

December 11, 2007

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: *Carriage of Digital Television Broadcast Signals: Amendment of Part 76 of the Commission's Rules*, CS Docket No. 98-120

Dear Ms. Dortch:

This letter reports for the record in the above-captioned proceeding a series of meetings that representatives of Comcast Corporation ("Comcast") had on December 10, 2007 with Rick Chessen, Senior Legal Advisor to Commissioner Michael Copps, Cristina Chou Pauzé, Legal Advisor for Media Issues to Commissioner Robert McDowell, and Rudy Brioché, Legal Advisor for Media Issues to Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein, and a telephone conversation on December 11, 2007 with Amy Blankenship, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate. Comcast was represented during each of these discussions by James R. Coltharp and Mary P. McManus of Comcast and the undersigned. In each of these conversations, we highlighted key arguments that Comcast has already presented on the record regarding the undesirability as a matter of policy and the impermissibility as a matter of law of any further expansion of must-carry requirements. We also referenced some of the quotations collected in the attached document.

This ex parte letter is submitted pursuant to Section 1.1200 *et seq.* of the Federal Communications Commission's rules. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ James L. Casserly
James L. Casserly

Attachment

Marlene H. Dortch
December 11, 2007
Page 2

cc: Amy Blankenship
Rudy Brioché
Rick Chessen
Cristina Chou Pauzé

Multicast Must-Carry: What Are Others Saying?

“Adding multicast must-carry would **inappropriately reserve yet more valuable ‘shelf space’** on cable systems for some privileged parties at the expense of other video programming and additional voice and broadband services that may have stronger consumer demand.”

*Joe Barton, Ranking Member, and 23 Members of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Nov. 20, 2007*

“[Y]ou have **presented no evidence** to support your assertion that multicast must-carry would promote program diversity and increase programming choices for consumers. In fact, we think it would have the opposite effect by putting additional broadcast channels at the front of the line ahead of the many diverse programming services offered by cable.”

Letter from Eleven Members of the House of Representatives to Chairman Martin, Nov. 26, 2007

“[The proposal] was an obvious effort to provide cover for more media consolidation, which would only have take media outlets further out of the reach of women and minorities . . . **Media sharecropping** is no substitute for media ownership. Given the crisis we face in ownership, we need real actions, not just **token gestures**. We need to heed the many calls from Congress and diverse voices across America who are demanding we act to improve women and minority ownership before, not after, we vote on media ownership rules.”

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein, Nov. 27, 2007

“The Chairman’s proposal to allow minority programmers to ‘lease’ surplus broadcast spectrum on channels covered by must carry rules would create **yet another category of government-preferred speakers** who would get in line for carriage ahead of services like ours.”

The Africa Channel, TV One, and American Life TV Network, Nov. 20, 2007

“[M]ost in the minority and civil rights community feel that the Commission’s close-fisted offer to rent channel space on broadcast TV as it simultaneously shuts down minority ownership on cable is a **patronizing slap in the face**.”

Rev. Miguel Rivera, President, National Coalition of Latino Clergy & Christian Leaders, Oct. 18, 2007

“[T]his proposal is regarded by many as a **poor ‘consolation’ prize** for what is widely considered to be an ‘anti-diversity’ agenda emanating from the FCC . . . [M]inority broadcasters seek an opportunity for programming ownership, not the subordinate position of merely renting some space on must-carry channels . . . The result would be that more *non-minority* broadcast channels, under the ultimate control of the same broadcasters who control the airwaves today, would get must-carry status, with the effect of **squeezing out the precious channel space that would otherwise be available to prospective minority, women’s and other emerging cable and satellite programmers**.”

“[T]he FCC is proposing what appears to be a massive new and unjustified **‘welfare for the rich’** program...”

“If the leasing proposal was the only available avenue for aspiring minority broadcasters, then it might be worth a second-look. But it is not . . . For the Commission to think that minority broadcasters are entitled only to ‘lease’ some of [the] space from incumbent broadcasters is to **relegate our communities to ‘second class’ status**...”

“The reality is that most programmers want the opportunity for ownership and not the **‘crumbs from the table.’** While innovative new networks would die in this stifling environment, channels like home shopping networks and infomercial networks would benefit most.”

*Rev. Jesse L. Jackson, Sr., Founder and President, Rainbow PUSH Coalition,
Oct. 30, 2007 and Nov. 30, 2007*