

April 26, 2018

The Honorable Ajit Pai
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Pai:

Your *ad hoc* approach to media ownership must end. The time has come for the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to stop making further changes to the nation's broadcast landscape until the agency has conducted and completed a holistic look at the state of broadcasting and the media and waited for a ruling from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, which is currently deliberating on the legality of your previous media ownership actions. Until this has occurred, the FCC should not adopt any additional changes to its media ownership rules, it should not implement any changes adopted over the last several months and it should not approve any pending transfers of control of broadcast licenses as part of proposed mergers or acquisitions. Failure to do so threatens the heart of localism, diversity and competitive fairness in local broadcasting.

We have noted with growing concern your pattern of eliminating the longstanding rules the FCC has maintained to limit local television and radio ownership concentration. As you well know, last September, 24 Senators (including many of the signers of this letter) called on you to stop your actions to eliminate broadcast ownership limits without first conducting a comprehensive review of the state of media ownership in the country. Yet in the months since that letter, you have relentlessly continued the dismantling of these rules with apparent disregard for the collective negative effect of your actions on the nation's media landscape.

The FCC's limits on broadcast ownership have a long history, both in statute and in the FCC's rules, and have enjoyed bipartisan support. Those rules are based upon the bedrock principles of localism and diversity, and they also create a level playing field among broadcast companies. And at their core, these rules reinforce the fact that broadcasters are ultimately the stewards of the public airwaves and should have close ties to the communities that they serve.

The FCC – under your leadership – has engaged in a systematic process of eliminating many of the individual rules designed to further this public interest obligation and keep broadcasters tied to their local community. Your efforts began with the reinstatement of the UHF discount and the elimination of FCC review of joint sales and shared services agreements. Both of these moves raised grave concerns among many groups, and in the case of your reinstatement of the UHF discount, gave rise to ongoing litigation about the propriety and legality of your action.

But those changes are not the only ones that cause us to question your commitment to robust localism and diversity. Eliminating the main studio rule gives large TV station ownership groups carte blanche to centralize their operations and eliminate the home base that a broadcaster has always maintained in every local market it serves. When combined with the troubling trend by some broadcasters of using corporately-developed national news content as a substitute for local journalism, your recent actions risk making the “local” in local broadcasting a thing of the past.

Additionally, late last year, the FCC paved the way for additional consolidation within local markets by loosening the local market ownership limits. No longer are the rules for owning multiple stations in a market clear; rather, permissive consolidation is permitted by the FCC based on its assessment of the impact a particular deal would have on a market. The first test of this new approach to local market consolidation lies in the pending merger between Sinclair Broadcast Group and Tribune Media. Many believe that your rush to alter the local ownership rules was designed to ease the final restrictions on this merger, clearing a path to approval with minimal divestitures, even in light of questions about how Sinclair operates its local stations and complies with its public interest obligations. These suggestions raise concerns about whether the FCC will objectively apply this new permissive standard to Sinclair and what sort of treatment other (potentially less favored) broadcasters may receive in the future.

Finally, in December, you opened an inquiry into whether and how the FCC should alter the national TV station ownership cap. We believe that the legality of any attempt by the FCC to change this statutory cap is in serious doubt (given that the FCC was directed by Congress to adopt the current cap) and we do not find the arguments presented thus far by proponents of raising the cap very persuasive. Moreover, you opened this examination in the midst of your consideration of the Sinclair transaction, which originally proposed to give one company beneficial ownership of stations reaching well over 70 percent of households in the United States (and even in proposed revised form, would reach over 50 percent of households). Although this could be an unfortunate coincidence, these actions raise troubling questions as to whether an ultimate decision has been preordained on this issue. If the agency were to grant the Sinclair transaction first, it could mean that either (1) you have concluded that the cap should be raised to no less than the final ownership percentage given to Sinclair; or (2) you have concluded that Sinclair should benefit from a different – and presumably more liberal – ownership cap than one that applies to others in the same market.

It is time for the FCC to comply with Congress’ directive contained in Section 202(h) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and conduct a thorough, fact-based and impartial review of the current state of broadcast ownership and the media marketplace. The rapid technological and practical changes in the broadcast space in the past several years suggest that the FCC must build a new and thorough record about the state of broadcasting and media today. Only once that review is complete can policymakers at the FCC and in Congress, and the public at large, fully comprehend what changes to the media ownership rules are justified. And any such review should examine the factual and legal basis for any media ownership action you have taken since assuming the chairmanship of the FCC, as serious concerns have been raised that those actions were not properly grounded in fact or law.

In addition, the FCC should not grant any proposed broadcast license transfers that could exceed the current 39 percent national ownership cap, as applied in the absence of the agency's UHF discount. As noted above, serious questions have been raised about the legality of your reinstatement of that discount and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit just heard oral argument in that case (with at least one judge expressing serious doubts about the propriety of the discount). To grant license transfers in excess of the cap in reliance on a questionable rule change would fly in the face of reasoned decision making and could severely upend competitive balance in the broadcast TV market if the court reverses your action.

Until the FCC completes a more comprehensive look the state of broadcasting and the court renders its decision, the agency should cease all rulemaking activity related to media ownership, including its questionable review of changes to the national ownership cap. The FCC also should pause consideration of all pending broadcast mergers, given that granting those mergers could give companies competitive advantages in the market once any new rules are adopted. These steps are necessary in the public interest to ensure fairness in the market and to remove any cloud of uncertainty over the agency's decision making in these matters.

Sincerely,



BILL NELSON
United States Senator



BRIAN SCHATZ
United States Senator




MARIA CANTWELL
United States Senator



RICHARD J. DURBIN
United States Senator



EDWARD J. MARKEY
United States Senator



RON WYDEN
United States Senator



MARGARET WOOD HASSAN
United States Senator




JACK REED
United States Senator


SHELDON WHITEHOUSE
United States Senator


BERNARD SANDERS
United States Senator


PATTY MURRAY
United States Senator



TAMMY DUCKWORTH
United States Senator


TOM UDALL
United States Senator



JEANNE SHAHEEN
United States Senator



AMY KLOBUCHAR
United States Senator



GARY C. PETERS
United States Senator


CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO
United States Senator


RICHARD BLUMENTHAL
United States Senator


TAMMY BALDWIN
United States Senator


JON TESTER
United States Senator


CORY A. BOOKER
United States Senator


JEFFREY A. MERKLEY
United States Senator



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Jon Tester
United States Senate
311 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Tester:

Thank you for your letter expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part.

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Bill Nelson
United States Senate
716 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Nelson:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part.

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Patty Murray
United States Senate
154 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Murray:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part. Below the signature, the name "Ajit V. Pai" is printed in a standard, sans-serif font.

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Richard J. Durbin
United States Senate
711 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Durbin:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Maria Cantwell
United States Senate
511 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Cantwell:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Bernard Sanders
United States Senate
332 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Sanders:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The first name "Ajit" is written with a large, stylized 'A' and 'j'. The middle initial "V." is written in a smaller, simpler font. The last name "Pai" is written with a large, stylized 'P' and 'i'.

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Sheldon Whitehouse
United States Senate
530 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Whitehouse:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The first name "Ajit" is written with a large, looped 'A'. The middle initial "V." is written in a smaller, simpler script. The last name "Pai" is written with a large, looped 'P' and a trailing flourish.

Ajit V. Pai



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Brian Schatz
United States Senate
722 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Schatz:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The first name "Ajit" is written with a large, looped 'A' and a long horizontal stroke. The middle initial "V." is written in a smaller, simpler script. The last name "Pai" is written with a large, looped 'P' and a long horizontal stroke. Below the signature, the name "Ajit V. Pai" is printed in a standard, sans-serif font.

Ajit V. Pai



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Ron Wyden
United States Senate
221 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Wyden:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Jack Reed
United States Senate
728 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Reed:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Tom Udall
United States Senate
531 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Udall:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The first name "Ajit" is written with a large, stylized 'A' and 'j'. The middle initial "V." is written in a smaller, simpler font. The last name "Pai" is written with a large, stylized 'P' and 'i'.

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Jeanne Shaheen
United States Senate
506 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Shaheen:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Tammy Baldwin
United States Senate
717 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Baldwin:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The first name "Ajit" is written with a large, stylized 'A' and 'j'. The middle initial "V." is written in a smaller, simpler font. The last name "Pai" is written with a large, stylized 'P' and 'i'.

Ajit V. Pai



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Cory Booker
United States Senate
359 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Booker:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Maggie Hassan
United States Senate
B85 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Hassan:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Catherine Cortez Masto
United States Senate
B40A Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Cortez Masto:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The first name "Ajit" is written with a large, stylized 'A' and 'j'. The middle initial "V." is written in a smaller, more formal script. The last name "Pai" is written with a large, stylized 'P' and 'i'.

Ajit V. Pai



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Jeff Merkley
United States Senate
313 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Merkley:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Richard Blumenthal
United States Senate
706 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Blumenthal:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The first name "Ajit" is written with a large, stylized 'A' that loops around. The last name "Pai" is written with a long, sweeping tail that extends downwards and to the left. The middle initial "V." is written in a smaller, more formal script between the first and last names.

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Edward J. Markey
United States Senate
255 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Markey:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Tammy Duckworth
United States Senate
G12 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Duckworth:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part, followed by "V." and "Pai".

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Gary Peters
United States Senate
724 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Peters:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The first name "Ajit" is written with a large, stylized 'A' and 'j'. The middle initial "V." is written in a smaller, simpler script. The last name "Pai" is written with a large, stylized 'P' and 'i'.

Ajit V. Pai



OFFICE OF
THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON

May 14, 2018

The Honorable Amy Klobuchar
United States Senate
302 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Klobuchar:

Thank you for your letters expressing your views regarding recent reforms of the FCC's broadcast ownership rules. As you know, federal law requires the Commission to reexamine many of these rules every four years. Unfortunately, the prior Commission failed to complete its 2010 review in a timely manner and instead decided to incorporate that review into its 2014 review. When the Commission in 2016 finally issued an order purporting to resolve the 2010 and 2014 reviews, it failed to modify the broadcast ownership rules to match the modern media marketplace. For example, it declined to eliminate the decades-old newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rule, which President Clinton's first FCC Chairman called perverse back in 2013.

When I became Chairman in January 2017, there were several pending petitions asking for reconsideration of the Commission's 2016 Order. Last year, the FCC resolved those petitions by making appropriate and balanced reforms to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules. For example, while broadcasters generally asked the Commission to remove any restriction on one company owning two of the top-four television stations in any local market, the FCC instead only provided broadcasters with the opportunity to obtain an exception on a case-by-case basis to the so-called "top four" prohibition.

In light of this history, I must respectfully decline your request not to implement any changes made to the media ownership rules in our 2017 Order on Reconsideration. The FCC has a statutory duty to ensure that our broadcast ownership rules keep up with changes in the media marketplace, and there is no reason to further delay the implementation of 2017 reforms that were themselves unreasonably delayed. Moreover, I would point out that the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit was asked to stop the FCC from implementing these changes and earlier this year declined to do so. On the other hand, I can assure you that no further changes will be made to the rules covered by quadrennial review mandate until the Commission completes another quadrennial review. We are required to commence such a review in 2018, and I anticipate that the FCC will take that step later this year.

Turning to the national ownership cap, the Commission is currently in the midst of a holistic review of that regulation. In addition to asking whether we should eliminate the UHF Discount, we have sought comment on whether the 39 percent cap should be maintained, raised, lowered, or eliminated. I called on the Commission to launch such a holistic review back in 2013 and am pleased that we were able to finally take that step last December. This, in my view,

is the right way to review the national ownership cap as opposed to looking on an ad hoc basis at only one aspect of the cap, the UHF Discount.


The comment cycle on the national ownership cap Notice of Proposed Rulemaking has now closed, and we are now in the process of reviewing the record. In my view, it is important for the Commission to complete this holistic review of the national ownership cap, and I therefore must respectfully decline your request to stop work on it.

You also request that the Commission stop approving any broadcast mergers or acquisitions on a blanket basis. Your letter doesn't reference any statutory authority for taking such a drastic step, and I am not aware of any. Rather, I believe that the proper course of action is to continue to evaluate applications on a case-by-case basis.

With respect to the Sinclair transaction that is specifically mentioned in your letter, however, I would point out that the FCC's informal 180-day clock has now been stopped for over four months because of the parties' failure to supply the Commission with the information necessary for us to assess the proposed merger.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ajit V. Pai". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ajit" being the most prominent part. Below the signature, the name "Ajit V. Pai" is printed in a standard, sans-serif font.

Ajit V. Pai