'am, I am unfamiliar with that white paper.

Mrs. Ellmers. Okay. Well, then I will just point out then that this particular white paper outlined this particular suggestion and you are following it.

Mr. Wheeler. On which topic or recommendation?

Mrs. Ellmers. Okay, I will read it again for you. The FCC should issue a declaratory ruling that multichannel video programming distributors, and it goes on to say, may not engage in unfair methods of competition or deceptive acts and practices with regard to online video distributors. And that is part of the white paper.

You started this process with questions to that practice. Is that not true?

Mr. Wheeler. I guess -- I apologize. An online video distributor is --

Mrs. Ellmers. Okay, I will tell you what. Let's leave that one aside.

Mr. Wheeler. Okay.

Mrs. Ellmers. The FCC, and this is, again, in the white paper, the FCC should begin a proceeding to determine which

| 2943 | regulations ought to apply to OVDs that choose to operate as MVPDs  |
|------|---|
| 2944 | themselves. You have begun this rulemaking as well, have you not?   |
| 2945 | Mr. Wheeler. Thank you. I have proposed and then have not           |
| 2946 |   |
| 2947 | Mrs. Ellmers. Yes or no? Yes or no?                                 |
| 2948 | Mr. Wheeler. Have not moved on.                                     |
| 2949 | Mrs. Ellmers. Okay. Well, there again, I would like to              |
| 2950 | submit a couple more of the quotes from the white paper. We are     |
| 2951 | submitting the white paper for the record.                          |
| 2952 | But you know, Chairman, I will be honest and tell you at this       |
| 2953 | point, and after watching this process, I am not sure exactly whose |
| 2954 | opinion you are actually taking                                     |
| 2955 | Mr. Johnson. Will the gentlelady yield?                             |
| 2956 | Mrs. Ellmers. My time has expired. And this is troubling            |
| 2957 | to me. So, this is very troubling and I think that we need to       |
| 2958 | take more time to acknowledge the fact that you may be taking       |
| 2959 | opinions that are truly biased and that is very frightening to      |
| 2960 | me moving forward.  |
| 2961 | And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.                                     |

2962

2963

2964

2965

Mr. Johnson. Did the gentlelady want to specifically say what she wanted to add to the record there, your last comment?

Mrs. Ellmers. Well I what will say is I basically, Mr.

Chairman, and I thank you, I have a couple of quotes and basically

2966 I will ask for those yes or no answers in written form.

Mr. Johnson. Without objection, so ordered.

Mrs. Ellmers. Thank you.

Mr. Johnson. The gentlelady has expired.

The chair now recognizes Mr. Collins from New York.

Mr. Collins. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, witnesses. It is almost this is a 3-hour hearing. I have to admit I took a break and had lunch.

What would be a hearing without the New York guy asking about pirate radio? So, here we go. I don't think I will take the whole 5 minutes. But Mr. Wheeler, you and I have had this discussion back and forth.

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Collins. And so in questions after, following the March 19 oversight hearing, you were asked about the report that showed a decline in enforcement in pirate radio. And the question was, has any guidance or instruction been given by the Office of the Chairman or Enforcement Bureau to commission staff not to enforce the statute or commission rules with regard to unlawful operations?

July 21, we did a get a response, July 21, 2015, from you that stated the Office of the Chairman and the Enforcement Bureau have not given or instructed to the commission staff not to enforce

2989

the statute or commission rules with regard to unlawful operation.

I am assuming you remember that.

2991

2990

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

2992

Mr. Collins. Okay. So, 1 week later, July 28 we spoke again

2993

2994

2995 2996

responded, and I quote, I have heard that. And you further added

2997

2998

2999

3000

3001

3002

3003

3004

3005

3006

3007

3008

3009

3010

3011

in this hearing and I asked you if there was any truth to the reports to the suggestion that the FCC had actually directed field offices to step down and back away from an enforcement. that any such command did not come from you.

So, last December, the existence of an internal email within the Enforcement Bureau, this was last December, was disclosed that in October of 2014 the staff of the Bureau's Northeast Region was informed that the FCC's response to pirate radio operations was being scaled back and the Enforcement Bureau would not be issuing notices of apparent liability to the majority of individuals engaged in such unlawful behavior.

So, my question is, since that disclosure came forward last December, have you looked into that directive.

Mr. Wheeler. I have not looked into that, which I maybe had, you know was not compos mentis or something at the time. read that into the record, I do not remember that. But I have taken serious interest in pirate radio. And I am told that about 20 percent of the activities of the Enforcement Bureau are

directed to pirate radio; that we have had about 130 enforcement actions last year; that we continue on that.

And I would add my voice to Commissioner O'Rielly's comment earlier about one of the realities that we are finding here is that we need to get to those who enable it. We can't just pat ourselves on the back for playing whack-a-mole, that we need to get to those that enable it. And if there could be legislation that would address that and empower us to do with --

Mr. Collins. Well, I have got a couple of questions. First of all, I would like, if you could, look into that directive and get back to our committee --

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you.

Mr. Collins. -- about who issued that directive. We would like to know where that came from. But also, recently--

Mr. Wheeler. The email does not say? I am sorry. There is the email. Is there an email?

Mr. Collins. I don't have the details.

Mr. Wheeler. Okay, I will get on top of that.

Mr. Collins. But real quickly, my last point. You just mentioned the need for congressional action to take on the landlords and the others that might be behind the scenes working on this. But by the same token, there was recently released from the FCC an advisory notice from the Enforcement Bureau that stated

that the FCC already has the ability to take FCC enforcement 3035 against those individuals. Your own bulletin said that. 3036 3037 So, I think that it is a bit disingenuous to say you need 3038 congressional action when your own Enforcement Bureau regulations 3039 says you have already got the authority. 3040 Mr. Wheeler. We would love to come back to you and be able 3041 to specifically identify the legislative authority that we are 3042 talking about. I believe --3043 Mr. Collins. But your own enforcement people say you have 3044 already got the authority. So, I would encourage you to, move 3045 forward. 3046 Mr. Wheeler. I think the question is what is the extent of 3047 that --3048 Mr. Collins. In my last 12 seconds, because I don't want 3049 to hold us over, I just also want to ask a very direct question 3050 because it has been suggested that senior managers of the 3051 Enforcement Bureau do not want to shut down pirate radio 3052 operations because they serve certain communities, certainly 3053 within New York City, that might not have otherwise access to that. 3054 Is there any truth in that? 3055 Mr. Wheeler. Well, that would be wrong. 3056 Mr. Collins. And so there is no truth in that? And it would

3057

be wrong.

3058 Mr. Wheeler. It is news to me. 3059 Mr. Collins. Okay, well I appreciate that fairly direct 3060 answer. 3061 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 3062 Mr. Johnson. I thank the gentleman for yielding back. 3063 And the chair now recognizes the ranking member, Ms. Eshoo. 3064 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a unanimous 3065 consent request to place into the record a compilation of 3066 The documents include press reports documenting that documents. broadband investment has not decreased as a result of the Title 3067 3068 II reclassification. The documents also include an analysis of FCC filings and earnings reports of the major telecom companies, 3069 3070 similarly showing that broadband investment has not decreased and also a letter relative to broadband privacy rulemaking, all of 3071 3072 which we have shared with your counsel and ask that these be placed 3073 in the record. 3074 [The information follows:] 3075 3076 \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT 11\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

3077 Mr. Johnson. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Johnson. I remind members that they have -- first of all, I want to thank the panel for being with us today. Thank you very much. I am not used to sitting in this chair. So, I almost forgot that part. Thank you for being here.

I remind members that they have 10 business days to submit questions for the record. And I ask the witnesses to respond to the questions promptly. Members should submit their questions by the close of business on April 6th.

Without objection, the subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:12 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]