

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
2006 Quadrennial Regulatory Review –)	MB Docket No. 06-121
Review of the Commission’s Broadcast)	
Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted)	
Pursuant to Section 202 of the)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996)	
)	
2002 Biennial Regulatory Review – Review of)	MB Docket No. 02-277
the Commission’s Broadcast Ownership Rules)	
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section)	
202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996)	
)	
Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and)	MM Docket No. 01-235
Newspapers)	
)	
Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple)	MM Docket No. 01-317
Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in)	
Local Markets)	
)	
Definition of Radio Markets)	MM Docket No. 00-244

ORDER

Adopted: December 15, 2006

Released: December 15, 2006

Reply Comment Date: January 16, 2007

By the Chief, Media Bureau:

1. On July 24, 2006, the Commission released its *Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making* in the above-captioned proceeding.¹ Comments in this proceeding were due on October 23, 2006. The deadline for the filing of reply comments is currently December 21, 2006.²

¹ 2006 *Quadrennial Regulatory Review – Review of the Commission’s Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 21 FCC Rcd 8834 (2006) (“*Further Notice*”).

² See *Order*, MB Docket No. 06-121, DA-1663 (rel. Sept. 18, 2006). The *Order* extended the original deadlines set in the *Further Notice*, which were September 22, 2006, and November 21, 2006, respectively, in order to allow parties additional time to conduct studies and compile data to inform the Commission’s decision in this proceeding.

2. In the *Further Notice*, the Commission sought comment on how to address the issues raised by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in *Prometheus v. FCC* with regard to the Commission's broadcast ownership rules³ and initiated the 2006 quadrennial review of the Commission's media ownership rules. The Commission sought comment on each of the ownership rules remanded by the court, and encouraged parties to include empirical data with their comments.⁴ On November 22, 2006, the Commission announced that it would be conducting ten economic studies to further inform the record (collectively, the "Media Ownership Studies").⁵

3. On December 12, 2006, Media General filed a request to extend the deadline to file reply comments.⁶ Media General seeks an extension of time until 45 days after the release of the Media Ownership Studies. Media General claims this would be efficient for parties and staff because it would obviate the need for parties to submit two sets of reply comments, allowing them instead to present consolidated replies addressing not only the initial comments but also the studies.⁷ Alternatively, Media General requests a shorter extension of time to file reply comments until January 16, 2007. It states that it and others are working with consultants to analyze the information presented in the initial comments, and a brief extension of time is necessary for parties to complete their analyses and prepare a more comprehensive response. Media General adds that given the volume of end-of-year business and other obligations, an extension would allow creation of a more complete record. It adds that the proceeding involves issues of significant complexity and extraordinary importance, and the public interest dictates that the Commission base its decisions on the best available evidence and analysis and the most complete record possible.⁸

4. We believe that the public interest justifies a brief extension of time to allow parties to file reply comments responding to the information submitted into the record. We agree with Media General that this extension is warranted by the significant complexity and importance of the issues in this proceeding and the volume of comments already filed. However, the Commission seeks to balance the public interest in a complete record upon which to base its decisions with concerns that it avoid undue administrative delay. After balancing these interests,

³ See *2002 Biennial Regulatory Review – Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, 18 FCC Rcd 13620, 13711-47 (2003) ("*2002 Biennial Review Order*"), *aff'd in part and remanded in part, Prometheus Radio Project, et al. v. F.C.C.*, 373 F.3d 372 (2004) ("*Prometheus*"), *stay modified on rehearing*, No. 03-3388 (3d Cir. Sept. 3, 2004) ("*Prometheus Rehearing Order*"), *cert. denied*, 73 U.S.L.W. 3466 (U.S. June 13, 2005) (Nos. 04-1020, 04-1033, 04-1036, 04-1045, 04-1168, and 04-1177).

⁴ *Further Notice*, 21 FCC Rcd at 8837 ¶ 3.

⁵ "FCC Names Economic Studies To Be Conducted As Part of Media Ownership Rules Review," Public Notice, MB Docket No. 06-121 (Nov. 22, 2006).

⁶ Motion for Extension of Time filed by Media General, Inc. (Dec. 12, 2006).

⁷ *Id.* at 2-3.

⁸ *Id.*

we conclude that the public interest would not be served by granting Media General's request for an extension of time until 45 days after the economic studies are released. We note that once the Media Ownership Studies are complete, the Commission will make them available on its website for public review and comment.⁹

5. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that Media General's Motion for Extension of Time filed in the above-captioned proceeding IS GRANTED to the extent stated in this Order and is otherwise DENIED.

6. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the deadline for filing reply comments in this proceeding IS EXTENDED to January 16, 2007.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Donna C. Gregg
Chief, Media Bureau

⁹ See <http://www.fcc.gov/ownership/studies.html>.