

**M I L L E R & V A N E A T O N**  
**P. L. L. C.**

MATTHEW C. AMES  
KENNETH A. BRUNETTI\*  
MARCI L. FRISCHKORN  
GAIL A. KARISH\*  
NICHOLAS P. MILLER  
MATTHEW K. SCHETTENHELM  
JOSEPH VAN EATON

\*Admitted to Practice in  
California Only

1155 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 1000  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-4320  
TELEPHONE (202) 785-0600  
FAX (202) 785-1234

MILLER & VAN EATON, L.L.P.  
580 CALIFORNIA STREET  
SUITE 1600  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104  
TELEPHONE (415) 477-3650  
FAX (415) 738-2466

WWW.MILLERVANEATON.COM

OF COUNSEL:  
JAMES R. HOBSON  
GERARD L. LEDERER  
WILLIAM R. MALONE

October 29, 2009

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: In the Matter of Petitions for Declaratory Ruling Regarding Public,  
Educational, and Governmental Programming MB Docket No. 09-13 CSR-  
8126, CSR-8127, CSR-8128**

Dear Madam Secretary:

On October 28, 2009, the Honorable John O'Reilly, Mayor of Dearborn, Michigan accompanied by his city attorney William Irving, and the Honorable David Payne, Supervisor of Bloomfield Township, Michigan accompanied by Leslie Helwig, the Township's Cable Administrator, as well as the undersigned, conducted an ex parte meeting with the Media Bureau with respect to the above captioned matters ("PEG Petitions").

In attendance from the Media Bureau were :

- William T. Lake, Chief
- Robert H. Ratcliffe, Deputy Chief
- Nancy Murphy, Associate Bureau Chief
- Mary Beth Murphy, Policy Division Chief
- John Norton, Policy Division Deputy Chief
- Holly Saurer, Attorney Advisor

The subject matter of our conversation with the Bureau was consistent with the representations outlined in the attached document.

**MILLER & VAN EATON, P.L.L.C.**


- 2 -

The *ex parte* notice is filed pursuant to Section 1.206 of the Commission's rules.

Sincerely,

**Miller & Van Eaton, P.L.L.C.**

By



Gerard L. Lederer

cc: William T. Lake, Chief  
Robert H. Ratcliffe, Deputy Chief  
Nancy Murphy, Associate Bureau Chief  
Mary Beth Murphy, Policy Division Chief  
John Norton, Policy Division Deputy Chief  
Holly Saurer, Attorney Advisor

2029\12\00150436.DOC

# PROTECTION OF PEG CHANNELS' CARRIAGE ON THE BASIC TIER

## BACKGROUND

In November of 2007, Comcast notified Michigan communities that as of January 15, 2008, it would convert all PEG channels to digital, and move the channels from their current location in the normal run of basic service channels to the 900-series of channels. The effect was that many – perhaps half a million or more subscribers in Michigan, including schools – would be required to obtain a converter to receive the PEG channels.

The Communities sued Comcast in January, 2008. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan first issued a Preliminary Injunction halting Comcast from converting the channels and then by Order dated November 26, 2008 in *City of Dearborn v. Comcast of Michigan III, Inc.*, No. 08-10156, the court directed us to file a Petition for a Declaratory Ruling asking the FCC to address seven questions. Reply Comments were due in that docket on April 1.<sup>1</sup>

## PEG ACCESS REQUIREMENTS UNDER FEDERAL LAW

PEG Channels are *not* like other channels on the cable system. The channels are under the control of the community, not the cable operator. 47 U.S.C. §541 (franchising authority may require cable operator to designate capacity for public, educational or government use). The channels are designed to assure “access to the electronic media by people other than licensees or owners of those media.” H. R. Rep. No. 98-934, 98<sup>th</sup> Cong. 2d Sess. 1984 at 30. When Congress amended the Cable Act in 1992, the House emphasized the importance of the channels, and emphasized that Congress intended for the channels to be viewable by every cable subscriber, absent an explicit agreement in the franchise to the contrary.<sup>2</sup>

## THE FCC SHOULD DECLARE THAT COMCAST'S PROPOSED ACTIONS VIOLATE FEDERAL LAW AND REGULATIONS.

Specifically, in response to the seven questions posed by the court, the FCC should:

- Rule that discriminatory treatment of PEG channels is an unlawful evasion of Federal law and regulations.
- Find that the obligation to provide PEG on the basic service tier applies in all communities.
- Confirm that in determining whether PEG is part of a tier, or is being treated discriminatorily, the analysis should proceed from the point-of-view of the consumer – who may be a viewer or programmer.
- Establish basic service tier criteria that look from the consumer's point-of-view.
- Find that operators may not charge for equipment required only to receive PEG channels.

---

<sup>1</sup> MB Docket No. 09-13 CSR-8126, CSR-8127, CSR-8128

<sup>2</sup> “PEG programming is delivered on channels set aside for community use in many cable systems, and these channels are available to all community members on a non discriminatory basis....” H.R. Rep. No. 102-628, 102nd Cong., 2nd Sess. 1992 at 85.

- Find that PEG channels are not being provided on the basic service tier if digitized and subject to special equipment requirements, and other burdens (in this case, for example, Comcast requires customers to make a special request to receive PEG channels, and to make a special appointment to have the converter installed; it will not automatically bring a box to the home of subscribers at the time of installation).
- Find that the digitization of PEG channels as proposed by Comcast is discriminatory.

### **THE FCC'S DELAY HURTS THE PEG COMMUNITY AND ADVANTAGES COMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES**

The FCC's delay in acting on this petition has and continues to result in very real damage to the PEG community.

- While the court's order bars Comcast from taking its planned actions in Michigan; Comcast is not barred in other states nor are other cable operators in Michigan barred from taking such actions. We are told that Charter plans to move channels in Michigan on December 1 to a very high channel number and to channels that are inferior in quality to the channels currently dedicated to PEG use. .
- Comcast told the court that it should certify the matter for direct appeal to the 6th Circuit rather than seek guidance as the Commission will never act in a timely manner. Petitioners, on the other hand, represented that the Commission could act in a reasonable period.
- The non-profit organizations, educational institutions and local governments that program PEG channels have very limited resources. The FCC's delay disadvantages those who do not have the sort of resources available to a Comcast or an AT&T. It requires repeated efforts at the FCC, and requires localities to pursue actions in other fora. At the same time the FCC is questioning whether deadlines need to be imposed on local government activities, it needs to recognize that its inaction results in the unsustainable and unfair imposition on local communities and PEG users.