



Robert M. Halperin  
(202) 624-2543  
rhalperin@crowell.com

043:smd  
01215.010

February 4, 2002

**BY HAND**

Mr. William F. Caton  
Acting Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
236 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.  
Suite 110  
Washington, DC 20002

RECEIVED

FEB - 4 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: Application of EchoStar Communications Corporation,  
General Motors Corporation, Hughes Electronics  
Corporation and EchoStar Communications Corporation,  
For Authority to Transfer Control, CS Docket No. 01-348

Dear Mr. Caton:

Transmitted on behalf of the State of Alaska are an original and 4 copies of the State of Alaska's Comments for filing in the above-referenced docket. As shown on the Certificate of Service, copies are being sent via e-mail to other Commission staff, as set forth in the Public Notice.

In the event there are any questions concerning this matter, please communicate with the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

  
Robert M. Halperin

Enclosures

cc: Linda Senecal (by e-mail)

1879309

No. of Copies rec'd 04  
List A B C D E

Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Application of )  
 )  
ECHOSTAR COMMUNICATIONS )  
CORPORATION, GENERAL )  
MOTORS CORPORATION, )  
HUGHES ELECTRONICS )  
CORPORATION, )  
 )  
Transferors, )  
 )  
And )  
 )  
ECHOSTAR COMMUNICATIONS )  
CORPORATION, )  
 )  
Transferee, )  
 )  
For Authority to Transfer Control. )

**RECEIVED**

FEB - 4 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

CS Docket No. 01-348

**COMMENTS OF THE STATE OF ALASKA**

Robert M. Halperin  
Bridget E. Calhoun  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
202/624-2500  
Attorneys for The State of Alaska

Of Counsel:

John W. Katz, Esquire  
Special Counsel to the Governor  
Director, State-Federal Relations  
Office of the State of Alaska  
Suite 336  
444 North Capitol Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001

February 4, 2002

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY .....	ii
I. BACKGROUND – THE MERGER, ITS CLAIMED BENEFITS AND THE STANDARD FOR COMMISSION APPROVAL.....	2
II. DOES THE TRANSACTION ENHANCE COMPETITION?.....	4
A. Video.....	5
B. Broadband.....	7
III. ARE THE ASSERTED BENEFITS “ACHIEVABLE ONLY AS A RESULT OF THE MERGER” AND “SUFFICIENTLY LIKELY AND VERIFIABLE? .....	9
A. The Commission Must Determine Whether The Claimed Benefit Of Better Service For Rural America, Alaska, And Hawaii Is Verifiable.....	10
B. The Commission Must Carefully Inquire Whether the Proposed Nationwide Pricing Is Both Merger Specific and Sufficient. ....	11
C. The Commission Must Scrutinize Whether The Claimed Benefit Of “Local Into Local” Programming Is Merger- Specific.....	11
D. The Commission Must Scrutinize Whether The Claimed Benefit of Next Generation Broadband Internet Access Service Is Verifiable And Merger-Specific. ....	12
IV. CONCLUSION .....	13

## SUMMARY

The Commission should give careful consideration to critical competition and other public interest issues raised by this application. Commission precedent provides that the application be granted only if the applicants can establish that (1) the transaction will enhance competition; (2) the claimed public interest benefits are demonstrable, verifiable, and merger-specific; and (3) the transaction will promote competition in the distribution of diverse sources of video programming. If these requirements are not satisfied, the Commission should either impose conditions that address and correct adverse competitive or public interest effects or deny the application.

It is not clear, on the face of this application, that these requirements have been satisfied. For example, the merger appears to reduce competition in video distribution services, particularly in rural areas that are not served by a cable television system. Although the applicants' promise of geographically uniform pricing may address potential pricing concerns, there are no assurances that rural residents of Alaska (and perhaps other states) will receive the same quantity and quality of programming and other services (*e.g.*, customer service) as those residing in areas where there is greater competition.

The merger also appears to reduce competition in broadband services significantly, particularly in Alaska. Because of sparse population, harsh geographic conditions and other factors, alternative forms of broadband service (cable modem and DSL) are not available in large parts of rural Alaska. DBS, therefore, may provide the only source of broadband services to small businesses

and consumers in these areas. Each of the merging parties currently offers broadband services and it appears that each planned on offering its own next generation broadband service. Although the merging parties now claim that each of them could not afford to launch next generation broadband in the absence of the merger, no specific evidence is provided to justify that claim. If the Commission agrees that the merger would reduce competition in broadband services in Alaska, the State requests that the Commission impose the conditions recommended in these comments to address that problem.

The State acknowledges the public interest benefits the applicants identify as they relate to Alaska. It is not clear, however, that these benefits are demonstrable, verifiable, and merger-specific. The State requests that the Commission conduct a thorough assessment (including a review of the applicants' internal documents) to determine whether these public interest benefits are cognizable under Commission precedent.

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Application of	)	
	)	
ECHOSTAR COMMUNICATIONS	)	
CORPORATION, GENERAL	)	
MOTORS CORPORATION,	)	
HUGHES ELECTRONICS	)	
CORPORATION,	)	
	)	CS Docket No. 01-348
Transferors,	)	
	)	
And	)	
	)	
ECHOSTAR COMMUNICATIONS	)	
CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Transferee,	)	
	)	
For Authority to Transfer Control.	)	

**COMMENTS OF THE STATE OF ALASKA**

The Commission should give careful consideration to critical competition and other public interest issues raised by the application of Echostar Communications Corporation (“Echostar”), General Motors Corporation (“GM”), and Hughes Electronics Corporation (“Hughes”) for Commission approval of the transfer of control of Hughes from GM to Echostar.

As demonstrated below, it is not clear on the basis of the application itself that the proposed transaction satisfies the requirements the Commission has established in prior cases dealing with mergers or acquisitions and associated license transfers or assignments. The Commission should carefully review the companies' internal documents and make other inquiries to determine whether these requirements are, in fact, satisfied. Among other things, the application raises serious questions concerning whether the proposed merger will create adverse competitive and public interest effects in broadband services in remote rural areas, particularly in Alaska.

**I. BACKGROUND – THE MERGER, ITS CLAIMED BENEFITS AND THE STANDARD FOR COMMISSION APPROVAL**

The two major forms of delivery of multiple channels of video programming to consumers across the nation are cable television and DBS.<sup>1</sup> This proposed transfer of control would result in the consolidation of the only two major DBS service providers in the nation – Echostar and DIRECTV.

In addition, Echostar and DIRECTV both offer some form of broadband Internet access service (either by themselves or in conjunction with affiliated companies). They are increasingly being considered as competitors to cable modem

---

<sup>1</sup> *In re Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming*, CD Docket No. 01-129, ¶¶ 5-8 (rel. Jan. 14, 2002). In its *Eighth Annual Report on Competition in the Market for Delivery of Video Programming*, the Commission found that while cable subscribership continues to grow, the “growth of non-cable MPVD subscribers continues to be primarily due to the growth of DBS.” *Id.* at ¶ 8. From June 2000 to June 2001, the number of DBS subscribers grew “nearly two and a half times the cable subscriber growth rate.” *Id.* at ¶ 7.

broadband services offered by cable television companies and digital subscriber line (DSL) service offered by telephone companies. Echostar and DIRECTV have plans to launch and operate a new generation of DBS broadband service, such as DIRECTV's planned SPACEWAY service. App. at 14.

The applicants generally claim that the transaction will result in many public interest benefits and that they are willing to make certain commitments to protect competition in rural areas. Among the public interest benefits the parties claim are (1) the ability to provide better service to Americans living in rural areas, Alaska, and Hawaii (*id.* at 33-34); (2) the ability to use spectrum more efficiently so that the post-merger firm will be able to provide "local into local" programming in many more areas of the country than each firm could do by itself without the merger (*id.* at 28-29); and (3) the ability to compete more vigorously against cable television services, including the provision of broadband services (*id.* at 30-33).

In accordance with accepted principles of antitrust law and Commission policy and precedent, the claimed public interest benefits of this transaction must be analyzed very carefully.<sup>2</sup> "[T]he Communications Act requires the Commission to make an independent public interest determination, which includes evaluating public interest benefits or harms of the merger's likely effect on future competition. To find that a merger is in the public interest, therefore, the Commission must 'be

---

<sup>2</sup> *In re Applications of Ameritech Corp., Transferor, and SBC Communications, Transferee, For Consent to Transfer Control*, 14 FCC Rcd. 14712, at 14825 ¶ 256 (1999) ("SBC-Ameritech Order").



convinced that it will enhance competition.”<sup>3</sup> Commission precedent further requires that the parties’ asserted public interest benefits be “achievable only as a result of the merger [and] are sufficiently likely and verifiable.”<sup>4</sup> The Commission has also recognized its congressional mandate to ensure that proposed transactions further the statutory goal of “promot[ing] competition in the delivery of diverse sources of video programming.”<sup>5</sup> Finally, the “Applicants bear the burden of proving that the transfer will advance the public interest.”<sup>6</sup>

## II. DOES THE TRANSACTION ENHANCE COMPETITION?

It is by no means clear that the proposed transaction will enhance competition in either video or broadband services.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Applications to Consent to the Transfer of Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations by Time Warner Inc. and America Online, Inc. Transferors, to AOL Time Warner, Inc., Transferee*, 16 FCC Rcd. 6547, at 6555, ¶ 21 (2001) (“*AOL-Time Warner Order*”) (quoting *In re Applications for Consent to the Transfer of Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorizations from MediaOne Group, Inc., Transferor, To AT&T Corp., Transferee*, 15 FCC Rcd. 9816, at 9820-21, ¶ 9 (2000) (“*AT&T-MediaOne Order*”); *SBC-Ameritech Order*, 14 FCC Rcd. at 14737, ¶ 48).

<sup>4</sup> *SBC-Ameritech Order*, 14 FCC Rcd. 14825 at ¶ 255.

<sup>5</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 532(c); *AOL-Time Warner Order*, 16 FCC Rcd. at 6555, ¶ 22.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 6554, ¶ 19 (citing *In re Applications for Consent to the Transfer of Control of Licenses and Section 214 Authorization from Tele-Communications, Inc., Transferor To AT&T Corp., Transferee*, 14 FCC Rcd. 3160, at 3169-70, ¶ 15 (1999) (“*AT&T-TCI Order*”); *In re Application of WorldCom, Inc. and MCI Communications Corporation for Transfer of Control of MCI Communications Corporation to WorldCom, Inc.*, 13 FCC Rcd. 18025, at 18031, ¶ 10 n.33 (1998)).

**A. Video**

In many rural areas of the country and much of rural Alaska, there are no cable television systems or other forms of multichannel video programming distribution (“MVPD”) services other than DBS. Thus, in these areas, this proposed transaction would eliminate all meaningful competition in MVPD services. In most other areas of the country, there is only one other provider of MVPD services – the local cable television system.<sup>7</sup> In these areas, this transaction would reduce competition from three distributors of multichannel programming to two distributors of multichannel programming.

The State understands that public representatives of rural communities in southern and western states are concerned about this transaction because its residents do not receive good quality DBS signals now. Many in rural communities are concerned that competition – and, as a result, service quality – will decline if this application is granted.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> MVPD services include cable, DBS, multichannel multipoint distribution, and satellite master antenna television. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 522(13). The Commission has defined MVPD services as a relevant market in its review of several transactions, including AOL-Time Warner, AT&T-MediaOne, and AT&T-TCI. *See AOL-Time Warner Order*, 16 FCC Rcd. at 6647, ¶ 244; *AT&T-MediaOne Order*, 15 FCC Rcd. at 9834, ¶ 36; *AT&T-TCI Order*, 14 FCC Rcd. at 3172-73, ¶ 21.

<sup>8</sup> The Commission has received letters from the House Rural Caucus (with 88 signatures), the Western Caucus (with 13 signatures), Senators Stevens and Hollings, and Senator Snowe attesting to concerns of the impact of the transaction on rural consumers.

Alaskans have special concerns in that regard. The Commission is aware of Alaska's concerns about signal quality,<sup>9</sup> but Alaskans have other service quality issues as well. Some Alaskan consumers, for example, have complained to the State that the 800 telephone number provided for service or billing inquiries for one of the DBS service providers does not accept calls from Alaska.

Competition in video services markets served by Echostar and DIRECTV are already very concentrated, regardless of whether one views the relevant market as comprising DBS services or MVPD services more generally. Of course, transactions that reduce competition from two to one require the closest possible scrutiny. Competition authorities are also wary of mergers or acquisitions that reduce the key number of players in a market from three to two.<sup>10</sup> In this case then, where the transaction would substantially reduce competition in already highly concentrated markets, it is even more critical for the Commission to be convinced that the transaction will enhance competition before granting the application.

---

<sup>9</sup> See submissions of the State of Alaska in IB Docket No. 98-21.

<sup>10</sup> For example, the Department of Justice brought suit to enjoin the merger of WorldCom and Sprint because, in part, of the view that there were telecommunication services markets in which competition would be reduced from three to two. See *United States v. WorldCom, Inc.*, Complaint, at ¶ 62 (D.D.C. June 26, 2000). In addition, the FTC brought suit to enjoin the merger of Heinz and Beech-Nut, two of the three dominant baby food companies in the U.S. See *FTC v. H.J. Heinz Co.*, 246 F.3d 708 (D.C. Cir. 2001); *F.T.C. v. H.J. Heinz Co.*, Civ. No. 1:00-CV-01688-JR, Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, at 1 (D.D.C. July 14, 2000).

## **B. Broadband**

In many portions of Alaska, DBS offers the promise of being the most efficient form of broadband access to the Internet. Commission reports show that broadband service in Alaska (particularly outside the Anchorage, Juneau, and Fairbanks areas) is scarce compared to the rest of the country.<sup>11</sup> The problems confronting telecommunications delivery in Alaska (such as few roads, very small and isolated communities, harsh weather and geography) raise serious concerns about whether broadband services by either DSL or cable modem will ever be available in most Alaskan communities.

This merger may reduce the number of broadband providers (particularly for next generation services) in many rural Alaskan (and probably other) communities from two-to-one, thus eliminating competition. Hughes appears to have committed to developing and launching SPACEWAY, a next generation satellite delivered broadband service, with North American service scheduled to begin in 2003, in the absence of the merger. App. at 14. In addition to continuing its interest in StarBand Communications, EchoStar hold interests in Wildblue Communications, Inc. and Celstat America, Inc., “both of which hope to offer a similar high-speed Internet service from Ka-band satellites in the future.” *Id.* at 11. A combination would eliminate competition between the applicants.

---

<sup>11</sup> See Industry Analysis Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, *High Speed Services for Internet Access: Subscribership as of December 31, 2000*, Tbl. 6 (Aug. 2001).

In an attempt to meet this concern, the applicants state that they have “already made significant broadband investments and plan[ ] future deployment of additional high-speed Internet access services,” but due to economic and technological hurdles, “the parties expect that the proposed transaction will allow the two companies to develop a combined critical mass of broadband subscribers to spread the tremendous fixed costs, that as noted above, have deterred other satellite companies from proceeding with broadband satellite systems.” *Id.* at 46-47. It appears clear, however, that prior to the merger, each of the applicants was indeed planning to offer next-generation broadband services despite expected competition from the other applicant. And, significantly, no specific evidence is presented in the application to justify the conclusion that each applicant had changed its mind.

The State believes that the Commission should carefully review the applicants’ internal business documents to determine whether those documents are consistent with what the applicants apparently have done and or with what the application says. If the applicants were likely to compete against each other in current and next generation broadband services, then the application should not be granted without conditions designed to offset the diminution in competition in Alaska (and perhaps Hawaii as well). The State recommends that the Commission consider the following conditions to address this problem:

1. The post-merger firm must make current broadband service offerings available throughout all of Alaska within a specific, but reasonable, period of time (such as 6 months). If the post-merger firm can demonstrate that service to some areas is technically impossible (as opposed to not profitable),

it may apply to the Commission for partial relief from this condition. That application shall contain proof of the asserted technical impossibility. The FCC should place that application on public notice and invite comments prior to acting on it.

2. The post-merger firm must make next generation broadband service offerings available throughout all of Alaska at the same time such services are offered in CONUS. If the post-merger firm can demonstrate that service to some areas is technically impossible (as opposed to not profitable), it may apply to the Commission for partial relief from this condition. That application shall contain proof of the asserted technical impossibility. The FCC should place that application on public notice and invite comments prior to acting on it.
3. The post-merger firm must provide the same national pricing guarantees with respect to broadband services that are made with respect to video services. With respect to broadband, equipment and installation prices offered to consumers in Alaska (and perhaps Hawaii) must be equal to those offered to customers in CONUS, regardless of need for larger dishes or other additional or more expensive equipment or installation services.

**III. ARE THE ASSERTED BENEFITS “ACHIEVABLE ONLY AS A RESULT OF THE MERGER” AND “SUFFICIENTLY LIKELY AND VERIFIABLE?”**

---

The Commission should also carefully consider whether the parties’ claimed public interest benefits satisfy Commission precedent requiring that such benefits be merger-specific and verifiable.<sup>12</sup> The application claims several efficiencies from the merger that appear to require further verification and explanation as to why they cannot be achieved by some other alternative short of a merger.

---

<sup>12</sup> See note 4, *supra*.

**A. The Commission Must Determine Whether The Claimed Benefit Of Better Service For Rural America, Alaska, And Hawaii Is Verifiable.**

The applicants state that Americans living in rural America, Alaska, and Hawaii will receive “more national programming networks and a better signal” as a result of the merger. App. at 33. Among other things, most DBS subscribers in Alaska purchase Echostar’s service,<sup>13</sup> and receive their key programming from satellites located at 119 degrees W.L.<sup>14</sup> Yet, it appears that the merger might result in this key national programming being shifted eastward, from satellites positioned from 119 degrees W.L., to satellites positioned at 101 degree W.L. Joint Eng. Stmt., at 6 (“Under another possible scenario, most national programming could be placed on the 32 DBS frequencies at 101 [degrees] W.L. . . .”). It is the State’s experience that this eastward shift in programming would greatly degrade service in some parts of Alaska and make service in other parts of Alaska impossible. From Alaska’s perspective, the result would be a move backwards, not forwards. The Commission should thus carefully scrutinize this claimed benefit and require more specificity and proof to verify that the merger will in fact provide improved quality of service to Alaska (and Hawaii).

---

<sup>13</sup> Echostar offers a programming package to Alaskan subscribers (though it is not priced at a comparable level to CONUS services). DirecTV offers no programming package aimed at Alaska. It is our understanding that the service it offers in the Continental U.S. service can be received in some parts of the State.

<sup>14</sup> See Joint. Eng. Stmt. at 4 (most of Echostar’s national and approximately 10% of local broadcast programming is transmitted from satellites located at 119 degrees W.L.).

**B. The Commission Must Carefully Inquire Whether the Proposed Nationwide Pricing Is Both Merger Specific and Sufficient.**

The applicants state that rural Americans (not explicitly including residents of Alaska or Hawaii) would be assured of reasonable prices for DBS service because the merged company would offer DBS service nationwide at uniform prices. App. at 34. However, the parties also state that uniform pricing “is the most practicable and efficient method of DBS pricing.”<sup>15</sup> *Id.* The merging parties, therefore, appear to agree that this alleged benefit is neither new nor merger-specific.

Moreover, the promise of uniform pricing may not, by itself, be sufficient to prevent geographic discrimination. Among other things, differences in service quality and ancillary customer services (handling of service complaints and billing issues) can result in the same prices being paid for inferior service, which is just as discriminatory as higher prices for the same quality of service.

**C. The Commission Must Scrutinize Whether The Claimed Benefit Of “Local Into Local” Programming Is Merger-Specific.**

The applicants claim that they can provide “local into local” programming into only about 35-40 local markets as independent competitors. App. at 28-29. By eliminating the need for each of them to duplicate the spectrum and transponder space allocated into the top 40 markets, they claim the merger will allow the post-merger firm to provide “local into local” programming into 100 local markets. *Id.*

---

<sup>15</sup> Indeed, the applicants admit that “satellites offer ubiquitous service at prices that are distance insensitive, in contrast to the distance-based prices that are characteristic of many terrestrial networks.” App. at 44 & n.95.



The State recognizes the value of “local into local” programming. Residents of Alaska undoubtedly would find local programming of Anchorage television stations of far greater relevance than the programming of broadcast stations located many hundreds or even thousands of miles away.

It appears, however, that the benefit of increased “local into local” programming may be accomplished by means other than a merger. The application does not address this issue. There may well be alternative arrangements through which spectrum and associated spot-beam satellites used to provide “local-into-local” programming could be coordinated and shared to facilitate an increase in the number of areas which could receive “local into local” programming while maintaining competition (at least at the retail level). Given the anti-competitive issues raised the merger, the Commission must carefully inquire whether this asserted benefit can be achieved by arrangements short of an outright merger of Echostar and DIRECTV.

**D. The Commission Must Scrutinize Whether The Claimed Benefit of Next Generation Broadband Internet Access Service Is Verifiable And Merger-Specific.**

The applicants claim that the merger will enhance the ability of the post-merger firm to offer next generation broadband Internet access service nationwide via satellite. *Id.* at 43-49. However, the parties present no specific information to support the claimed enhanced ability, nor do they provide any information concerning what is likely to arise from it, particularly with respect to Alaska (and

Hawaii). Moreover, the applicants present information that appears to show that this claimed efficiency is *not* merger-specific.

As set forth above, Hughes's SPACEWAY service is scheduled to begin in 2003, in the absence of the merger (*id.* at 14), and EchoStar holds interests in two entities (Wildblue Communications, Inc. and Celstat America, Inc.) "which hope to offer a similar high-speed Internet service from Ka-band satellites in the future." App. at 11. The applicants' own actions appear to indicate that a merger is not necessary to provide these services.

Furthermore, even if, as the applicants now claim, it is not economically or technically feasible for each firm to develop a next generation satellite-delivered Internet access service on its own, the applicants do not address less anti-competitive alternatives to the merger. There may well be alternative arrangements into which the parties may enter that would achieve the same asserted benefit while permitting competition at least at the retail level. The Commission should carefully assess whether this claimed benefit is merger-specific or whether it could be achieved by means short of a merger.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, this proposed transaction raises several important competition and public interest issues. The State therefore requests the Commission to scrutinize carefully the proposed transaction in accordance with Commission precedent and, if appropriate, to impose the conditions set forth above

to assure that any reduction in competition in broadband services in Alaska is remedied effectively.

Respectfully submitted,

THE STATE OF ALASKA



---

Robert M. Halperin  
Bridget E. Calhoun  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
202/624-2543

Counsel for The State of Alaska

Of Counsel:

John W. Katz, Esquire  
Special Counsel to the Governor  
Director, State-Federal Relations  
Office of the State of Alaska  
Suite 336  
444 North Capitol Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Date: February 4, 2002

1878705

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing Comments of the State of Alaska in CS Docket No. 01-348 were served this 4<sup>th</sup> day of February 2002, by electronic mail to the following:

Qualex International, Portals II,  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room CY-B402  
Washington, DC 20554  
[Qualexint@aol.com](mailto:Qualexint@aol.com)

Royce Sherlock  
Cable Services Bureau  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 3-A729  
Washington, DC 20554  
[Rsherloc@fcc.gov](mailto:Rsherloc@fcc.gov)

Marcia Glauberman  
Cable Services Bureau  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 3-A738  
Washington, DC 20554  
[Mglauber@fcc.gov](mailto:Mglauber@fcc.gov)

Barbara Esbin  
Cable Service Bureau  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 3-C458  
Washington, DC 20554  
[besbin@fcc.gov](mailto:besbin@fcc.gov)

James Bird  
Office of General Counsel  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-C824  
Washington, DC 20554  
[Jbird@fcc.gov](mailto:Jbird@fcc.gov)

David Sappington  
Office of Plans and Policy  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 7-C452  
Washington, DC 20554  
[Dsapping@fcc.gov](mailto:Dsapping@fcc.gov)


JoAnn Lucanik  
International Bureau  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 6-C416  
Washington, DC 20554  
[Jlucanik@fcc.gov](mailto:Jlucanik@fcc.gov)

Douglas Webbink  
International Bureau  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 6-C730  
Washington, DC 20554  
[Dwebbink@fcc.gov](mailto:Dwebbink@fcc.gov)

Julius Knapp  
Office of Engineering and Technology  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 7-B133  
Washington, DC 20554  
[Jknapp@fcc.gov](mailto:Jknapp@fcc.gov)

Gary M. Epstein  
James H. Barker, III  
Arthur S. Landerholm  
Latham & Watkins  
555 11<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20004  
[Gary.epstein@lw.com](mailto:Gary.epstein@lw.com)  
[James.barker@lw.com](mailto:James.barker@lw.com)  
[Art.landerholm@lw.com](mailto:Art.landerholm@lw.com)

Pantelis Michalopoulos  
Philip L. Malet  
Rhonda M. Bolton  
Steptoe & Johnson LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036-1795  
[Pmichalo@steptoe.com](mailto:Pmichalo@steptoe.com)  
[Pmalet@steptoe.com](mailto:Pmalet@steptoe.com)  
[Rbolton@steptoe.com](mailto:Rbolton@steptoe.com)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon M. Davis