**Before the**

Federal Communications Commission

Washington, D.C. 20554

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| In the Matter of  PMCM TV, LLC, Licensee of WJLP,  Middletown Township, New Jersey  v.  Time Warner Cable Inc. | **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)**  **)** | CSR-8919-M Docket No. 16-27 |

Memorandum Opinion and Order

**Adopted: May 17, 2016 Released: May 17, 2016**

By the Chief, Media Bureau:

# Introduction

1. PMCM TV, LLC (PMCM), licensee of commercial broadcast television station WJLP, Middletown Township, New Jersey, filed the above-captioned must carry complaint pursuant to Sections 76.7 and 76.61 of the Commission’s rules,[[1]](#footnote-2) seeking to ensure carriage on cable channel 3, the channel number corresponding to the station’s RF channel assignment, on cable systems operated by Time Warner Cable Inc. (TWC) in the New York, New York designated market area (New York DMA).[[2]](#footnote-3) TWC filed an opposition to PMCM’s complaint, and PMCM filed a reply.[[3]](#footnote-4) For the reasons that follow, we deny PMCM’s complaint.

# Background

1. Pursuant to Section 614 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act), and the implementing rules adopted by the Commission, commercial television broadcast stations, such as WJLP, are entitled to assert mandatory carriage rights on cable systems located within their market.[[4]](#footnote-5) A station’s market for this purpose is its DMA, as defined by the Nielsen Company.[[5]](#footnote-6) The Commission has clarified that “broadcast stations may assert their carriage and channel positioning rights at any time so long as they have not elected retransmission consent.”[[6]](#footnote-7) Section 614 of the Act and Section 76.57 of the Commission’s rules provide commercial television stations with four possible channel positioning options to which they may assert their rights.[[7]](#footnote-8) Specifically, a commercial broadcast station may elect to be carried on: (1) the channel number on which the station is broadcast over the air; (2) the channel number on which the station was carried on July 19, 1985; or (3) the channel number on which the station was carried on January 1, 1992.[[8]](#footnote-9) Alternatively, a broadcast station may be carried on any other channel number mutually agreed upon by the station and the cable operator.[[9]](#footnote-10)
2. TWC operates cable television systems serving various communities in the New York DMA. By letter dated June 6, 2014, PMCM notified TWC that WJLP would commence operation in August 2014 as a new television station in the New York DMA and that it was electing mandatory carriage for the election period ending December 31, 2014 for WJLP on all cable systems operated by TWC in the New York DMA on channel 3, asserting that channel 3 was its “over the air” channel number.[[10]](#footnote-11) At the time PMCM made its must carry election, there was an ongoing dispute concerning WJLP’s virtual or PSIP[[11]](#footnote-12) major channel assignment, specifically whether PMCM was entitled to use virtual channel number 3 for its over-the-air broadcast signal.[[12]](#footnote-13) In light of this dispute, TWC and two other MVPDs filed requests seeking deferral of PMCM’s must carry and channel positioning election until 90 days after the Media Bureau’s final decision on the appropriate virtual channel for over-the-air broadcasting by WJLP. By letter dated July 25, 2014, the Media Bureau waived Section 76.64(f)(4) of the Commission’s rules and granted the deferral requests.[[13]](#footnote-14)
3. On June 5, 2015, concurrent with its issuance of a declaratory ruling assigning WJLP virtual channel 33,[[14]](#footnote-15) the Bureau issued a letter lifting the July 25, 2014 deferral order and making PMCM’s initial must-carry request and channel position election effective in 90 days, as of September 3, 2015.[[15]](#footnote-16) The Bureau stated that if TWC and the other MVPDs do not implement PMCM’s original must-carry request or channel position election within that time, PMCM may choose either to invoke the cable carriage enforcement procedures set forth in Section 614 of the Act and Section 76.61 of the Commission’s rules or alternatively to elect carriage for WJLP on cable channel 33, the virtual channel assigned to WJLP.[[16]](#footnote-17) On July 17, 2015, TWC sent PMCM a letter inquiring whether PMCM intended to elect carriage for WJLP on cable channel 33 and indicating that it intended to voluntarily begin carrying WJLP, an affiliate of the MeTV network, on cable channel 1239, which was currently occupied by the satellite feed of the MeTV network, in order to provide a seamless transition for viewers of MeTV programming.[[17]](#footnote-18) In its July 28, 2015 response, PMCM reaffirmed its election of mandatory carriage on cable channel 3, declined an election for the placement of WJLP on cable channel 33, and accepted TWC’s offer to carry WJLP on an interim basis on channel 1239.[[18]](#footnote-19) By letter dated July 30, 2015, TWC acknowledged PMCM’s must carry election for WJLP and confirmed that it would commence carriage of WJLP on cable channel 1239 on or before September 3, 2015.[[19]](#footnote-20) TWC launched WJLP on cable channel 1239 on August 25, 2015.[[20]](#footnote-21)
4. On October 22, 2015, PMCM gave written notice to TWC pursuant to Section 76.61 of the Commission’s rules that TWC’s carriage of WJLP on cable channel 1239 fails to meet its statutory and regulatory carriage obligations.[[21]](#footnote-22) By letter dated November 19, 2015, TWC denied PMCM’s request for carriage on cable channel 3, asserting that PMCM has no right to demand carriage of WJLP on channel 3 and that TWC’s carriage of WJLP on channel 1239 is proper because PMCM was given the opportunity to update its channel placement election to select channel 33 but failed to do so.[[22]](#footnote-23) On January 19, 2016, PMCM filed its must carry complaint seeking carriage of WJLP on cable channel 3.[[23]](#footnote-24)

# discussion

1. Initially, with regard to procedural issues, we note that PMCM seeks action on its complaint by the full Commission.[[24]](#footnote-25) However, Sections 0.61 and 0.283 of the Commission’s rules delegate authority to the Media Bureau to handle must carry complaints.[[25]](#footnote-26) Further, as discussed below, PMCM’s complaint does not “present novel questions of law, fact or policy that cannot be resolved under existing precedents and guidelines.”[[26]](#footnote-27) Accordingly, we will treat the complaint as having been filed with the Bureau.
2. We conclude that PMCM is not entitled to mandatory carriage of WJLP on TWC’s cable systems in the New York DMA on cable channel 3, the channel number corresponding to WJLP’s RF channel assignment. PMCM states that Section 614(b)(6) of the Act and Section 76.57 of the Commission’s rules require a cable operator to carry a local broadcast station electing must carry status “on the cable system channel number on which the local commercial television station is broadcast over the air.”[[27]](#footnote-28) PMCM asserts that it is entitled to carriage of WJLP on cable channel 3 because the FCC’s Post-DTV Table of Allotments specifies that the “channel” allotted to Middletown Township is channel 3 and the frequency on which channel 3 must broadcast over the air is 60-66 MHz.[[28]](#footnote-29) PMCM further asserts that Part 73 consistently identifies a station’s “channel” with the channel allotted to it in the Table of Allotments and the frequency on which it radiates its signal.[[29]](#footnote-30) PMCM acknowledges that “the Media Bureau has in some cases taken the position that a must-carry station’s cable carriage position is determined by its PSIP major number rather than the channel associated with the frequency on which it broadcasts over the air,” but argues that this position is at odds with the language of Section 614(b)(6) and would subvert the entire channel-based regulatory scheme of Part 73.[[30]](#footnote-31)
3. We find PMCM’s arguments unpersuasive. As TWC observes, Commission and Media Bureau precedent clearly recognizes that a digital broadcast station’s virtual channel assignment, not its RF channel assignment, is the relevant channel number for purposes of determining the station’s cable carriage position.[[31]](#footnote-32) In Section 614(b)(4)(B) of the Act, Congress explicitly authorized the Commission “to establish any changes in the signal carriage requirements of cable television systems necessary” to accommodate the conversion from analog to digital television.[[32]](#footnote-33) Pursuant to this authority, the Commission considered whether and, if so, how the on-channel must-carry channel placement option should be modified as a result of the digital transition.[[33]](#footnote-34) At that time, the industry was developing the PSIP protocol. To ensure that cable subscribers would be able to tune to broadcast signals on their PSIP channel, the Commission modified its rules to require cable operators to pass through the PSIP information.[[34]](#footnote-35) Subsequently, as part of its implementation of the digital transition, the Commission amended its rules to adopt the ATSC PSIP Standard.[[35]](#footnote-36) In its *2008 Declaratory Order* addressing the responsibilities of cable operators with respect to carriage of digital broadcasters, the Commission clarified broadcasters’ rights with respect to the on-channel option.[[36]](#footnote-37) The Commission explained that “[i]n digital broadcasting, a broadcast station’s channel number is no longer identified by reference to its over-the-air radio frequency. Instead, in compliance with the ATSC standard, the station’s ‘major channel number’ is identified in its [PSIP].”[[37]](#footnote-38) The Commission further clarified that “any station carried pursuant to mandatory carriage may demand carriage on its major channel number as broadcast in the station’s PSIP.”[[38]](#footnote-39) As the basis for this clarification, the Commission explained that “Section 76.57(c), adopted in the *First Report and Order*, should be read as clarifying the manner in which cable operators are to determine the channel number on which a local commercial or qualified NCE station is ‘broadcast over the air’ when implementing such a station's election under Sections 76.57(a) or (b).”[[39]](#footnote-40) Thus, the Commission made clear that after the digital transition, a must-carry station’s carriage rights attach to its PSIP major channel number rather than its RF channel number.
4. Further, there is no indication in the Commission’s discussion of the on-channel carriage option in the *First Report and Order* or the *2008 Declaratory Order* that the Commission intended to add a new option, and had the Commission intended that result, it would have been sufficiently significant to warrant explicit recognition. For these reasons, we find no merit in PMCM’s assertion that the *2008 Declaratory Order* merely acknowledged that, following the digital transition, stations might prefer to claim carriage rights on their newly-adopted virtual channels and gave stations the discretion to demand carriage on either their virtual channels or their RF channels.[[40]](#footnote-41) We have previously rejected the argument that a station has two must carry channel positioning options in the digital era, the right to carriage on its RF channel number or to carriage on its PSIP major channel number.[[41]](#footnote-42) We also reject PMCM’s assertion that “to now suddenly tie cable carriage rights exclusively to PSIPs rather than allotted channels would in one stroke upset the cable carriage rights of possibly hundreds of stations across the country.”[[42]](#footnote-43) PMCM has presented no evidence that the decision in the *2008 Declaratory Order* has upset the cable carriage rights of hundreds of stations. To the contrary, there have been few must carry complaints concerning cable carriage of broadcast television signals on PSIP major channel numbers in the seven years since the digital transition. Accordingly, we conclude that under Section 614 of the Act and Section 76.57 of the Commission’s rules, PMCM’s channel positioning rights for WJLP may attach only to its major channel number as carried in its PSIP, namely channel 33, or such other channel as PMCM and TWC may determine is mutually agreeable, and WJLP is not entitled to be carried on channel 3 absent an agreement for carriage on that channel.[[43]](#footnote-44)
5. While WJLP’s PSIP major channel is channel 33, TWC argues that its carriage of WJLP on cable channel 1239 is lawful because PMCM affirmatively opted not to seek carriage of WJLP on cable channel 33.[[44]](#footnote-45) TWC asserts that when, as here, a station demands carriage on a cable channel other than the one on which it has the right to carriage, the cable operator is free to unilaterally assign a cable channel for the station.[[45]](#footnote-46) PMCM does not address this argument in its reply. We note that PMCM has consented to TWC’s carriage of WJLP on cable channel 1239 on an interim basis, pending a decision on its application for review of the Bureau’s declaratory ruling assigning WJLP virtual channel 33.[[46]](#footnote-47) Given that PMCM did not seek carriage of WJLP on channel 33 on TWC’s cable systems, TWC’s current carriage of WJLP on cable channel 1239 is lawful.
6. Finally, PMCM asserts that TWC has not made channel 1239 a part of its basic service tier and requests that, regardless of what action the Commission takes regarding WJLP’s demand for carriage on cable channel 3, the Commission order TWC to make WJLP’s signal available on the basic service tier on all of its systems, as required by Sections 76.57(f) and 76.901(a) of the Commission’s rules.[[47]](#footnote-48) In response, however, TWC states that while channel 1239 was not part of the basic service tier when it was carrying the MeTV network feed, TWC added this channel to the basic service tier when it launched WJLP.[[48]](#footnote-49) In addition, we have reviewed the TV packages and channel line-ups for several TWC systems serving communities in the New York DMA.[[49]](#footnote-50) Based on our review, we find that TWC has in fact made WJLP’s signal available on the basic service tier on its systems in the New York DMA.
7. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that, pursuant to Section 614 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. § 534, the must carry complaint filed by PMCM TV, LLC, licensee of commercial broadcast television station WJLP, Middletown Township, New Jersey, against Time Warner Cable, Inc. **IS DENIED**.
8. This action is taken under authority delegated by Section 0.283 of the Commission’s rules.[[50]](#footnote-51)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

William T. Lake  
Chief, Media Bureau
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