Before the

**Federal Communications Commission**

**Washington, D.C. 20554**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| In the Matter of  Review of the Emergency Alert System;  Independent Spanish Broadcasters Association, the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ, Inc., and the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council, Petition for Immediate Relief;  Randy Gehman Petition for Rulemaking | **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)** | EB Docket No. 04-296 |

**ORDER**

**Adopted: November 21, 2014 Released: November 21, 2014**

By the Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau:

**I. Introduction**

1. In this Order we address the petitions for temporary waiver of Section 11.56 of the Commission’s rules,[[1]](#footnote-2) filed by Charter Communications (Charter);[[2]](#footnote-3) Comcast Cable Communications, LLC (Comcast);[[3]](#footnote-4) Kenai Broadcasting, LLC (Kenai);[[4]](#footnote-5) New Ulm Telecom, Inc. (New Ulm);[[5]](#footnote-6) Oregon Amateur Radio Club (OARC);[[6]](#footnote-7) Townsquare Media Oneonta License, LLC (Townsquare);[[7]](#footnote-8) Western Oregon Radio Club, Inc. (WORC);[[8]](#footnote-9) and WVCH Communications, Inc. (WVCH) (collectively, the Petitioners).[[9]](#footnote-10) Section 11.56 of the Commission’s rules requires Emergency Alert System (EAS) Participants[[10]](#footnote-11) to have installed operational equipment that can receive and process EAS alerts formatted in the Common Alerting Protocol (CAP) by June 30, 2012.[[11]](#footnote-12) For the reasons set out herein, we grant, *nunc pro tunc*, these petitions.

**II. Background**

1. Under Commission rules, EAS Participants are required to be able to receive CAP-based EAS alerts by June 30, 2012.[[12]](#footnote-13) In its *EAS* *Fifth Report and Order*, the Commission observed that because the primary method of distributing CAP messages will be via broadband Internet connections, the physical availability of broadband Internet access would be a predicate for compliance with the requirement that EAS Participants be able to receive CAP-based alerts.[[13]](#footnote-14) Accordingly, the Commission concluded that the physical unavailability of broadband Internet service offered a presumption in favor of a waiver.[[14]](#footnote-15) The Commission also observed, however, that broadband Internet access might become available at some point after a waiver has been granted, and that alternate means of distributing CAP alert messages, such as satellite delivery, might also become available, thus obviating the basis for granting the waiver.[[15]](#footnote-16) For this reason, the Commission indicated that any waiver based on the physical unavailability of broadband Internet access likely would not exceed six months, with the option of renewal if circumstances have not changed.[[16]](#footnote-17) Finally, the Commission concluded that, in all events, to the extent a waiver applies, the affected party would be required to continue to operate its legacy EAS equipment.[[17]](#footnote-18)
2. The Petitioners all filed requests for temporary waiver of the obligation to receive and process CAP-formatted alerts specified in Section 11.56 of the Commission’s rules due to the physical unavailability of broadband Internet service at Petitioners’ facilities.[[18]](#footnote-19) The Petitioners subsequently all filed correspondence indicating that they had secured broadband connectivity and were CAP-compliant for those facilities.[[19]](#footnote-20)

**III. Discussion**

1. The Commission has authority to waive its rules if there is “good cause” to do so.[[20]](#footnote-21) The Commission may find such good cause where special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule, and such deviation will serve the public interest.[[21]](#footnote-22) The waiver applicant generally faces a high hurdle and must plead with particularity the facts and circumstances that warrant a waiver.[[22]](#footnote-23) However, as indicated above, with respect to applicants for waivers of the CAP-related obligations set forth in Section 11.56 of the Commission’s rules, the Commission has established a presumption in favor of granting temporary waivers based upon the physical unavailability of broadband Internet service.[[23]](#footnote-24)
2. We find that the Petitions all meet the presumption for temporary waiver of the CAP-related obligations set forth in Section 11.56 of the Commission’s rules, as established by the Commission in the *EAS Fifth Report and Order*.[[24]](#footnote-25) We further observe that Petitioners continued to operate legacy EAS equipment at all times, thus, the public was not deprived of EAS alerts.[[25]](#footnote-26) Finally, we note that Petitioners have subsequently notified the Commission that all of the systems subject to their waiver requests are in compliance with Section 11.56 or, in the case of New Ulm, no longer in service.[[26]](#footnote-27)
3. Accordingly, we grant, *nunc pro tunc*, the Petitioners’ temporary waiver requests for the period of June 30, 2012, until the date upon which the systems subject to the temporary waiver requests became compliant with the CAP obligations set forth in Section 11.56 of the Commission’s rules, as identified in the Petitioners’ correspondence identified above.[[27]](#footnote-28)

**IV. Ordering Clauses**

1. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that pursuant to Section 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. § 154(i), and Section 1.3 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.3, the “Requests for Temporary Waiver” filed by Charter Communications; Comcast Cable Communications, LLC; Kenai Broadcasting, LLC; New Ulm Telecom, Inc.; Oregon Amateur Radio Club; Townsquare Media Oneonta License, LLC; Western Oregon Radio Club, Inc.; and WVCH Communications, Inc., ARE GRANTED, as specified herein.
2. This action is taken under delegated authority pursuant to Sections 0.191 and 0.392 of the Commission’s rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.191, 0.392.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

David G. Simpson

Rear Admiral (Ret.), USN

Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau
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24. *See id.* at 644,¶ 3; *see also* *supra* n.18. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
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