```
17
      Nanz Riccard
18
      Christian Melendez
19
      Alex Allen
      Adam Lynn
20
      Mi chael Halperin
Ni ckey Guerra
21
22
0004
                      PUBLIC SPEAKERS (contd.):
 1
      Josh Silver
 3
      Wendy Thompson
      Al exandra Russel I
      Garl and Ni xon
 5
 6
7
      Patricia Omana
      Lynn Erski ne
 8
      Francwa Sims
 9
      Sondra Levin
10
      Shireen Mitchell
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
0005
                     P R O C E E D I N G S KEVIN MARTIN: Madam Secretary, if you
 2
3
      could announce then our next steps for today's
 4
      meeting.
                                             Okay, this concludes ng. We will now begin
 5
6
7
                      MARLENE DORTCH:
      the agenda for our open meeting.
      today's localism hearing. Along with competition
      and diversity, promoting localism is a key goal of
the Commission's media ownership rules. The purpose
of the hearing is to gather informing from
consumers, industry, civic organizations and others
on broadcasters role in their local communities and
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
      proposed changes to our rules.
14
                      KÉVIN MARTIN: This is the Federal
      Communications Commission's 6th public hearing on
15
      localism and I want to first take a moment to
16
      welcome everyone and thank you all for agreeing to
17
      participate and it is important, in this important
18
19
      meeting today.
20
                       Before we begin with our panel
      presentations, I think all of the Commissioners want
21
      to do, have some opening statements, I assume is
22
0006
 1
      that correct?
 2
3
                      MI CHAEL COPPS:
                                           I do.
                      KEVIN MARTIN: Why don't actually then
      we go to the Board of Commissioner Council and Chief
to start out for us.

MICHAEL COPPS: Thank you all for being
 4
5
 6
      here this morning, you came on short notice, some from afar, and had to prepare on the turn of a dime,
 7
 8
      but your presence attests to your dedication and
10
      public spiritedness and we are grateful for that.
```

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 You're going to hear a lot of nice words 12 today about localism, about how localism is one of 13 the core values of broadcast regulation, about how from the earliest days of broadcasting we've 14 required licensees to serve the needs and interests of their local communities, about how localism is good for viewers, good for business and good for the 15 16 17 future of our demočracy and it's all truĕ. 18 19 But my greatest fears is that all those 20 nice words will float into the ether and we'll walk away and congratulate ourselves that we've struck a 21 22 blow for localism, meanwhile consolidation continues 0007 to choke the life blood out of localism with its 2 outsourced news, homogenized playlists and distant ownership and meanwhile consolidation denegrates diversity, denies minorities and women and 5 6 7 diminishes our already distorted democratic It seems to get worse with almost each passing week. I for one can wait no longer. If we truly believe in localism, if it's not just lip 8 9 service, the time has come to do something about it.

First, let's acknowledge that the loss 10 11 of localism is not something that  $\check{\text{w}}\text{as}$  inevitable. 12 It was a conscious choice. It was a conscious 13 14 choi ce. 15 Back in the 1980s we had a Chairman of the FCC who famously said that a television set was 16 nothing but a toaster with pictures and that's how 17 18 he and his accomplices set about to treat it, just 19 another household appliance. 20 So they did away with the requirements that promoted localism, like talking to your 21 community about the issues that concern the people 22 8000 1 who live there, like guidelines at license renewal time that examined the station's commitment to local 2 3 4 programming and like a license renewal process that took place every three years to ensure 5 accountability to the community rather than every eight years to give convenience to the industry. 6 7 So now we have no more community dialogue, no more real accountability, no process to 8 9 hold stations to their commitment to serve the 10 people. It's all gone, not by chance, but by 11 desi gn. Think about it, why on earth would some little commission think that it had to write 12 13 (inaudible) mail to remove explicit performance 14 15 requirements from broadcasters who are granted 16 exclusive rights to use public property. 17 Which brings me to the current 18 This is the last official public 19 hearing in connection with the localism notice of inquiry that was launched in 2004. While I 20 21 appreciate the Chairman's commitment to complete the 22 localism proceeding before addressing the media 0009 ownership rules, the question remains what it means 2 to complete the proceeding. Let me be clear what I mean. the proceeding means to me at a minimum issuing a Page 3

FCC Hearing 10.31.07

notice of proposed rule-making with clear recommendations giving the public adequate time to comment on the specific proposals to put localism back into broadcasting and a timetable for final Commission action.

And let's be clear, this is not just Commissioner Mike Copps' view. It's a bipartisan view from Congress. Recently Democratic Senator Byron Doyl gan and Republican Senator Trent Lott told us in no uncertain terms that given the importance of localism, a mere report is not enough. They want recommendations and a formal notice of proposed rule-making with at least 90 days for public comment. This must be done, they said, before moving forward with the ownership proceeding and that's a quote.

We just received another bipartisan letter from Republican Senator Olympia Snow and

Democratic Senator Bill Nelson calling on the FCC to seriously address localism and pending diversity recommendations prior to acting on media ownership. These issues transcend party labels and

are in no way unique to red States or blue States.

They are grass-roots concerns.

The best way to address these concerns may be through an honest to goodness license renewal process and a re-invigorated public interest standard. The bottom line here is that the FCC just has to get out of the business of allowing medic environments to acquire new licenses or renew existing ones without requiring that every licensee will actually use the public airwaves to serve the public interest.

We will soon know it appears whether the Commission's rhetoric about localism is the real thing or whether this proceeding is being truncated because the Commission needs to place a checkmark in the localism box that stands in the way of loosening such ownership rules as newspaper broadcasts cross-ownership that powerful industry players are

pushing like mad.

But localism must never be seen as a means to an end. It's an end in itself. It's at the heart of what the public interest is all about. All deliberate speed in getting some localism back, by all means, a rush to judgment to clear the way for more big media mergers, no way.

Right now there are too many Americans

openly wondering whether this is all a great big show. Pretty window-dressing to distract the public so the FCC and big media can cut their deal in peace.

No one on this Commission, even if some feel differently from me about the pros and cons of changing the ownership rules should want to perpetuate those kinds of public misgivings about the FCC. We need a process that allays fears rather than one that creates fears.

I've received an E-mail yesterday from a gentleman who works at a small market radio station in the Midwest. In the E-mail he talks about the

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 difference between a truly local station and the 0012 stations owned by big corporations in dealing with 1 heavy rain storms that were hitting the area. 3 Here's what he wrote about the big stations, quote, "These stations have their 4 5 programming piped in from another community 6 7 They've also signed up for a service for their weather reporting which is recorded and sent from 8 1,000 miles away. There were flood warnings and 9 flash flood warnings, yet there was never mention of that severe weather during the peak of the storms. Nobody even works in those buildings. They have an 10 11 engineer come in to take meter readings and check on things a couple times per day.

"If this is the type of localism we 12 13 14 ought to expect, then the public interest is not being served by these companies," he went on. 15 16 "And finally, they can raise all the money they want to for local charities and air 17 18 numerous public service announcements, but if the 19 20 local citizens are not even warned about looming severe weather, what good is it," end quote.
That's a good question and it goes 21 22 0013 beyond the weather forecast to whether we can have a 1 media environment in this country that reflects our 3 communities and diversity and creativity and that 4 nourishes the civic dialogue on which our future 5 depends. 6 Let's, for heaven's sake, treat this 7 issue with some sense of civic sobriety and 8 seriousness of purpose.
It's in this vain that I look forward to 9 hearing from all our panels and public today. 10 Thank you again all for being here. KEVIN MARTIN: Thank you. 11 12 13 To Mr. Adelstein. JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: Thank you, this is the final hearing of the localism task force. I'm very pleased that at the urging of key members of 14 15 16 Congress, this otherwise dormant proceeding was 17 18 revived and today we're here again listening to an 19 expert set of panelists and the public. 20 The important questions (inaudible) with the proceeding today are will we do anything productive with what we've learned. We've been 21 22 0014 across the country. Will it lead to real changes in 2 how we hold media outlets accountable to their local 3 (Inaudible) entire proceeding just a communities. chore to get done so that media giants can have 5 6 7 their way with even greater media consolidation. The lack of adequate advanced public notice of today's hearing raises real concerns about how serious we are about public output. Despite 8 unanimous approval weeks ago to get this done and do this today, it wasn't announced to the public until 9 10 the last possible moment allowed by law, just five 11 12 business days ago late at night. Now despite this unnecessary hurdle, I'm 13 pleased we've assembled such a great panel and an 14 15 impressive panel of witnesses on such short notices. Page 5

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 I thank Chairman Martin for his cooperation in 17 working with us to do this in such a short period of time and I thank all of our witnesses for going 18 19 through all the hurdles that you had to jump to get 20 here and to share with us your views on this critical issue. 21 22 I am disappointed, though, that I 0015 haven't been permitted to meet with the FCC staff 2 that co-chaired the localism task force. I made a request for this last week and I just don't think 4 it's acceptable that Commission staff aren't permitted to meet with every Commissioner.

I'd remind all my colleagues that the staff works for the Commission, not just the 5 6 7 Chairman. Any instruction to deny us meetings or 8 9 information is anathema to the spirit of the 10 Commission in Federal law. 11 As we conclude this final public 12 localism hearing, it's fair to ask what we have 13 accomplished. There are two basic issues at hand. What steps can we take to enhance the responsiveness of our media to our local communities and does media 14 15 consolidation enhance or detract from service to 16 17 local communities. 18 When the localism task force was 19 launched, we were promised rigorous studies and 20 clear policy and legislative recommendations. 21 seen neither any studies nor any recommendations thus far. After the expenditure of over 350,000 22 0016 dollars of taxpayer funds and many staff resources, 2 3 the task force owes us solid studies and solid recommendations on which to base immediate action by 4 5 the Commission. The only study that actually came out 6 was one that was leaked to Senator Boxer at a public heari ng. 8 9 Certainly before we address the media ownership rules we need to implement concrete steps 10 to enhance localism. A number of members of 11 Congress, as Commissioner Copps have pointed out, 12 have appropriately asked that we do so and we should heed their good advice. 13 This doesn't mean we should trot out 14 some half measures and say there you go, we're done. It means we need to put in place rules that improve 15 16 accountability of broadcast media outlets to the 17 communities to which they are licensed, which 18 19 shouldn't simply provide a set of best practices for 20 broadcasters 21 We shouldn't simply revise an 22 out-of-date manual and instruct the public that it's 0017 their responsibility to get the most from their local station, nor should we simply get a report 2 3 4 that sugar-coats the issues from the localism task force, a task force that really has been functionally abolished, maybe that's why I couldn't 5 6 7 get a meeting with them. We all know the issues. We expect real

8

substantive Commission response to the many concerns Page 6

and concrete recommendations to form the basis for a

FCC Hearing 10.31.07

that were raised by an array of concerned citizens from all across this great country. We also need to complete action on improving the number of women and people of color who own broadcast media outlets in this country.

this country.

I propose the immediate creation of a task force, an independent panel that would help us to get an action agenda that we can act on quickly before this proceeding, before we finalize the media ownership rules. The Reverend Jesse Jackson is here today and he's offered to serve on such a panel. We just came from a meeting hosted at Rainbow PUSH in Chicago. I'm glad we came out there and thank you

for hosting us

 It's a city where people of color represent two-thirds of the population, and yet they own just 5 percent of the broadcast stations. To me -- today's media landscape does not reflect the diversity of America. We've got to carefully weigh whether media ownership that doesn't reflect the communities to whom they're licensed are truly delivering local service that reflects the diversity of issues that face the entire community, including women, including people of color.

As far as I know, none of our studies address that fundamental localism question. We can't proceed in good conscious until it is answered.

It's also clear from our hearings that local issues that the electorate needs to know about aren't being covered in a way that prepares voters to make educated decisions. The problem we hear from people as we go to these hearings across the country is that breaking news is being replaced with breaking gossip. Community after community, we hear

from citizens that serious coverage of local and State Governments is diminished. There's a virtual black-out of coverage of State and local elections and candidates.

And while news operations say they have to slash resources in this difficult environment, some are offering up to a million dollars to get an interview with Paris Hilton.

Real investigative journalism and file for reporting have given way to an if it bleeds, it leads mentality.

Now there are a lot of localism options on the table. They include clarifying our public interests obligations, strengthening our license renewal process, requiring ascertainment, enhancing public disclosure, broadcasters issues and program listings, (inaudible) locals and requirements on multi-cast stations and improving access to low powered and non-commercial station licenses.

We need to approve real meaningful rules, not just another notice of inquiry or proposed rules before we move forward with media

ownershi p.

With regard to the effect of media consolidation on localism, the public has spoken.

FCC Hearing 10.31.07

The public comments we received at hearings across the country were overwhelmingly negative on how consolidation has detracted from the responsiveness of local media outlets to local concerns.

We also heard eloquent arguments about the potential benefits of consolidation, but these were all from invited witnesses who actually worked or owned media outlets, not from the public at large.

And while I appreciate the arguments on both sides, the law requires us to serve the public interests, not the interests of the media giants that we oversee and the public is not interested in further media consolidation.

This was confirmed again yesterday in a polled Commission by the Media Democracy Coalition, just being released today, overwhelming majorities of Republicans and Democrats consider media consolidation a problem and in nearly equal

proporti ons.

 This confirms, once again, as reflected on the bipartisan concern on Capitol Hill that this is not a partisan issue. Americans distrust big media, whether those are coming from the right, from the left and virtually everybody in between. Distrusted media, like big Government, I think is rooted in the American spirit.

It's no surprise that by a margin of 57 percent to 30 percent the public favors making it illegal to own a dominant newspaper and a TV station in the same city. Again, the margins are about the same for liberals, moderates and conservatives. The poll also found that the public prefers local news sources, the very ones threatened by consolidation. It also found the public is concerned that consolidation will produce even more bias into a media world they already consider too biased.

Now I admit it's unusual to cite polling data in a Commission proceeding and I don't normally do it. In this case, though, the law is simple and

clear. We are to promote the public interest. What the public thinks is, therefore, of great consequence to fulfilling our statutory obligation. It would be the height of arrogance for those of us here inside the beltway in this building to assert that somehow we know better what's good for the public than they know for themselves.

If we ignore what we've heard across the nation and what we're about to hear today, all of our hearings would have been a sham to provide cover for a pre-determined outcome. We must listen to the public. It's not just a moral obligation, it's the law.

So the Commission welcomes all of you here today and all of our guests who are going to speak. I hope we won't just listen with an open mind, but we'll factor what you say into our actions. Listening to you while commendable is the easy part. It's actually taking what you say and acting on it that seems to be the most difficult

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 21 part. 22 So thank you all for coming and joining 0023 us here today 1 KEVIN MARTIN: Thank you. Commissioner Tate. DEBORAH TAYLOR TATE: Thank you, 5 Mr. Chairman, I want to add my welcome to all of you 6 7 all who are here, our esteemed panelists and members of the public who will be meeting. The gentleman 8 from Virginia and I are new to the Commission, since you all have been involved with this process and so we're really here to listen to you all today. 9 10 This is, of course, the last of our six localism hearings and thank you all for all the time that you've taken to participate, to comment and to 11 12 13 14 be here today. 15 Since October of 2003, the FCC has held hearings all across America. 16 The process actually 17 started years before I arrived at the FCC and has continued throughout my tenure from Monterey, California, to Portland, Maine, literally from sea to shining sea we've heard from hundreds, if not thousands, of American citizens on this important 18 19 20 21 22 i ssue. 0024 And while the debate gets passionate, 2 often, I think that there's certainly something that we all agree on and that is the importance of local news and local information to citizens, to every one of us as consumers in every corner of America.
It's the local news outlets that know 5 6 7 our communities best. They provide the types of information on which citizens can rely, local weather and traffic, local high school football 8 9 10 scores, community events, school programs, local There are also many 11 political races and on and on. 12 times first responders in time of crisis, whether it's a crime or a weather disaster or public health emergency, local news outlets are the first to communicate often critical information to their 13 14 15 16 ci ti zens. Having grown up in a very small town, a 17 small media market, I saw firsthand the importance 18 19

Having grown up in a very small town, a small media market, I saw firsthand the importance of localism in a small market. Listening to WGNS every morning on the way to school, I heard who, local owners, local news, local agricultural prices, local births and, sadly, local deaths and it's

20

21 22

0025

2 3

8 9 10

11

12 13

14

precisely what you hear today when you visit that station.

Today's hearing will take a look back at all the information that we have gleaned from our hearings and is in the record and attempt to analyze those findings.

I, like Commissioner Adelstein, hope that we will consider our own minority and diversity committee recommendations that they have made. I thank them for their hard work over the past few years and I hope that we will consider those recommendations in the short-term.

I'm glad that we have taken such a thorough, such a long and measured approach to this Page 9

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 process because that is important to do. 16 time for us to get down to work and I look forward to joining any colleagues in crafting rules that recognize the global nature of the world in which we 17 18 live, while meeting our commitment to localism.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
KEVIN MARTIN: Thank you, Commissioner 19 20 21 22 Tate. 0026 Commissioner McDowell. ROBERT McDOWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the observance of time, I want to hear from ya'll, so I'll truncate my remarks and just put the whole statement in the record, if possible, but I do want to thank each and every one 5 6 7 of you for coming here to the Commission today. 8 This is an extremely important issue. 9 This is an extremely personal issue for me to have a localism hearing here in Washington, D.C., which is my home town media market. This is where I was born 10 11 and raised and actually the McDowell family has 12 worked in the Washington media market.

My mother, Martha Shay McDowell, worked for the Washington Post in the 1970s, a local 13 14 15 newspaper some of you have probably heard of. My father was a senior editor for National Geographic 16 17 Magazine, an international publication, and was an 18 19 intern, an intern, no less, for WMAL and WTOP radio. And the moral of that story is be nice 20 21 to your interns because some day they might grow up 22 to regulate you. 0027 In any case, looking forward to all your remarks and when we get to the public comment period 3 4 5 6 7 8 as well and without further ado, Mr. Chairman, on with the show. KEVIN MARTIN: Thank you and thank you all for participating in this important hearing.

All of ya'lls thoughts and advice are going to be critical to us as we go forward. 9 Establishing and maintaining a system of local broadcasting that is responsive to the unique 10 11 interests and needs of individual communities is an 12 extremely important policy goal for the Commission. Indeed along with competition and diversity, 13 localism was one of the three goals that underlies 14 15 all of our media ownership rules. The Commission is currently engaged in a review of these rules and the testimony we're going to hear today, along with that of all the previous localism hearings, is going to inform the Commission's decision-making not only in the 16 17 18 19 20 21 localism proceeding, but also in the media ownership 22 proceeding. 0028 With that, I'd like to take a moment to 1 review with you the work and the process the 3 4 Commission has done to date on these related proceedings on media ownership and localism. 5 In 2003 when we last conducted a review of the media ownership rules, many people expressed concerns about the process and specifically people complained that there weren't enough hearings, that Page 10

FCC Hearing 10.31.07

not enough studies were done and there wasn't enough opportunity for public comment and input.

And when we began this process last year, the Commission, this process on ownership last year, the process on localism several years ago, the Commission committed to conducting this proceeding in a manner that was going to be open and transparent and that would allow for ample public parti ci pati on.

And I think that's what the Commission As a part of the current review of the has done.

media ownership rules, we've held five hearings around the country, costs more than 150,000 dollars, we've listened to and recorded thousands of public 0029

We've spent almost 700,000 dollars on comment. 10 independent studies and we put all those studies out for comment and made all of the underlying data available to the public.

Several times we've filed, we've allowed for extensions of time to file comments in the record and to date, we've received over 162,000 written comments in the proceeding.

Similarly, I committed to completing the full inquiry on localism, something that was

initiated but stopped under the previous Chairman.

Now today we're holding the 6th planned hearing on the topic and all tolled the Commission has devoted more than 160,000 to the hearing from expert witnesses and members of the public  $\bar{\text{o}}\text{n}$ broadcast service to their local communities, we've spent another 350,000 dollars on gathering data that again will be used in localism and on the studies that were conducted on media ownership, along with the specific localism paper, study that was done by Simon Anderson at the University of Virginia on localism and welfare which we made available last

December.

10

11

12 13 14

15 16 17

18

19

20

21 22

3 4 5

11 12

13

14

15

16 17 18

0030

1

3

5

6 7

8 9

10 11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

0031

Now I know that localism is important to, to many broadcasters who recognize their own success depends on responding to the needs and interests of their local community. And most broadcasters do a good job both airing programming of unique interest to their local community, more generally by contributing the sense of community in their local areas. But it has become apparent, however, that some broadcasters aren't doing all they can or all they should in serving their local communities.

And, thus, I've already proposed the Commission to take a number of policy changes and rule changes to ensure that broadcasters better serve their local communities.

And these actions are designed to enhance the ability of local citizens regarding -regardless of gender or race to access the broadcast medium to reach their communities, to improve the communication between broadcast licensees and their local communities and identifying local programming,

and to ensure that vitally important local information and viewpoints are provided to the

community.

4

5

6

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17 18

19 20

21

22 0032

3

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 0033

2 3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

So in order to ensure that American people have the benefits of a competitive and diverse media marketplace that serves their local communities, we need to create more opportunities for different, new and independent voices to be We need to address the concern that consolidation has limited the number of local outlets available to minorities and new entrants.

The limited number of channels available in the broadcast television and radio spectrum bands and the high start-up costs of building a station are significant barriers to entering into broadcasting. It can be very difficult for anyone, nonetheless a new voice, to find an available channel and gather enough capital to build or buy a new broadcasť station.

That's why that I propose to the other Commissioners and the Commission adopted earlier this year the recommendation that Congress, that it

create and renew its new -- its tax certificate program designed to encourage small firms, including those owned by minorities and women, to acquire communications businesses, including broadcast stations.

We all know that providing tax advantages has worked in the past to encourage greater diversity of ownership and to open the doors for entry by small businesses, including disadvantaged firms and entities owned by women and mi nori ti es.

As detailed in our recent Section 257 report to Congress, I support the establishment of a new program that would permit the deferral of taxes on any capital gains involved in such a transaction, as long as the gain is re-invested in a qualifying communications entity.

The new program would also provide tax credits to sellers who also are financing it through small firms and other measures might include restrictions on the size of the purchaser or minimum holding period for the purchased licenses or a cap

even on the total eligible value to the transaction. Now I also recognize that we can't rely on Congress alone to act and I think there's things the Commission itself can do and take a number of steps to help small and independently-owned businesses to overcome these obstacles.

First, I think the Commission should allow these similar qualifying designated entities, small and independently-owned businesses, to lease some of an existing television station's excess digital broadcast spectrum to distribute their own programmi ng.

This new station would be able to air its own programs and obtain all the accompanying rights and obligations of other broadcast stations, such as public interest obligations and the ability to carry, and the requirement to carry local programmi ng.

Now there's already a real world example

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 of a similar type of arrangement. Post Newsweek 21 provides for carriage of Latino alternative TV, LATV 22 programming on its multi-cast channels in Miami, 0034 Orlando, Houston, San Antonio and I've circulated a proposal to permit this practice last March and 2 3 continue to encourage all my colleagues to adopt it. 4 5 Now while we also should continue to look for ways to facilitate minorities ability to 6 7 purchase full power broadcast stations like the tax certificate, this ability to lease broadcast channels could quickly open up capacity in local communities all across the country, considerably 8 9 enhancing the ability of small and independently-owned businesses and other qualified 10 11 12 designated entities to reach their entire community 13 with a free programming stream. 14 Now the Commission already has in place 15 similar policies to create additional opportunities in radio and cable through leased access rules and 16 low powered FM and I believe that these rules could 17 actually be changed to be, provide more useful and to provide for additional access as well. 18 19 20 In response to some of the concerns 21 expressed by my, my, my colleagues and by some of the members of the panel today, like the Media 22 0035 Access Project, we propose that soon the Commission 2 3 is going to amend its leased access rules and its program carriage rules to be more effective. Neither of these regulatory regimes have successfully achieved their intended goal of facilitating the ability of diverse and local 5 6 7 viewpoints to reach their local audiences and 8 critics have long argued that the local leased access regime has dramatically been underutilized 10 because of an artificially high rate. 11 And I also have heard from many potential programmers that the program carriage 12 rules are ineffective and because of a distorted complaint process and we'll address that issue as 13 14 15 well. 16 Now the low power FM rules, too, I think can be improved. While they've been a significant success in local communities, I think they can be 17 18 19 improved. Again, as Promethius and the Media Access 20 Project have noted, there are things we can do to 21 amend our rules to promote better entry and ensure local responsiveness on the radio side. 0036 Now last January I actually proposed to all of my Commissioners and it's still pending 2 before us to amend our LPFM rules, to take a series of steps, all of which were recommended by 5 Promethius and the Media Access Project, to do 6 7 things like eliminating the rule prohibiting the low power FM transfers and assignments, to allow the sale of, of those, to reinstate the original low power FM rule that all authorization holders be 8 9 local to the community and limit ownership to one station permitee, to clarify that repetitious and automated programming doesn't meet the local 10 11

12 13

origination requirements, to prohibit the programs Page 13

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 from being broadcast more than twice to meet the 15 local origination requirements, to expand the definition of local for, for rural communities, to 16 17 permit AM broadcast stations to operate on FM translator stations, to permit some changes of more than 50 percent of the membership of the governing Board, and finally, to impose a cap on the number of 18 19 20 applications accepted into the, in the 2003 21 22 translator filing window, thereby protecting LPFM 0037 1 servi ce. 2 And I think it's important that almost all of those proposals that again have been pending before the Commission for almost a year were all advocated by some of the members of the panel today. 5 We've also heard from, recommendations from our, the Commission's Diversity Federal 6 7 Advisory Committee and the Minority Media and 8 9 Telecommunications Council that we take some 10 additional steps to facilitate the ability of 11 qualified designated entities to more easily get 12 into broadcasting and I think that we've tried to be 13 responsi ve. 14 Last March, again, I proposed to the Commission and it's still pending before all my 15 Commissioners if they would all vote it, that they 16 17 take several other policy changes and rule changes 18 to implement their exact recommendations. 19 For example, we proposed that we allow these designated entities to purchase expired construction permits and be allotted additional time to construct and build those broadcast facilities. 20 21 22 0038 1 I've also proposed that we amend our, our attribution rules to allow for additional 2 3 4 5 financing of our so-called equity plus debt rule. Again, this was something that was, that was urged on us by the Diversity Federal Advisory Committee and by minority and media and telecommunications advocates that would assist those small businesses 6 7 in acquiring broadcast stations, retaining existing stations and building out these construction permits 8 9 10 that are available. 11 All of these proposals were suggested by 12 outside advocacy groups and have been pending at the Commission already for more than six months. 13 14 I've also heard from the Coalition of Public Interest Groups that broadcasters should air a certain amount of different types of content to 15 16 ensure they are being locally responsive.

Well I do have some concerns with some 17 18 types of mandatory minimums, for example, 19 20 requirements for free air times for politicians. 21 I did propose last March that the 22 Commission make a comprehensive change to the kind 0039 of information that broadcasters have to report in 2 their process for their renewal. If broadcasters mean it when they tell us they're already providing local programming, local news and local information, then they shouldn't object to telling the Commission 5 in detail what they're actually doing. 6 And specifically I propose that

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 broadcasters complete and provide every quarter an 9 enhanced form in which they would describe and 10 specify the local civic affairs programming, the local electoral affairs programming, the amount of public service announcements they're providing, whether they're for free or whether they've been paid and independently produce programming that the 11 12 13 14 15 station airs that would be meeting the needs of its 16 Local audi ence. 17 And I think the most important step is 18 to first require the broadcasters to be providing 19 that information on a detailed basis. And I think 20 that broadcasters would need to provide this enhanced information not only in their file, but also in their, on their Websites and make them 21 22 0040

available on their broadcast stations, association's Websites, as well

3

4

5

6

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

17

18

19 20

21

22

0041

2

5 6

7

8

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

0042

Now, I've also circulated a number of other proposals to my fellow Commissioners aimed at enhancing citizens acts as to and broadcast carriage of local programming, I've circulated proposals to amend carry rules to ensure the ability of consumers to access all of their free local broadcast channel s.

I see that Jim Goodmon is here and I know that some of the good work that he's doing down in Raleigh in providing additional local information on his multi-cast signals and I think the ability to make sure that those are getting carried to all consumers is an important aspect of being able to make sure that broadcasters have the opportunity to provide that programming.

And I also circulated a proposal to clarify that all local broadcasters can refuse to air any network programming in order to make sure that they're airing programming of greater local concern to their communities.

And finally, last March I also recommended that the Commission adopt a notice to consider requiring a physical presence of, so someone's actually at every broad -- radio broadcasting facility during all hours of operation. Requiring that all radio stations be attended would only increase the ability of the station to provide information of a local nature in the community and it would particularly be important during the event of a severe emergency, a local weather emergency or any other kind of local emergency that there be a requirement that all operations be attended will increase the likelihood that each broadcaster would be capable of relying -- relaying critical life-saving information to the public.

And I think this would address some of the concerns that have been raised by what, for example, happened in, in Minot that Commissioner Adelstein raised concerns about.

Now I think the FCC needs to be committed to ensuring that broadcasters adequately serve their local communities and to expand

opportunities for entry into media ownership and Page 15

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 media programming and to that end, I believe we should act on the issues that I've already discussed today. And I appreciate that many of you have put those ideas forward and will continue to put forward additional recommendations and I think there is yet more to be done. Now the proposals I've made thus far are not the end of the story, but we should not be inactive as we continue to receive further input. We can and should move forward on the proposals that are currently before the Commission.

I have high hopes that working with all my colleagues and others we'll be able to continue to make progress on these issues as again, as I said, many of these are proposals that have been put forth by the, many of the panelists today.

Finally, before we begin with the Media Bureau's presentation and the panels, which I very much appreciate their, their willingness to come forward, I want to respond to two of the things that were raised by some of my fellow Commissioners. 0043 First, Commissioner Copps I think said he wanted to understand what the final outcome of this would end up being, including I think he said both an NPRM with specific recommendations in the timetable for final Commission action and I think that those are the kind of things that I think that we are going to be committed to end up being doing. And Commissioner Adelstein raised two points to respond to, first he said that he cited polling data only here because it was what the law required because we have to act in the public interest. Actually, everything we have to do here is in the public interest, so to the extent that the, what the public thinks about it in polling data, it would be just as applicable that everything that we do, so while I don't disagree that the public interests and polling data should matter here, it should matter everywhere, because we always have to act in the public interest. That's your underlying fundamental requirement here at the Commi ssi on. Whether it's on this issue or on what a 0044 majority of people think about issues like (i naudi bl e). And finally, he said that he had been prohibited from meeting with the staff people that were in charge of the localism issue; well that's not true at all. The person who's in charge of it now under Chairman Martin is not the same person who was in charge of it under Chairman Powell. And he's more than happy to meet with Monica Desai any time he'd like to because she's the staff person who has been in charge of this program and these issues since I ended up becoming Chairman.
So with that, I actually I want to turn
it over to Monica Desai to begin to do a summary of
where we are on some of the locals issues and the issues that have been raised so far in the record.

MONICA DESAI:

Mr. Chairman, and Commissioners.

3

4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13 14

20

21 22

2

5

6 7

8

9 10 11

12

13

14

15 16 17

18 19

20 21

22

8 9

10

11

16 17

18

Page 16

Good morning,

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 In August of 2003, the Commission 20 launched a localism in broadcasting initiative to review localism practices among broadcasters. 21 part of this proceeding, on July 1st, 2004, they 22 0045 issued a notice of inquiry on the subject. 2 3 Media Bureau is reviewing the record in this proceeding to date. At the table with me are Bill Friedman 4 5 6 7 and Jeremy Kisell of the Media Bureau. Jeremy will summarize the record to date. JEREMY KI SELL: Good morning, 8 Mr. Chairman, and Commissioners. 9 Sorry. 10 During the course of the 2002 review of 11 its structural broadcast ownership rules, the 12 Commission received public comments indicating that 13 broadcasters may be failing to meet the needs of 14 their local communities. 15 In response the Commission opened a separate inquiry proceeding to seek input on a number of issues related to broadcast localism. 16 17 sought input from the public on how broadcasters communicate with the members of the communities that 18 19 they serve to identify interests and needs and how 20 well they are treating those issues in their 21 22 programming, including specific questions about 0046 political programming and the state of broadcast 1 service to all community segments, large and small.
The NOI asked whether the Commission 2 should adopt new policies, practices or rules designed directly to promote localism in broadcasting and if so, what those policies, 4 5 6 7 practices or rules should be. 8 In the alternative, it inquired if it 9 should continue to rely on market forces in the existing issue responsive programming requirements 10 that ensure that broadcasters meet their localism 11 12 obligations. 13 To date the Commission has received more 14 than 82,800 written comments from broadcasters, 15 broadcast industry organizations, public interest groups and members of the public. Many broadcast 16 entities submitted information outlining the process 17 18 that each follows to determine the needs and 19 interests of people within their respective 20 communities of license. Licensee commentors also provided detailed data concerning the amount, nature and variety of the programming that each station 21 22 0047 1 airs to meet local needs. A number of public interest 2 3 4 organizations submitted studies of various aspects of the nature and quality of local broadcast 5 programming today, many questioning the performance 6 7 of broadcasters. In addition to these written comments, 8 the Commission has conducted five localism field hearings throughout the country, in Charlotte, North Carolina, San Antonio, Texas, Rapid City, South 9 10 Dakota, Monterey, California, and Portland, Maine. 11 12 Of course the 6th hearing is being Page 17

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 13 conducted here today in Washington, D.C. 14 During these proceedings attended by 15 various Commissioners and Commission staff, the Agency has engaged in dialogue with industry and civic leaders, broadcasters and academics as well as members of the public to obtain information 16 17 18 19 concerning the issues articulated in the NOI 20 To date, the hearings have included 21 75 formal presentations from scheduled panelists as 22 well as 391 open mic presentations from anyone else 0048 1 in attendance who wanted to be heard. 2 The written materials and transcripts of 3 4 5 6 7 the oral testimony gathered at those hearings as well as all written comments filed in response to the NOI have been placed into the record in the localism proceeding and are available on the Commission's Website. 8 Some commentors state their belief that 9 broadcasters take seriously their obligation to air 10 locally responsive programming and that many 11 broadcasters have been inventive in airing locally 12 oriented news, public affairs and political 13 programmi ng. 14 For example, they note that some 15 broadcasters participate in formal meetings 16 sponsored by the respective State broadcasters 17 associations at which community leaders, local politicians, executives of non-profit organizations, 18 representatives of minority groups and public interest advocates share the issues that they 19 20 21 believe to be important with them, while others 22 periodically conduct focus groups and annual viewer 0049 tracking phone calls that seek feedback and the 1 2 identification of community interests. Other commentors state that broadcasters 4 include regular and proactive news reporting on 5 local stories, information about weather 6 emergencies, weekly programs and specials and material focusing on minority groups or children. 8 Some state that stations also provide 9 access to political candidates with programming 10 featuring candidates and other political experts discussing issues of the day. 11 12 Some commentors note that broadcasters also provide local groups and non-profit organizations with support in media access. Some licensees state that their public interest programming includes news magazines, consumer segments during newscalistative and other non-traditional 13 14 15 16 17 formats that are more likely to engage their 18 19 audiences and provoke interest in and discussion of 20 important local events and issues. 21 Other commentors note that broadcast 22 stations provide crucial information in the case of 0050

emergencies and must continue to serve this public safety role in their weather and other programming.

In addition, many stations have reported that they offer programming directed to underserved elements of their audience, such as minority groups and the economically disadvantaged.

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 A number of commentators indicate that 8 stations face increased competition from 9 nationally-oriented program sources such as cable 10 and satellite.  $\hbox{ Other commentors, however, state that broadcast licensees devote little time to meeting } \\$ 11 12 these important obligations. These non-licensee 13 14 commentors contend that stations are making 15 inadequate efforts to serve their local communities 16 and question the validity of claims by broadcasters that they are providing substantial locally-oriented 17 programmi ng. 18 19 Instead, these parties maintain that financial considerations exacerbated by the 20 de-regulation of broadcasting that began in the 21 22 1980s have resulted in a critical decrease in the 0051 quality and quantity of programs offered by 2 licensees that is responsive to the needs and 3 interests of the communities that they serve. Commentors note what they perceive to be a continual decline in the amount of local and 5 network broadcast news coverage of substantive campaign election issues in recent years as well as 6 7 the local -- lack of local public affairs 8 9 programming especially in underserved communities. 10 Some commentors also note the lack of 11 programming diversity and criticize broadcasters for barring access by independent producers of 12 programming and for not developing and promoting 13 14 local artists.  $\,$  As noted in the NOI, it is the obligation of the Commission to ensure that 15 16 17 broadcasters affirmatively meet their obligations to serve their communities of interests. We believe 18 19 that the record in this proceeding provides valuable 20 guidance to assist the Commission in obtaining that 21 objective. 22 We at the Media Bureau look forward to 0052 hearing from the witnesses that are scheduled to 2 speak today and after considering their views and 3 the rest of the record, evidence in this proceeding, sharing with the Commission our recommendations in 5 our localism report. 6 7 Thank you. KEVIN MARTIN: Thank you. At this point we're going to end up turning it over to our moderator, Lou Sigalos. 8 ŏ JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: Mr. Chairman, you 10 11 might have some questions for the Bureau. KEVIN MARTIN: 12 What's that? JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: 13 I think we might 14 have some questions for the Bureau, I don't know --KEVIN MARTIN: Did you want to --15 MI CHAEL COPPS: Well I'd just be 16 curious, it sounds like, I heard we had 82,000 or 162,000 or however many comments in, I'd like to be clear on what that public record is and in very 17 18 19 general terms you expressed some of the concerns, 20 but what are the two or three themes that really 21 22 stand out, what are the areas of public concern is

```
question number one.
 2
3
                    And then number two, as you look at the
     record of the five specific markets that we visited,
 4
5
     are you able to make any differentiations between
     those markets that we visited in terms of the presence or absence of localism, where the
 6
 7
     satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the people who
 8
     live there with the amount of localism that they are
     receiving or not receiving?
 9
10
                    MONICA DESAI:
                                     Well I'll respond to your
     second question first, which is whether we've seen
11
12
     any differentiation among the different markets and
     that, we'll have to get back to you on that one, we'll have to take a look at the record in that regard and try to distinguish that way.
13
14
15
16
                    With respect to the first question, some
     general themes or areas of concern, as Jeremy noted
17
18
     in his report, you know, some commentors suggest
19
     that broadcasters don't devote enough time to
20
     meeting obligations related to localism.
     They say that there needs to be more, some commentors say there need to be more
21
22
0054
     locally-oriented programming.
 1
                                         They, they also, some
 2
3
     commentors complain about the decline in the amount
     of local and network broadcast news coverage of
 4
     issues such as campaign and election related issues.
 5
                    And then there's also commentors, there
 6
7
     are a group of commentors who note, who suggest that
     there's a lack of programming diversity and
     criticize broadcasters for barring access by
 8
     independent producers of programming and for not developing and promoting local artists.
 9
10
                   MI CHAEL COPPS:
11
                                      When the localism task
     force was announced back in 2003, it was stated that
12
13
     it would conduct studies to rigorously measure
     localism and how it may be affected by FCC rules and
14
15
     report back within 12 months. Obviously we didn't
     make the 12 months, but how many studies have, have been done in pursuit of the localism initiative?

KEVIN MARTIN: Monica?
16
17
18
19
                    KEVIN MARTIN:
                                    Commissioner Copps, if I
20
     can, if I can enter a response.
21
                    As you indicated, Chairman Powell had
22
     said that he would produce a significant number of
0055
     studies and produce them within 12 months of the
 1
     time this was initiated in 2004. As you know,
     because we were both on the Commission at the time,
     when I took over as Chairman in March of 2005, that
 5
     time frame had expired and indeed we were supposed
 6
7
     to have already completed the entire localism
     proceeding and those studies had not been conducted.
 8
     As a matter of fact, there was one study that was conducted by Professor Si mon Anderson at
 9
     the University of Virginia, that was submitted to us
10
11
     as a first draft, it's been published since last
12
     December.
13
                    The other data that was gathered is the
     data that was actually used for the 10 studies that were, for some of the 10 studies that were done in
14
15
     the ownership proceeding.
16
17
                    But you're right, when Chairman Powell
```

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 18 left, those studies had not been conducted. MI CHAEL COPPS: 19 My only point is the 20 necessity to proceed carefully here. I know we have 21 the one study that was done by Simon Anderson, I think it's 20 pages long. 22 0056 I doubt that it's been peer reviewed, correct me if I'm wrong, and I think questions like 2 are there differences between the markets that we visited are really important. 5 Are there differences between big cities 6 7 and small cities in terms of our public interest oversight responsibilities. So I hope as you go through this record, all 80 or 160,000 comments, whatever it is, you do so deliberately, as I said before, all deliberate speed, I'm all for that, but I don't want to rush to 8 9 10 11 12 any conclusions here if we haven't done the research or we haven't really combed the record and looked for those kind of differentiations and nuances that 13 14 15 are going to be so vitally important in forming the 16 record and forming the wisdom of any decisions that 17 we may make. KEVIN MARTIN: Of course. Of course 18 since, since Monica Desai and the Bureau aren't 19 making any recommendations today, since, since all 20 they're doing is just a brief summary of what we've 21 22 already done, of course they'll end up doing that 0057 1 for --2 MICHAEL COPPS: I look forward to it. 3 So I wouldn't, like I KEVIN MARTIN: 4 5 think she always ends up doing when she's leaving the Bureau, I'm confident she'll be end up doing 6 7 that. JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: I had a question 8 about the record, as well. 9 KEVIN MARTIN: Sure. JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: 10 You've Looked at 11 the 162,000 comments I take it that have been submitted and studied into the record. 12 is out of those comments that were received, how 13 many public witnesses called in the localism 14 15 proceeding for loosening of the media ownership limits as a means of enhancing localism? 16 17 MONICA DESAL: I have to get back to you 18 on that. 19 JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: How about at the public hearings, just if we just looked at the public hearings that were held, the public witnesses 20 21 that came up, did any public witness say that it was 22 0058 a good idea to loosen the ownership rules in order to enhance localism, because I think you and I 3 attended all of them? 4 MONICA DESAI: I actually haven't attended all of them, I've been in the Bureau for about six months, but I'll have to go back and check the transcript of all of the witness testimony and 5 6 7 8 then I'll get back to you on that. KEVIN MARTÍN: I think that, Jonathan, I 9 10 think that when we were in San Antonio I think I can 11 remember only one, I can remember the reaction of Page 21

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 12 the audience, as well, that's the reason why I 13 remember there was only one that I think called for it, so, so, but certainly I don't think that there's been more than a handful at any of the, all of 14 15 16 hearings we've attended. 17 JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: That was my recollection as well, I appreciate it.

KEVIN MARTIN: I think, like I said, I, 18 19 20 and the only reason I can remember one is because 21 the, the, the boos from the audience when the person 22 said it in San Antonio was I think the way that we 0059 1 might recall it. 2 3 JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: Yeah, I think I remembered one, but it might have been two or three, I didn't know if I had missed a couple. 4 5 6 7 KEVIN MARTIN: Well I'm sorry if I underesti mated. JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: You know, just real 8 quick getting back to you, I appreciate your 9 response to my concerns about the staff meeting, just wanted to clarify, I believe that we should be able to meet with any staff we want, any time, not 10 11 just those that are hand-picked by you or by anybody else. I think it's important that we have access to 12 13 anybody on the staff, they work for the entire 14 15 Commission, not just us. 16 KEVIN MARTIN: I think that, Jonathan, we can end up debating if you'd like, we're taking 17 time away from our panel as to why we're all here, 18 but what I would say is that absolutely, but if 19 you're going to ask questions about a project they're no longer in charge of and don't know the 20 21 answers to and, indeed, they were doing it with a 22 0060 former Chairman, you're going to not get answers 2 about where we are, so if you want to talk about a particular topic that we're working on, they can be 3 4 5 there as well to give you a background, but the people who are working on it now would need to be there as well because if not, those answers might be misinterpreted and, but again, I think at this point 6 7 8 it's probably important for us to try to move on to 9 the panelists. I know that many of them are anxious 10 to end up trying to participate. 11 So, I do think it's important to alert everyone, including the audience, because we're 12 going to continue this straight on through and move on to public comment after this, occasionally individual Commissioners will get up and go to the restroom or will go get something to drink, but they'll be right back and we'll continue on straight 13 14 15 16 17 through with everyone's public comments after that. 18 19 And so Louis, if you want to, Louis, if you could actually proceed now, that would be great. LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, 20 21 22 and Commissioners. 0061 As we move to our panel discussion, I'd 2 3 like to review the ground rules very briefly. Panelists, each of you have five minutes to make your remarks. I urge you to stay within that time limit in order to leave as much time as Page 22

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 6 7 possible for the public comment period. Members of the audience, please listen respectfully to the panelists, even if you disagree with the views they express. I know that the issues we're discussing today arouse a lot of passion, but for this hearing to run smoothly and be successful, 8 9 10 11 12 we need to maintain basic decorum and avoid 13 unnecessary interruptions. I thank you. 14 Participating in this panel are 15 Marcellus Alexander, executive vice president for NAB Television, president of NAB Television 16 17 Foundati on. Bob Edwards, national first vice 18 19 president of AFTRA, hosts the Bob Edwards show XM satellite radio and former host NPR's morning 20 21 edition. 22 Lisa Fager Bediako, president and 0062 co-founder Industry Ears. 1 Kim Grandy, president, National 234567 Organization for Women. Jim Goodmon, president and CEO, Capital Broadcasti ng. Wade Henderson, president and CEO, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. 8 Dan Isett, director of corporate and ŏ Government Affairs, Parents, Television Council. 10 Reverend Jesse L. Jackson, Senior, president and founder, Rainbow PUSH Coalition. 11 Andrew Schwartzman, president and CEO, 12 13 Media Access Project. Christopher Sterling, president -- professor of media and public affairs, public 14 15 policy, public administration, George Washington University. 16 17 18 S. Derek Turner, research director, Free 19 Press. 20 And Mark Cooper, director of research, Consumer Federation of America. 21 22 Mr. Al exander. 0063 MARCELLUS ALEXANDER: Good morning, 1 2 3 4 Chairman Martin, and Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. My name is Marcellus Alexander, I'm 5 executive vice president for television at the National Association of Broadcasters. I also as president of NAB EF, an organization that 6 7 I also serve 8 develops educational programs to help women and 9 people of color advance in the broadcasting 10 busi ness. 11 During my time in broadcasting I've managed and been part owner of a successful radio 12 13 station in Detroit and managed television stations in Baltimore and Philadelphia. I know firsthand the 14 15 special relationship that exists between broadcaster and his or her community.
You've heard from broadcasters around 16 17 the country that localism is the heart of everything 18 19 they do. Well, believe it. While detractors may say broadcasters are not provided to committing localism, the volumes of examples both in the record 20 21 22 and throughout these hearings belie that conclusion. Page 23

```
0064
       In addition, such conclusions are inconsistent with
       one fundamental economic fact, broadcasters compete
       with each other, every minute of every day to attract local viewers to their station.

To do that, local, relevant programming is essential. Without it, viewers simply change the
 4
 5
 6
7
       channel and go elsewhere in the market to get it.
                          That is why we have one of the most
 8
 9
       vibrant over-the-air broadcasting systems in the world, in fact, the most vibrant. We're proud of
10
       the record established in this proceeding.
11
       Broadcasters in every community and the Tocal
12
       constituents that they serve have appeared in force to defend their public service record. Governors, Mayors, Police Chiefs and countless others have
13
14
15
16
       stood behind the broadcasters record of strong
17
       service to their communities in cities as large as
       Chicago and as small as Portland, Maine.
18
19
                          But it is broadcasters commitment to
       their daily local news, local programming and emergency information during times of crisis that sits at the center of their local service.
20
21
22
0065
 1
       Television stations produce more local news than
 2
       ever before.
                          In this proceeding, most broadcasters
       said that on average they aired 25 to 40 hours of
       local news each week. You also heard that beyond local news programming, radio and television stations provide a variety of other locally-produced content, including programming on sports, religion, the arts and other community-oriented issues.

Indeed local broadcasting is enjoying a repair scane in locally produced programming.
 5
 6
7
 8
 9
10
       renaissance in locally-produced programming.
Broadcasters unique and important role in providing
11
12
13
       emergency information was never more evident than it
14
       was during Katrina and the recent California
       wildfires. In both of these communities, broadcasters dedicated themselves to getting
15
16
       information to those who needed it most.
17
                          As their own communities burned,
18
19
       television and radio stations in San Diego and
       Los Angeles maintained a constant on-air vigilance
20
21
       alerting citizens with up-to-the-second changes in
22
       evacuation orders. In fact, aiding emergency
0066
 1
       officials with one of the largest evacuations in
       American history.

I'd like to show you an example of just one of the many broadcasters who covered this event.
 4
5
6
7
       Let's go to the video, please.
                          (Video clip playing.
"It was a devastation and loss as fire
 8
       storms swept across Southern California and KABC TV
       was there from the very beginning. In a crisis, our local news is the first place people turn for the information they need to keep safe. They expect their local station to be there and we do our best
 9
10
11
12
13
       to exceed that expectation with information specific
14
       to the situation, their neighbor, their needs.
15
                          "On Sunday when the winds began to blow
16
       and the fires broke out, we jumped into action,
```

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 17 cancelling regular programming and commercials, marshalling the full resources of eyewitness news to 18 bring non-stop coverage of this critical situation.
"Over the next three days KABC TV would 19 20 21 air 41 hours of uninterrupted commercial free news coverage, calling in all available personnel, 22 0067 cancelling vacations and days off and extending shifts to make non-stop coverage possible. Carried 3 4 live, uninterrupted news conferences by the Governor and local authorities about each fire situation. broadcast important information gathered by our reporters and photographers in the heart of the fire zone and ran additional live updates and on-air 5 6 7 calls throughout the night.

"Our coverage also used the special 8 9 10 technology KABC has been so proud to introduce to 11 Southern California, our two helicopters provided the best overview of the unfolding fire situations, 12 13 our live Dopler radar showed detailed wind and smoke patterns allowing viewers to see how the wind storm was unfolding and affecting the fire and smoke in 14 15 16 the air. 17 "But our use of technology to serve our viewers didn't stop on air. In this digital age we 18 19 created special online tools and resources at 20 ABC7. com to allow instant 24-hour access to 21 information on evacuation sites, weather 22 information, road and school closures and emergency 0068 1 al erts. 2 3 "Our Web department created a special interactive Google map with links to all the fire locations and the stories of information specific to 4 5 6 7 We streamed live news conferences and those fires. portions of our live broadcast coverage on our Website so even those in offices or places without 8 access to television could get the information they need. We sent out cell phone text alerts and E-mailed breaking news weather and headline alerts.

"ABC7 com generated nearly 12 million 9 10 11 12 page views over the last week with nearly a million and a half unique visitors to our site, most who 13 14 came directly to our site. Nearly a half a million people viewed our fire site Google map. 15 16 300,000 got information on evacuations and closures and nearly 300,000 people watched our live streaming 17 18 vi deo. "KABC TV's commitment did not stop when 19 the fires died down, before the week was even over 20 21 we had launched an ambitious on-air relief drive in 22 cooperation with the Red Cross chapters in L.A., 0069 Orange and San Bernadino counties to raise funds for 2 3 the fire victims. 'l'm glad you guys are doing it for everybody as well, we appreciate it. We've been watching the newscasts all week, it's just been so heart breaking watching all the families and my 4 5 6 7

heart pleaking water.

heart goes out to them.

"So many people are displaced by the fires and don't have a thing, the normal comforts of home right now and I think it's really important for Page 25

8

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 everybody to come down here and support, you know, this was really important to me. "I woke up this morning and they told me that you guys were doing this and I thought, you know, I have to come down and support because this is, these are our neighbors. "That drive raised more than a half a million dollars in individual contributions and over 3 million in corporate contributions in less than Oh, that's astonishing news here at the Rose Bowl and now continues as a mail in and online donation program. The fire storm was unprecedented. 0070 Our responses of the local station was not.
"This is our mission as a local station. This is what we do. KABC TV both on air and online proved both its commitment and its value to the Southern California community." The broadcasters are more than conduits for information. They are local citizens as well. According to our 2006 broadcast community service report, broadcasters across the country provided more than 10 billion dollars worth of community service last year alone. This is not a contribution that can be overlooked or swept under the carpet. As we have seen in all of the public hearings thus far, local charities are universal in their praise of broadcasters and the work they do to serve their local communities. Broadcasters carry diverse viewpoints, some conservative, some liberal, some young, some old. Broadcasters can serve as megaphones for social issues in causes as well. members, including Radio One, ICBC and Howard University's own WHUR radio, among many others, rallied support for the Jena 6, impacting the 0071 outcome of that situation. And in Los Angeles, in other places, Spanish language radio stations helped organize rallies, galvanizing the Latino community on immigration issues. Is our industry perfect? Of course not. Is there room for stations to do more? Absolutely. Will we ever be able to satisfy all of our critics, not a chance. In fact, the record of these hearings show we've been accused of everything from causing global warming to the mortgage crisis. As Nell Carter used to say in her show of the same title, give me a break. We're very proud of the record and will continue to build on it. But the truth remains only competitively viable broadcast stations sustained by adequate advertising revenues can serve the public interest effectively and provide the local programming so essential to communities. The capability of local broadcasters to continue operating profitably in financially sustainable ownership structures must be of central concern to the Commission.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to

12

13 14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

2 3

5

6 7

8

9 10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

1

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22 0072

join you today, I hope that you have found through this lengthy proceeding as I have in my 25 years in the business that when broadcasters say they are committed to localism, they have a record and

results to back it up.

I believe our record speaks for itself by the millions of Americans who turn every day to their local broadcasters for information they need the most and entertainment they enjoy.

Thank you. LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you,

Mr. Al exander.

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

20 21

22

0073 1

2 3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18 19 20

21

22

1

3

5

6 7

8

0074

Mr. Edwards.

BOB EDWARDS: I thank the Commission for this opportunity to testify. My name's Bob Edwards and I'm testifying on behalf of AFTRA, the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists, which represent more broadcast workers than any other union. I am a proud member and I serve AFTRA as its national first vice president.

The major radio conglomerates argue that the broadcast ownership caps should be lifted to

enable them to respond to increased competition from satellite radio and the Internet, but this ignores the local aspect of terrestrial radio broadcasting. Satellite radio is by definition a national The strength of terrestrial radio and its platform. major appeal is that it's local.

When it comes to conveying local information, news, weather and community events, there is no rural competition between these platforms. A national satellite broadcaster is not going to give local communities information about, for example, their local school board election and

if terrestrial broadcasters continue to consolidate, local communities won't get that information from

local radio stations either.

Localism is inextricably linked with the rest of the Commission's regulations governing media ownership, which are also currently under review. The drive to consolidate ownership of media seems to ignore the disaster that consolidation has brought to local news and public affairs and radio in this country.

The Commission should not intensify the continuing evisceration of broadcast localism as a result of consolidation by adopting rules enabling even more consolidation. Although I've spent most of my career working in public radio, it's impossible to ignore the fact that commercial radio and television dominate the airwaves in this country.

It should not be a luxury for journalists to practice their profession in an environment that's free from commercial constraints. I'm well aware that my colleagues who work at commercial stations take their responsibilities to local communities very seriously, unfortunately their employers increasingly focused on the corporate bottom line don't seem to share that pri ori ty.

If the Commission is going to give large, multi-national companies the right to exploit the publicly-owned airwaves for profit, it should consider how those companies have historically

Page 27

13 14

15 16 17

18

19

20

FCC Hearing 10.31.07

22 behaved when they have been de-regulated. Radic 0075

ownership was largely de-regulated in 1996 to the detriment of localism in broadcasting. In Chicago, Westinghouse owned WMAQ AM had been an all news station since 1989. Westinghouse bought CBS and later merged with Viacom in the '90s. The merged company's radio division, CBS radio, then called Infinity, owned Chicago's only other all news format station, WBBM AM.

In 2000, Viacom, CBS, Infinity, determined that it was no longer profitable to compete against itself, so it shut down WMAQ AM, because WMAQ AM and WBBM AM were the only two all news format radio stations in Chicago. When Viacom killed WMAQ AM, it was killing WBBM AM's only competition, leaving the third largest radio market in the United States with only one all news radio station.

Although these moves may have been highly profitable for Viacom, they were hardly in the public interest. Viacom's radio division, CBS Radio, also owns both of the only all news format radio stations in the New York City market.

Although CBS Radio continues to compete against itself in New York City by maintaining separate newsrooms, the fact remains that the same multi-national media conglomerate programs both of the only all news radio stations in New York. There is not a separate independent all news format radio station in the largest radio market in the United States.

These examples and countless more illustrate that media consolidation has been the enemy of localism in broadcasting. If the Commission truly seeks to enhance localism, it should tighten, not loosen, ownership restrictions. This much is certain, there exists no compelling public interest justification at this time for the Commission to relax its ownership caps and thereby repeat the mistakes of post 1996 consolidation.

The same thing is already happening in print and television, you have heard AFTRA members testify at other public hearings across the country about how media companies that own newspapers and television stations in the same market routinely

re-purpose and recycle content. You've heard about how broadcast conglomerates that operate two stations in a market consolidate newsrooms, fire journalists and homogenize programming.

My colleagues around the country have been very clear about what these proceedings mean to us and I hope you've been listening.

If you further de-regulate media in this

If you further de-regulate media in this country, networks, broadcast stations and newspapers will continue to consolidate, resulting in fewer voices heard by citizens. If you permit this consolidation, television stations and newspapers will behave as commercial radio owners behaved when they were largely de-regulated. They will adopt a

business model that shuts out local news and

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 entertainment in favor of national homogenized 17 programmi ng. If commercial media are given the unfettered right to abandon their obligation to 18 19 serve the public interest, they will do just that. 20 21 Please do not let this happen. 22 Instead, please proceed in a deliberate 0078 fashion, keeping in mind the public interest, not 2 corporate profitability. Accordingly, I would urge the Commission to not fast track its consideration 4 of the real and lasting impact that further 5 consolidation would have on localism in broadcasting.

The health and robustness of American

The health and robustness of American

The health and robustness of American 6 7 media is riding on your decision and I thank you 8 9 very much for this opportunity to testify. LOUIS SIGALOS: 10 Thank you, Mr. Edwards. 11 (Appl ause) 12 Ms. Bedi ako. 13 LISA FAGER BEDIAKO: Thank you, hello, my name is Lisa Fager Bediako. I'm the president and co-founder of Industry Ears. I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify this 31st day of October which many of you recognize as Halloween, however today is also the last day of Domestic 14 15 16 17 18 19 Violence Awareness Month. I'm wearing red today to 20 break the silence and symbolically scream for women of color who have suffered. 21 22 Most recent stories of Megan Williams 0079 who was kidnapped, brutally raped and tortured and held by six assailants for a month in West Virginia 3 and the mother living in Dunbar housing projects in Florida who was repeatedly gang raped in front of her son. These stories and other about women of 4 5 6 7 color and people of color receive little to no media attention in this vast consolidating media 8 9 environment. Women of color and people of color are 10 treated as if they are invisible, unimportant, a 11 last thought. 12 Industry Ears is a non-profit, 13 non-partisan and independent organization which is focused on the impact media has on communities of 14 15 color and children since 2003. My co-founder, Paul Porter, and I have collectively more than 40 years 16 of experience working for national and local media outlets. Using our insiders knowledge, we created 17 18 19 Industry Ears and IndustryEars.com to address the 20 myths, misconceptions about how media and entertainment industries operate and more 21 22 importantly, to develop effective means to combat 0800 1 the negative consequences of harmful media messages 2 and images on children. 3 4 For decades radio was a media source for The civil rights movement relied people of color. 5 on radio stations to report what other stations would not. It also gave voice to black leaders and concerned citizens. Now Clear Channel and Radio 6 7 One, the two largest urban radio format 8

conglomerates, have eliminated news.

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 10 Last year, for example, throw the 11 clip -- just kidding. I didn't know we could bring bells and whistles, or else I would have brought my 12 13 own video and it would have been fabulous. Last year when Korea was reported to having launched several missiles towards the United 14 15 States, the number one story on urban radio was the 16 release of Little Kim from jail, with no mention of 17 18 the seriousness of what was going on in our country. 19 The lack of localism has affected people 20 of color more than any other format in urban radio. 21 Over 75 percent of urban radio stations carry 22 syndication and what this does is it limits, it 0081 limits our voices, our -- it also limits jobs for people of color and others who want to work in radio, in urban radio. Syndication has not only caused a disproportionate loss of industry jobs, but 4 5 6 7 more importantly stifled news and information to local communities. For decades radio -- I'm sorry. I was only asked to be on the panel yesterday, so my testimony is still in development. Again, as a woman of color, it's just another metaphor of what is going on now in media and in 8 9 10 other things in our community. 11 I want to get back to public service 12 13 obligations. We, I heard that word used and I'd 14 like to see right now it's a lot about public 15 service obligations are limited to Sunday at 5 a.m. I love Reverend Jackson's show but unfortunately in some markets he is on at 5 a.m. in the morning on Sunday and I'm not sure that that is a, you know, a huge listener, listenership at that time. 16 17 18 19 20 Washington, D.C., is a great example of 21 what consolidation and a lack of localism has 22 created for communities of color. The nation's 0082 Capitol overshadows local issues. The public 1 airwaves are a vital communications source to local communities. African-Americans, which is, which are the largest segment of the D.C. population, listen and watch more TV and radio than any other ethnic 4 5 6 7 group. In this market, D.C. is a top 10 market, 8 we have four urban radio stations, three out of the 9 four have syndicated programming and only one out of 10 the four has news coverage. I also want to, also make note of what happens with syndication. Syndication is easier to stop one voice than it is 100 independent voices in 11 12 13 14 100 markets. Also what we have going on are national playlists that are permitted and encouraged 15 by corporate (inaudible) practices which, which, 16 17 which is supported by tons of evidence, uncovered by former Attorney General Elliott Spitzer and current Governor of New York City, but unfortunately these corporate violators have, are Federal violators of 18 19 20 21 the law have only received a slap on the wrist from 22 the FCC. 0083 Our Attorney General up in New York was 1 able to get 36 million dollars in fines and our Federal organization here was only able to agree to

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 12 million with no admittance of guilt. 5 So, I'll end this and say that I 6 7 strongly urge the FCC to slow down and to take into account and review diversity recommendations that 8 have been submitted. We need a diverse environment of owners to reflect our diverse America. 9 10 (Appl ause) 11 LOUIS SIGÁLOS: Thank you, thank you, 12 Ms. Bedi ako. 13 Ms. Gandy. 14 KIM GANDY: Thank you. Chairman Martin and Commissioners, my name is Kim Gandy, I'm president of the Now Foundation as well as the 15 16 National Organization for Women, the countries largest grass-roots women's rights organization with over half a million members across the country. 17 18 19 20 Lisa and I are also part of the Women's Coalition for Dignity and Diversity, a coalition 21 22 representing more than 12 million women that was 0084 1 formed in the wake of the Imus scandal. I have four inter-connected points, all of which are backed up by the studies that you 4 already have in hand. 5 First, that programming needs of local 6 7 communities are best served by local ownership. It's hard to argue with the obvious. Single station 8 owners who are headquartered in a community and focused on that community are better able to understand and serve that area's needs than large 9 10 11 conglomerates that are headquartered in another State or across the country.

So increasing local ownership should be 12 13 a goal in any effort aimed at increasing local 14 content and local responsiveness. 15 In case it's not obvious enough, there 16 17 are numbers to back up the assertion that local ownership increases local programming, for example, 18 19 the fact that locally-owned and operated television stations aired more local news content than their conglomerate counterparts to the tune of 25 to, 20 21 22 25 percent more local broadcast news in every half 0085 1 hour news show. 2 Second, this desirable local ownership, 3 especially single station ownership, is more likely 4 to occur with female and minority owners. Whether you're talking about radio or television, the median 5 minority or female owner controls only a single station and is headquartered in the community where 6 7 8 that station is located, obviously serving the interests of localism. 9 10 For example, radio stations owned by women are significantly more likely to be locally owned. 64.4 percent of female-owned stations are locally owned, compared to only 41.6 percent of 11 12 13 non-female-owned stations. Moreover, women are more likely to own only a single station, thereby focusing programming on that one community. 14 15 16 17 In radio, for example, the majority of all female owners are single station owners and the 18 19 proportion is even higher for women of color, with 20 over 90 percent of Latino station owners and over

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 80 percent of African-American female owners having 22 only a single radio station focused on local 0086 community. Third, local owners are being squeezed 3 out by increased concentration and market consolidation hurting both localism and media 5 diversity efforts. These locally-based owners, 6 7 especially those who own only a single station or a small number of stations are being squeezed out of the market by consolidation which makes it more and 8 more difficult for them to compete with large conglomerates both for programming and for 9 10 11 advertising dollars. 12 According to the Free Press study, the probability that a particular station will be 13 14 female-owned or minority-owned is significantly 15 lower in concentrated markets and the more concentrated the market, the less likelihood that 16 17 there will be a female-owned or minority-owned 18 station in that market. 19 We urge this Commission not to take any action that will increase ownership concentration, in fact, we urge you to do exactly the opposite. 20 21 Finally, increased ownership by women 22 0087 and people of color will serve the interests of 2 3 localism, in addition to increasing public access to this public asset, the airwaves. Despite the fact that we represent two-thirds of the country, women 4 5 and people of color are woefully underrepresented in 6 media ownership. 7 Women own 5 percent of television 8 stations and 6 percent of commercial radio stations. 9 Racial ethnic minorities own about 3 percent of 10 television stations and less than 8 percent of radio stations. Unfortunately most studies do not allow us to look separately at minority female ownership 11 12 and we urge you to rectify this in future studies.
So, in order to increase service and responsiveness to local communities, particularly 13 14 15 the underserved audiences of women and people of 16 17 color, the FCC must remedy the serious underrepresentation of women and people of color in 18 broadcast ownership of both radio and television 19 20 stations. As we've pointed out in previous 21 22 comments, there are numerous public interest 8800 benefits to increasing minority in women's 2 3 ownership, including an increase in program diversity, a breakdown of stereotypes, better 4 5 service for underrepresented segments of the population, increased civic participation and not 6 least remedying past discrimination against women and minorities who were not included in the 8 Government's initial free handout of the broadcast 9 spectrum. 10 The Commission has repeatedly found that it's essential to a democracy for the electorate to 11 have access to divergent viewpoints on controversial 12 issues, bet few of the FCC's Commission studies even 13 14 attempt to address whether current levels of media

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 15 consolidation address that issue and provide the 16 public with a true diversity of views. Finally, in light of recent events, 17 believe that the paltry level of female ownership affects the coverage of women's issues and the way women are portrayed in the media. Increasing the 18 19 20 diversity of ownership would increase diverse 21 22 content and diverse voices and that would serve all 0089 of us. 2 We look forward to working with you toward that end. (Appl ause). 5 LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you, Ms. Gandy. Mr. Goodmon. JIM GOODMON: 7 Thank you very much, my 8 name is Jim Goodmon, I'm president of Capital 9 Broadcasting Company in Raleigh and I'd like to say 10 I'm the third generation president of our company, my grandfather started it in 1929. You know, this 11 is a great time to be a broadcaster and thank you 12 13 for digital television and thank you for digital 14 15 Now starting with that point, I've got three, I've got a suggestion, I'm going to move the 16 We're going to move the ball 17 ball forward today. 18 I have three suggestions for you. forward. The first one is, please don't do anything about ownership, and I have two reasons for 19 20 21 saying that. One is we are now going into the 22 digital transition. You know those two TV stations 0090 I own in Raleigh, they are really eight TV stations now. You know that FM station I own in Raleigh, I really have three stations now. I mean we're moving into digital. 5 not sure what's going to happen to those other channels, I don't know exactly where this is going 6 to go, but why would we work on ownership regulation at the end of an era? You know, why do we make a change before we really get into this digital and 8 9 10 see what's going on? 11 And the other thing I want to say about 12 ownership is I'm really worried you'll change one You'll get real interested in the radio caps 13 14 or I know you're very interested in newspapers. What happened to us in the last ownership was we had 15 a group working on radio and, you know, we'll do this about radio and they're off fussing about radio and they come up with something. We had a group 16 17 18 working on television ownership and we already have 19 two here and over here you can have three and they 20 21 fight and fight and fight. 22 And then you come up with you can own a 0091 newspaper and then, and then all of a sudden this 1 rule-making is turned out and everybody fell to pieces. Nobody put it all on the same piece of paper. It's not just whether you should allow a TV station and a newspaper to be co-owned. Remember, 5 6 that same crowd can own eight radio stations, and that same crowd can own the cable company. So you can't take one thing and work on Page 33

```
FCC Hearing 10.31.07
      it. I mean this has to be, am I making any sense?
10
      I'm saying -- it's kind of a --
                      (No)
11
                      ĴΙΜ໌GOODMON: No, okay.
12
      Right, so do it altogether. Do it altogether. Like don't just pick one ownership thing, so please don't do ownership now.
13
14
15
                      The second issue is please do the third
16
17
                    I mean I'm, we've got a lot of work to do
18
      to get these analog antennas and digital stuff up,
19
      it's a, we're, several of us have got lots of
20
      problems so we really need the third periodic to
21
      move along with the digital transition.
22
                      Now, localism. On one side, localism,
0092
      on one side we've got the crowd that says, we look
      at the broadcasters, we're wonderful, look at all
 3
4
      the stuff we do. On the other side we've got these
      people saying broadcasters are not fulfilling their
 5
      requirements, this is terrible.
 6
7
                      Well my suggestion is why don't you ask
      us what we're doing. You've had a proceeding, you've had a proceeding, I don't know whether it's a notice -- I'm not sure what it is, you know, why --
 8
 9
      to suggest that broadcast stations report quarterly
10
11
      on what we do.
12
                      That's a, that's an imminently
13
      reasonable notion so you can see what we're doing.
      You've got some really good proposals about what should be on that questionnaire, if you could get
14
15
      that out, then you can start, we can and you all can start deciding what you think about what we're
16
17
      doing, with real data.
18
                      And then the second part of that is the
19
20
      minimum public interest standards proceeding. You
      have on one hand, there's this suggestion that we're
21
22
      supposed to serve the local community, but nobody
0093
      wants to suggest where that is.
 1
      Tell us what our minimum public interest standards are. That could be a really healthy exercise for everybody. We wouldn't be just
      shooting out here about what's good and what's bad
 5
      and you've got three or four really good proposals
 6
7
      about what should be included in the minimum public
      interest standards.
 8
 9
                      And it's generally is you do local
      programming, not that you have to do programming about A, B, C or D, but that you do local programming and local community ascertainment, stuff like that, so I'm just saying it would really help to do quarterly reporting. You know, I think these
10
11
12
13
14
      things have been here since '99.
15
16
                      I used to say I wanted to live to see my
      grandchildren finish high school, now I'm on the,
17
      these proceedings. I mean this could really be
18
      helpful to everybody, is to get this minimum public interest standards and quarterly reporting out. So
19
20
21
      that's three things.
                      Please let's get through the transition
22
0094
      before we start getting to this ownership.
      you're going to do ownership, you've got to look at
                                                  Page 34
```

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 everything. You can't just take one thing and say 4 this is okay, you've got to remember all the 5 different things we can own. The third periodic and 6 quarterly reporting and minimum public interest standards. 8 Thank you very much. LOUIS SIGALOS: Than 9 Thank you, Mr. Goodmon. 10 Mr. Henderson. Good morning, 11 WADE HENDERSON: 12 Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. 13 Wade Henderson, president of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the nation's oldest, largest and most diverse civil and human rights coalition, with nearly 200 member organizations 14 15 16 17 18 working to build an America as good as its ideals. 19 I'm also the Joseph Rowe professor of 20 public interest law at the University of the 21 District of Columbia. Now, the leadership conference strongly 22 0095 believes in the value and power of the free market of ideas. We also believe that the health of our nation's democracy depends on the continued 3 existence of a diversity of viewpoints in the public 5 domai n. 6 But today instead of local ownership 7 with a diversity of view, we now have homogenized 8 cookie-cutter media divorced from local concerns. We believe that every American should be concerned about the loss of the independent journalistic voices that have connected our nation, served our local communities and provided the foundation for 9 10 11 12 our democracies. If a company can buy a wide 13 variety of media in the same community, it 14 15 essentially provides one voice, not many. This means less diversity of viewpoint. 16 17 If racial and ethnic minorities, people of color, women, older Americans and persons with disabilities 18 19 are not employed at news operations at all levels of management, there are few who can speak with 20 authority about their condition in the community. 21 22 This means less or less complete 0096 coverage of issues that are important to them. 2 3 Issues like economic inclusion, the struggle for quality public education, immigration reform and the 4 5 prevention of violent hate crime. And if there isn't local integration in the management of local news operations, issues important to local communities can be ignored. This means the public 6 7 This means the public 8 9 interest isn't being served. Now in June of this year the Leadership 10 conference sponsored a Web-based national town half meeting with on-the-ground locations in both Washington, D.C., and Denver, Colorado, on the 11 12 13 importance of diversity in media ownership. surprisingly the program was called why media 14 15 diversity matters. Video from our June event which featured author, commentator and talk show host Tavist 16 17 18 Smiley, Denver Mayor John Hickenluper and your own 19 FCC Commissioner, Michael Copps, can be viewed at Page 35

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 our Website at www. Civilrights.org and we have 21 brought DVDs of the event for submission to the Commission. If I had known, I perhaps would have 22 0097 shown them, but in the interest of time, let's move 2 3 Now we believe that media diversity, very straightforwardly, is a civil rights issue. 5 Media diversity is a civil rights issue and we felt 6 7 it was important to highlight the issue for the nation because of what is really at stake, nothing less than equal opportunity in the public domain and equal access to important local and national 8 9 10 information and resources. The unanimous conclusion of participants in our program was that while hearings like this are important, the FCC is doing an inadequate job of 11 12 13 14 identifying and working to eliminate the barriers of 15 participation of women and people of color in radio Now the 21st century is rapidly 16 and television. becoming the age of big media and as consolidation grows, localism suffers and diversity dwindles.

Local ownership of broadcast outlets means better coverage for the communities they serve 17 18 19 20 and yet even in our nation's Capitol, it is 21 difficult to find newspaper, television and radio 22 0098 content that accurately showcases the breadth and 2 3 diversity of our unique version of the American experi ence. 4 This is not a coincidence. Research by Free Press, which is here, of course they're here at the table, shows that Washington, D.C., media 5 6 7 ownership is heavily concentrated and predominantly 8 9 non-local. Two companies, News Corporation and NBC 10 GE, together control over half the television 11 revenues in Washington -- in the Washington, D.C., market. Only two of the areas 10 full power commercial TV stations are locally-owned and operated. Non-local owners control 63 percent of 12 13 14 15 the District's 44 commercial radio stations. 16 doesn't, of course, reflect the diversity of this popul ati on. 17 Now, like Commissioner McDowell, I'm a 18 19 Washington, D.C., native and I can tell you that 20 local news has not always been responsive, even to 21 important local issues with national dimension. 22 I remember when the nation's Capitol was 0099 a locally-segregated City and where the interests of African-Americans were largely ignored. And I valued your mention of WTOP and WMAL, I'm sorry that 3 4 I couldn't have interned at either of them, but I 5 think we all recognize the value of those 6 7 internships and I think we also recognize that those opportunities should be available to all segments of 8 our community 9 And so certainly these things have real 10 importance. Now in recent years the issue of voting rights in Congress for District residents has after 11 12 much time and effort finally moved from a peripheral 13 concern to an issue deemed worthy of coverage by

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 most local media outlets. Local media has recently 15 given the issue a validity and prominence that helped engage the citizens of Washington, D.C., 16 17 well as the national and international civil rights 18 communities. 19 But this is a rare exception and it came about after many years of protest, arguing that because the District was predominantly an 20 21 22 African-American City, there was largely no 0100 1 attention paid to the gross stain on American 2 democracy that denying residents of the nation's Capitol has for our own circumstance. So, we understand these, these, the allenges. We in the civil rights 5 important challenges. 6 community care about media ownership because the way 7 the public looks at issues, indeed whether the 8 public is even aware of issues like fair housing or 9 voting discrimination or D.C. voting rights, for 10 that matter, is directly related to the way these 11 issues are covered by the media. The way the media covers issues is directly related to who the reporters and producers and anchors are. Who is employed by the media is 12 13 14 directly related to who owns the media and who owns 15 the media is directly related to policies that 16 determine who gets a Federal license to operate and 17 18 who does not. 19 The battle over who controls the media 20 is a battle that the civil rights community has 21 fought for decades because we have long recognized 22 the critical role media plays in creating a more 0101 1 just and equitable society. We recognize that without the First 3 4 Amendment to the Constitution, there would have been no civil rights movement and we recognize had the visions of police dogs, hosers and people being beaten at the height of the modern civil rights movement had not been broadcast into the homes of 5 6 7 America, the transformation that we have come to 8 9 accept as the modern movement would not have 10 occurred. So what we're talking about today has 11 12 real consequence for real people in communities all over this country and we would join in those who 13 14 suggest there is no public interest to be served by loosening the rules of ownership to allow the kinds of concentrations that obviously have been 15 facilitated by the 1996 Telecom Act but could be 17 further facilitated by action taken through this 18 Commission. 19 20 We would urge you to think long and hard 21 and carefully before you make further changes that could erode the diversity of viewpoint that we have 22 0102 come to enjoy 1 2 Thank you very much. (Appl ause). 4 5 LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you, Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Isett. DAN ISETT:

6

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Page 37

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 Commissioners, I have the unenviable task of going into between Mr. Henderson and Reverend Jackson, but I'll attempt to do the best I can. My name is Dan Isett, I'm proud to represent the better than 1.2 million members of the Parents Television Council whose mission it is to protect children from sex, violence, and profanity in entertainment. On the surface there would seem to be little connection between our mission and the media ownership issues that bring us together here today, but indeed there is no question that the consolidation of media outlets has led to a coarsening of television content, a destruction of the concept of community standard of decency, and 0103 unresponsive, irresponsible news media that ignores news unfavorable to its parent corporation and a cable television industry that effectively functions as a cartel, forcing consumers and families to buy enormous amounts of unwanted programming just to get access to the family programming they actually want. Media consolidation has led to a self-serving news media that seeks to protect the interests of its corporate parent. The FCC has been empowered by Congress to uphold broadcast, decency standards on the public airwaves at the times when children are most likely to be in the audience and the Supreme Court has upheld Congress' right to do Unfortunately the broadcast networks have challenged the FCC's ability to enforce these standards and, as you know, even convinced two Federal Judges in New York City that they have the, quote, unquote, right to air the "F" and the "S" word at times of day when we know there to be tons word at times of day when we know there to be tens of millions of children in the audience. Although dozens of concerned family groups, including the 0104 PTC, as well as tens of thousands of concerned parents looked on with disgust that a Federal Court could reach such a preposterous conclusion, there has been only limited public outcry over that deci si on. The reason for that, in my opinion, is simple, in large measure, the American people don't know that it has happened. In the wake of that Court decision, not a single national broadcast news organization saw fit to cover it and even in a multitude of a 24-hour a day news on cable, there was near zero coverage of a decision that will directly impact every family in the country as well as the policies determining appropriate uses of airwaves that they, themselves, own.

There is one, there's only one conclusion that can be reached, that the corporate fuss divisions did not cover their parents -- their parent company's lawsuits to claim the absurd right to air profanity early in the day. In a more diverse, more localized media environment, companies are held to account for their 0105

9

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

20 21

22

2

3

5

6

7

8

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

Clearly in this case they've not been. actions. Page 38

FCC Hearing 10.31.07

Rather than take their public interest obligation seriously, the broadcast networks have exhibited a pattern of behavior that reflects a contempt for the owners of the very airwaves from which they profit.

On November 2004, Viacom, then the corporate parent of CBS Television Network, entered into a Consent Decree with the Commission wherein it admitted airing indecent material, paid a fine and committed itself to a detailed compliance plan to prevent the further airing of indecent material.

There was no evidence that that compliance plan was followed and just last week CBS meekly explained to the Commission that it had understood the Consent, the terms of the Consent Decree only applied to live programming.

Since it was CBS only -- own attorneys,

Since it was CBS only -- own attorneys, rather, who negotiated the terms of this contract and there's no such stipulation in it, it is preposterous and outrageous that CBS made this claim. If media conglomerates can't be trusted with

something as simple as making a good faith effort to prevent the airing of indecent material, then how can they be trusted to be good stewards of the public airwaves and then be given more access to them.

The proposed elimination of the newspaper duopoly rule threatens the important shake that media outlets have on each other, if a television station and a newspaper in a given market share ownership, it follows that they will share editorial outlook on policy. Even if they don't, how likely is it that a newspaper would criticize a local broadcaster for anything, much less a violation of community standards of decency if both entities are owned by the same company.

Much as networks have a choke-hold over the programming decisions of their affiliates, so, too, would an ownership group exercise editorial control over its media properties in the same market.

There has been much attention paid recently to the acquisition of the Wall Street

Journal by News Corporation but I'd like to illustrate another way in which media consolidation has an adverse affect on families.

The vast majority of cable programming is owned by a mere 6 major media conglomerates and all of these corporations force cable and satellite providers to carry all of their network offerings, if any are to be carried, a practice known as bundling.

Consequently, consumer choice in cable programming has remained illusive, despite FCC reporting last year, despite an FCC report last year that demonstrated that consumers could save as much as 13 percent if simply allowed to pick and choose their own channel lineups.

News Corporation recently launched the Fox business channel and through a similar bundled arrangement will leverage carriage of this network

Page 39

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 and demand a prescribed per subscriber fee into tens of millions of home, regardless of any market demand for a new network devoted exclusively to business

22 0108

5 6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18 19

20

21

22

2 3

5 6 7

8

9

10 11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

20

21

It is at once outrageous and ironic that a network devoted to the coverage of business would exploit a fundamentally anti-competitive business model to quarantee it will make a buck. However, that is exactly what happened and is happening every day with dozens of network that are free from competitive pressure and line the pockets of media conglomerates who force cable programmers to distribute their programming even while forcing consumers to pay for it.

At a mere 50 cents per subscriber per month for a network like the Fox business channel this will net News Corporation nearly a half billion dollars per year before a single cent of advertising is sold. And News Corp will be able to count on this revenue regardless of any would-be market

demand for its product.

This is only possible in a marketplace dominated by a few major players who through vertical and horizontal ownership integration game the system to extort ever more money from families who unwittingly line the pockets of the media

0109 gi ants. 1

> Continued media consolidation puts the corporate interest before the public interest and it is up to the FCC as the rightful upholder of the public interest to maintain a media ownership policy that benefits the public and not merely only those who exploit the media landscape for their own gain.

> The interest of the public, concerned parents and impressionable children, the very owners of the broadcast airwaves, must be paramount and it's time that responsibility and common decency once again became part of the media conglomerates I exi con.

> > Thank you very much.

(Appl ause).

LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you, Mr. Isett.

Reverend Jackson.

REV. JESSE JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission, I am honored to be here today to discuss the critical issue of media ownership.

For some of the millions of Americans

22 0110 1

that will never have a seat at this table, is I hope that our presence today it not a fig leaf to cover up a fact accomplished that we're heard and not tol erated.

11

12

Most Americans agree with what you've heard here today. The same people who want local control of school boards, want States rights in voting off costs to gain control of media which determines legal and State outcome. For too long media policies have made -- have laid behind closed This broken, corrupt process has led to too few own too much at the expense of too many.

Page 40

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 It's time to democratize our public 14 ai rwaves. We need to democratize the way the FCC 15 does business. It's not enough to give people a chance to speak. The FCC needs to listen and do 16 something to address our concerns.

The FCC should be serving people, of course, and not profit. If the FCC listened to the 17 18 19 public, it would be focused on improving media 20 21 diversity, not rushing toward consolidation. 22 Media diversity could not be more 0111 important. Media's a life or death issue for 1 communities of color across the country.
Representation is directly tied to ownership. Look no further than the Jena 6 to see the results. We agree with the concern that people of color own just 2 6 7 7 percent of the broadcast stations in the country, it's a disgrace you will level of inequality in one 8 of the most important arenas of our economy and our 9 democracy. 10 The City of Washington, people of color make up 72 percent of the population, but not a single TV station owned in D.C. is minority owned. If you want more diversity, consolidation is not the answer. Consolidation is the polar opposite of 11 12 13 14 di versi ty. You can't have both. Fewer owners mean 15 fewer opportunities. 16 17 If a giant company is able to purchase a station across the country, people of color already 18 victims of the long history of discriminatory practices, lending practices, now the mortgage (inaudible) crisis, are pushed off the field, often out of the picture. That's unacceptable and yet our 19 20 21 22 0112 Government has turned a blind eye for their case. I'd been concerned a few months ago 3 about statements made by Mr. I mus and the "B" word. We are damaging then the insult which (inaudible) 4 5 6 7 self-sufficient. He was on MSNBC 750 hours a year, on CBS Radio 1,040 hours a year, he was on more hours of day in a week and a year than all blacks, Latinos, Asians and women combined. It's 8 unacceptable, such a concentration of power. 9 We believe diversity crisis, it's still 10 not clear that the FCC is serious about addressing 11 12 Stopping media consolidation is the most 13 important way of help minority ownership. neglect around the community crisis are grave while the rest is good for local communities. 14 15 Let me say in a more rare specific situation, the Cirrus, XM merger issues. There 16 17 There are major concerns with its current proposed structure 18 19 of the Cirrus acquisition of XM satellite. 20 (inaudible) transition would result in the business 21 transaction of the two most significant largest companies in the satellite communications, in 22 0113 effect, this creates a monopoly. Competition in 2 this space would become virtually impossible. 3 Program menus is dangerously subject to the combined (inaudible) self-interest and whim. 5 This transaction as currently structured has the potential to weaken serious economic havoc Page 41

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 on any business attempting to become part of the 8 marketplace in the communities these businesses 9 The Bose transaction as currently represent. structured has the very real potential of eliminating diversity and opportunities for our minority participation in ownership. The Commission 10 11 12 must uphold the statute and regulations to contend 13 14 diversity and opportunist for ownership minor 15 ri ghts. As previously structured, it is a bad 16 deal. It's not in the public interest. Please hear 17 us, let we, the people, be proud of our airwaves. 18 19 Thank you very much. 20 (Appl ause) LOUIS SIGALOS: 21 Thank you, 22 Reverend Jackson. 0114 Mr. Schwartzman. ANDREW SCHWARTZMAN: Thank you. For 3 more than 30 years I've sat on panels such as this. During that time I've heard the testimony of scores 5 of talented, dedicated commercial broadcasters who have provided meaningful service to their local communities and few, if any, are more committed to 6 7 public service than my friend Jim Goodmon. My 8 testimony today is not about those broadcasters. 10 It is about the much larger number of 11 broadcasters who do little or nothing to address the problems, needs and interests of the community 12 they're required to serve. It's not about Channel 7 in San Diego, it's about the several television 13 14 stations in San Diego that have no local originating 15 capacity whatsoever and did absolutely nothing to 16 change their programming during the same time that 17 Channel 7 was taking, stepping up and taking care of 18 19 the job. 20 They are never invited to appear by the NAB or by the Commission. They are the ones who 21 should be called upon to explain why they lack any 22 0115 original local programming other than 2 advertisements. They should be asked how they merit 3 a free license for exclusive use of scarce, publicly-owned spectrum when they don't provide 5 something, anything designed to serve the public interest as opposed to their own private interests. 6 Indeed, although I hope this will soon change, as of now the Commission's policy is that 8 9 radio or TV stations carrying commercials or home shopping 24 hours a day are presumed to be operating 10 11 in the public interest. 12 Sadly, in the wake of the 1996 Telecommunications Act and the consequent growth of 13 14 large regional and national ownership groups, the 15 number of broadcasters like Jim Goodmon is diminishing and the number of mediocre broadcasters 16 17 is increasing 18 Now locally-originated news and public affairs is but one important measure of commitment 19 to local public service. There are about 1,400 full powered commercial TVs and another 5 or 600 20 21 Class As. According to the (inaudible) less than 22 0116

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 800 of those 2,000 television stations originate 2 3 newscasts. 2,000 minus 800 is 1,200. How can the Commission possibly make the statutorily mandated determination that those 1,200 stations are operated in the public interest? It's even worse with radio.

I notice the NAB had no presentation 4 5 6 7 about radio in San Diego, that's because the public service in San Diego is provided by KPBS, a 8 9 non-commercial broadcaster. Most of the local radio 10 stations in San Diego had to carry the KPBS feed because they had no capacity to assist their community during the time of emergency.

Thousands of stations do little or nothing and thousands of more outsourced their news gathering to a single company which carries essentially identical newscasts on scores of stations. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 One company alone, Metro Networks, which is owned by Viacom, itself a group owner, provides newscasts for more than 2,000 of the nation's radio 18 19 20 stations. Where is the diversity viewpoint in that? Technologies marketed with such names as 21 22 voice casting and central casting are used to cover 0117 up the fact that many broadcasters export 2 3 programming into local stations rather than create Such stations are run by senior it by site. management and program executives located hundreds 5 or thousands of miles away. This would be a much more useful hearing if the Commission were to invite 6 7 or, if necessary, compel the testimony of those 8 licensees. How and why do these stations get their licenses renewed. It can't be because they carry public service announcements when they can't sell 9 10 11 12 the air time, or maybe it can, I'd like to know. would millions of American citizens. After all, 13 14 protection of their rights to receive information is 15 and ought to be the primary goal of the Commission's 16 regulatory system. What should the Commission do about 17 this. Unless the Commission has answers for these questions, it cannot complete this localism inquiry 18 19 20 and these are matters the Commission ought to 21 address before and not after it contemplates further relaxation of its broadcast ownership rules. 0118 That having been said, here's a list of things the Commission could do to start fixing the problem. First, develop a meaningful and much more transparent license renewal process based on much 5 more detailed information about broadcasters actual program practices. That order is on the 8th floor 6 7 8 and it's, ought to be voted on, you know who you are. 9 Reduce the term of broadcast licenses to 10 three years. Require every single licensee to carry 11 minimum amounts of locally-originated 12 licensee-produced programming designed to address local needs, tastes and interests. Expand the 13 number and range of low power FM stations, and 14

develop meaningful programs to develop -- to double

the number of minority. And female-owned broadcast

stations within the next five years.

15

16

17

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 Now one last point, very special 19 emphasis, much of my presentation thus far has 20 focused on increasing the amount of programming 21 which is responsive to local needs and tastes. 22 But not everything important can be 0119 1 measured. Effective local service requires 2 institutional and personal attachments to the It requires a diverse work force that is community. capable of conveying the many different perspectives 5 found in each community. There is no way to 6 7 document the qualitative impact of having a station operated locally by individual citizens who live in the community and expect to remain there.

Finally, the intensity of the public's 8 9 10 concern about how broadcasters serve their community 11 is something the Commission should not and in 12 practice cannot ignore. Despite obvious attempts to 13 minimize public attendance at events such as this, 14 thousands of Americans have shown up to tell you how 15 much they care. Please don't ignore them. (Appl ause) LOUIS SIGALOS: 16 17 Thank you, 18 Mr. Schwartzman. 19 Mr. Sterling. 20 CHRISTOPHER STERLING: As is evidenced 21 by the people in this room and the people outside 22 the building, this is clearly a very healthy process 0120 and a useful function. 1 I want to make three points very briefly this morning. First, I think it's fascinating and telling that localism issues are of long-standing 3 4 5 concern. 6 7 Localism was among the oldest of the goals of radio policy dating all the way back to the 8 Department of Commerce in the 1920s. The FCC single 9 market duopoly ownership provisions date at least to the 1930s and were intended primarily to promote local service. Cross-ownership limits, also designed to strengthen localism, have been debated 10 11 12 at least as long. Newspapers dominated. 13 example, the earliest FM license applications in 14 15 1941 prompted a three-year FCC investigation, though 16 the present rule is only just over three decades 17 ol d. 18 Station licensing and the renewal 19 process remains central to promoting and encouraging localism until both were undone for radio by the 20 21 1996 Act and loosened for television in the years 22 si nce. 0121 Despite all of this de-regulation, FCC 2 3 Commissioners and staff continually speak of localism as a core mission, a concern of what is now 4 a dramatically different industry.
We've heard lots of examples this 5 morning of where localism stands in 2007. That 6 7 brings me to my second basic point. 8 That is, we have plenty of local 9 We have far too few voices. We've enjoyed 10 a steady increase in channels or outlets from which 11 My students are amazed that I grew up in Page 44

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 12 Madison, Wisconsin, a town that then had only four 13 television stations. How could I possibly have 14 survived that and not been scarred for life. But the plethora of options that we have today too often add little real diversity in either content or points of view and provide limited local 15 16 17 programming, let alone news or public affairs or even much of what former Commissioner Lee Levinger 18 19 called the reflection or projection of their local 20 communities. 21 22 Too often if a new medium does offer a 0122 localism potential, such as the drop-in FM channels of two decades ago or low powered FM which we've already heard a good deal about this morning, 3 4 5 6 7 they're often cut off at the knees by the broadcasting establishment, including, surprisingly, public radio pleading concerns about interference. At the same time we've seen a steady 8 decline in the number of media voices or separate 9 owners, thanks largely to consolidation. One reason has been the demise of the Commission's own once 10 very close adherence to its duopoly policy of one station of each type to a customer in a given 11 12 13 market. 14 Another is the growing reliance by both Congress and the FCC on marketplace competition in 15 16 place of the former public service emphasis of many structural or behavioral broadcast rules and thus 17 the electronic media, both legacy broadcasting and the newer cable satellite. And other services are now largely all about national content and national programming and appeal. 18 19 20 21 22 Consolidation of outlets and national 0123 program production has nearly eliminated any local 2 or regional originality. 3 Point number three, can broadcast 4 5 localism be revived? Yes, but we have to provide more than lip service to localism as a core mission, to use former Chairman Powell's words, along with 6 7 diversity and competition policy 8 I've got several quick suggestions, though others have suggested them before. First, 9 10 consider taking commercial broadcasters off the 11 public affairs hook entirely, while at the same time assisting public radio and television stations to do 12 13 that job. 14 Create a public affairs trust, an annual 15 assessment on commercial stations to support public affairs programming on public stations. This would include news, local political coverage, programming 16 17 about local public controversy. CPB might be the 18 19 intermediary to make this work. In turn, commercial stations could drop any or all remaining local 20 21 public service programming, those that still supply 22 They might even be given as a new book any. 0124 suggests a permanent license as they nearly have one already, removable only for good cause.

Second, if the idea of commercial 2

stations helping to fund such programs on public stations has no appeal, then revisit proposals for a Page 45

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 public affairs programming requirement on digital 7 radio and especially digital television channels. 8 Third, as digital radio becomes more 9 widespread, consider requiring one of its side 10 channels be devoted to local, community and public 11 affairs content. 12 And fourth, as already noted by others on this panel, something needs to be done to 13 14 increase minority, female and small business 15 participation in station ownership. 16 Finally, notice broadcasters, 17 themselves, are promoting radio as a local service in face of competing national programmed options, 18 19 even the marketplace professes potential value in 20 broadcast localism, whether actual programming 21 reflects that or not. 22 Building on all of this, the FCC should 0125 1 strive for viable mechanisms to make localism real 2 3 4 5 agai n. Thank you. LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you, Mr. Sterling. Mr. Turner. S. DEREK TURNER: Gentlemen, 6 7 Commissioners, my name is Derek Turner and I'm a 8 research director for Free Press, a public interest 9 organization dedicated to public education and 10 consumer advocacy on communications policy At the center of this proceeding lies 11 the basic question, how do FCC rules further the goals of localism, competition and diversity. The 12 13 record in this proceeding is clear. Media consolidation has been a disaster for localism 14 15 16 precisely because increased concentration of ownership is a disaster for competition and 17 18 diversity gutting the few remaining rules is clearly 19 not in the public interest. 20 Now how do we know this? Because the Commission's own data tells us. The Commission's 21 22 latest research was born in a biased environment. 0126 The FCC's former chief economist started by asking 1 the question how can the FCC, quote, approach 2 3 4 relaxing newspaper broadcasts cost ownership restrictions, end quote. 5 Now despite this shaky framework, the 6 7 underlying data produced from this research does have value. Using this data and implementing the substantive critiques of the peer reviewers, we find that, one, though the Commission has claimed that 8 9 10 cross-owned stations do more local news, the FCC's 11 own data reveal that markets with cross-owned stations produced less total minutes of local news, 12 13 a result that is even more pronounced in smaller 14 markets. 15 Two, higher levels of local ownership lead to more legal news at the market level. and this is very important, increasing market 16 17 concentration decreases the production of local news 18 at the market level. That's a very strong effect. 19 20 Four, locally-owned so-called big four 21 affiliates produce more local news than their 22 non-locally-owned counterparts.

Five, cross-owned stations aired less hard local news in the days leading up to the 2006 local elections.

Now given these results, what possible reason would you have for dismantling these important ownership rules. The industry groups will tell you that they need to gut these rules because their businesses are in poverty, that the Internet has changed everything. This is simply untrue.

The Commission's own data indicates that outside of the very largest markets there is no financial benefit from the creation of cross-owned duopoly combinations.

As far as the Internet changing everything, I wish it were true, but it's not. Overwhelmingly broadcast television and newspapers continue to be the most relied upon sources of local news. This is because they are really the only entities in local communities that actually produce local news.

Only a small percentage of the public uses the Internet as their primary source for local  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) +$ 

news and those that do are visiting the Websites of their local broadcasters and newspapers.

Now over the long-term the Internet does present a challenge to the current business models of the traditional media companies, but it also presents an opportunity. There will always be a market for local news and broadcasters and newspapers are the company's best suited to meet that demand.

There's no evidence to suggest that consolidation is the answer to the challenges that traditional media may face. In fact, history suggests that consolidation will hurt these companies in the long run.

When companies consolidate, they cut newsroom staffing budgets which devastates local journalism and turns away their local customers.

Now, let's turn to the critical issue of

female and minority ownership. Here the record is quite clear, increased media consolidation will result in fewer stations owned by women and people of color. This is because these owners are more

likely to own just a single station and are more likely to be local owners, the precise characteristics of station owners who are most vulnerable to the pressures of media consolidation.

Now we know this because my organization, Free Press, actually did the hard work of assessing the race, ethnicity and gender of the owners of our nation's broadcast stations. However, in the Commission's most recent effort to count female minority-owned stations, it failed miserably.

female minority-owned stations, it failed miserably.

Study two missed 67 percent of all
minority-owned TV stations and a whopping 75 percent
of the TV stations owned by women. This record
(inaudible) is pervasive throughout most of the
10 studies.

For example, study one, the taxpayer Page 47

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 17 funded survey of peoples media habits neglected to include in its demographic question a category for 18 19 That's right, our nation's largest and fastest growing minority group simply forgotten.

The Communications Act established this
Commission to serve the public interest. You can 20 21 22 0130 1 have proceedings and hold hearings like these in order to get you the evidence that you need to make 3 4 decisions that actually do serve the public interest. You have a duty to pay attention to the 5 record and to the people. You are faced with a choice, you can listen to the concerns of Wall Street or you can listen to the concerns of Main Street. The public 6 7 8 is tired of these companies using our airwaves as 9 10 their personal ATMs. They want you to say no to 11 more consolidation and say yes to local 12 accountability, yes to diversity and ownership and yes to the public interests. 13 14 Commissioners, for the sake of our great 15 nation's democracy, I hope you're listening. Thank you. (Appl ause) 16 17 LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you, Mr. Turner. 18 19 Mr. Cooper. MARK COOPER: 20 Thank you. Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Derek told you what you did not do. I'm going to talk about what you should 21 22 0131 do and what the broadcast and localism initiative 2 will do. The broadcast localism initiative was, 4 5 6 7 in fact, an important policy shift at the FCC. Under its auspices the public filed comments and came to hearings like this for a couple of years. The Media Bureau developed a firm theoretical 8 framework for explaining why more than simple economics is needed to promote localism in the public interest. It explored a rich, multifaceted definition of localism and began to conduct research 9 10 11 that would evaluate localism in an honest and 12 13 straightforward way. 14 Unfortunately, despite the fanfare of an 15 initiative that was, quote, to play a critical role in gathering empirical data and grass-roots 16 17 information on localism, the initiative simply disappeared from the recent research studies.

It was supposed to inform the 18 19 Commission's thinking about media policy. Its finding should have been presented to the public and 20 21 the Commission in an independent report that could 22 0132 be considered as we crafted our media policy going 2 3 It should not disappear into a thousand footnotes in a final order on media ownership. If the Commission were to give the broadcast localism initiative its due, it would find 4 5 6 7 that the challenges to localism are great and relaxing ownership limits will make it harder to 8 achieve the goal of a broadcast media that is truly responsive to the needs of the public. 10 That is what the initiative was finding Page 48

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 11 before it was disappeared. 12 It identified a half dozen specific economic, social and political factors that indicate 13 market forces alone will not produce adequate localism in the broadcast media to serve societies needs. The Media Bureau identified three broad 14 15 16 17 categories of concern. The notice of inquiry had nine major areas of concern. Combining these, we 18 19 find 24 specific localism issues across five 20 categori es. 21 The list is worth reading because it was 22 simply ignored in the 10 studies that the Commission 0133 actually conducted. 2 Under coverage of local affairs we find 3 community news, including police, traffic, weather and sports, emergencies and events, education about 4 5 6 7 local institutions, local religious affairs, local advertising and PSAs, we hear a lot about PSAs. Under sensitivity to local taste we find 8 9 what do listeners want, how to avoid offense to community values, how do we tailor programming to 10 local tastes. 11 Under opportunity for local involvement 12 we find local ownership and control, use of local resources, working in the industry, 13 14 locally-originated programming and outlets for local 15 tal ent. We hear none of that in these studies. Under facilitation of local political 16 17 discourse, we find public affairs programming, local public affairs programming, expression of group interests, community political and religious group discussions, local political viewpoints expressed, 18 19 20 local call-in and talk shows, public access and 21 22 edi tori al i zi ng. 0134 1 Under competition issues, we have a few 2 of critical importance, pay lists, payola affiliates

and children's programming.

Each of these issues must be considered from both the localism point of view and the point of view of minorities. Thus, a parallel set of minority or underserved communities, as the notice of inquiry said, would include the following, is there minority-targeted programming and minority-originated programming that is sensitive to local minority interests.

Does the media provide opportunities for minority ownership and control of outlets, minority employment in the media, use of minority talent, minority group expression and representation of minority group issues in a fair and balanced manner.

Almost none of these issues were addressed in the recent round of research. Until the Commission provides a detailed analysis of the impact of ownership limits on localism and diversity and gives the public and policymakers ample time to consider these findings, it should not issue a final

rule on media ownership.

4 5

6

78

ŏ

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

Simply rolling all of this into one humongous order would do a disservice to the good and hard work that went into the localism initiative Page 49

```
FCC Hearing 10.31.07
     and put us back at square one, with an order that
 6
     does not reflect the policy goals of promoting
     localism and diversity in the media.

You simply cannot solve the deficit of localism and diversity without addressing and reversing its decline at the core of the broadcast
 7
 8
 9
10
     industry in order to promote the localism and
11
     diversity in the media.
12
13
                   Thank you.
                   (Appl ause).
LOUIS SIGALOS:
14
15
                                     Thank you, Mr. Cooper.
                   KEVIN MARTIN: I think a few
16
17
     Commissioners have questions.
                   Commissioner Copps.
MICHAEL COPPS: Yeah, thank you
18
19
20
     everybody for very informative and helpful and often
     el oquent statements.
21
22
                   I just want to key in very quickly on
0136
     something Mr. Turner said because I think you may
 1
     have really dropped a bombshell here with regard to
     the interests in newspaper broadcasts
 4
     cross-ownership.
 5
                   Am I understanding you correctly to say
     that your data shows that in those markets where
 6
     there is newspaper broadcast cross-ownership, that
 7
 8
     there is actually less local news?
 9
                   S. DĚREK TURNER:
                                       Well that's -- I --
10
                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hold on, I'm
11
     sorry, I think you said it wasn't your data, it was
12
     our data?
                   S. DEREK TURNER: That's right.
13
     of the 10 studies did deal with this issue, however
14
15
     none of them asked the appropriate question of what
     happens to news at the market level because simple
16
17
     economic theory predicts that a cross-owned station
18
     may be able to take advantage of its synergies,
     which will discourage our stations from actually
19
20
     producing local news, so not only do you have a
21
     lapse of a unique local voice, now you're pushing
22
     the other owners away from doing local news, so we
0137
     actually aggregated your data up to the market level
 1
 2
     and applied the methodologies that were used across
 3
     all the studies. So it's not that we're tinkering
     with the data, and it's very clear what it shows,
 5
     that you do see a negative effect at the market
 6
7
     Level.
                   MICHAEL COPPS: Fine, thank you. JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: I just wanted to
 8
     observe that Henry Shelton from the NAACP couldn't be here but I'd like to ask that his testimony be
 9
10
     submitted for the record.
11
12
                   KEVIN MARTIN:
                                    Oh, of course, of course.
                   JONATHAN ADELSTEIN:
13
                                          There's no
14
     objection to that?
                   KEVIN MARTIN: I've got a, go ahead.
JONATHAN ADELSTEIN: I just wanted to
15
16
17
     thank you, I thought that was quite profound, myself
     that, in fact, in cross-owned communities, that
18
     there's actually less news and that comes from our
19
20
     data.
21
                   So you think that's because of the, the
                                            Page 50
```

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 effect in the marketplace of that, sort of as a 0138 dominant new news source that other stations can't 1 get a hold or just give up on local news entirely?

S. DEREK TURNER: Well that's correct,
mean as you can easily imagine the situation where
now most news stations sort of take their cue from 4 5 6 7 the daily newspaper, they open it up, they read what's in there. 8 With a cross-owned situation, you may 9 find that they're only giving their reporters access to the station they own. All the other stations are 10 sort of cut off from talking to the other reporters 11 from getting inside scoops and so they throw up their hands in the air and say, well, I guess we'll 12 13 14 just do more syndicated programming because we can 15 no longer compete adequately, so, that's the affect 16 that we're seeing KEVIŇ MARTIN: Mark, you look like --MARK COOPER: There's actually other 17 18 19 data in the record, an academic study which looked 20 at what happens when the New York Times moves into a local community and what they found in that study, it's one of the reviewers actually of the peer 21 22 0139 reviewers, Lisa George is the principal author, 1 George Wolfolk is the second author. 3 What they found is that that newspaper 4 grabs a certain segment of the audience that moves 5 away from the local newspaper and the local newspaper's re-orient themselves away from a certain type of coverage and the fascinating thing was that they found that electoral turn out, which is the 6 7 8 bottom line of democracy, went down in local 9 10 elections because the newspapers have moved away 11 from a specific type of news and lost that audience, 12 but was unaffected in national elections which of 13 course is what the New York Times is serving. So there's good solid evidence that of 14 this, what you should call a crowding out effect is 15 when you get a dominant entity in this, in a marketplace, it crowds out the others and none of 16 17 18 the -- interestingly, one of the radio studies asked that question, but none of the TV studies actually 19 20 looked at the effect at the market level, which is 21 what the public policy is about. KEVIN MARTIN: So, Derek, I just want to 22 0140 make sure I understand your point, I mean I think I do, but what you're saying is that so even when a cross-owned station in a market produces more, even if they produce more local news, in the whole market 5 6 7 itself when you look at everyone else, they're actually doing less on their local news because of the impact of what that cross-ownership is, is that what, I think that's what you said. S. DEREK TURNER: That' 8 9 That's the net effect

and you have to realize that we're talking sort of econometrics here so we're controlling for everything under the sun and trying to actually isolate the effect of cross-ownership. And I would not actually concede that the cross-owned stations do more local news because the one study that

Page 51

10 11 12

13

14

15

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 actually looked at it, the only effect they really found was during the lead up to the election they 17 18 may have been doing slightly more sports and 19 weather, but not political coverage. KEVIN MARTIN: What I was saying, though, even if you assume they did, that wasn't, the whole market was still harmed is what I was 20 21 22 0141 saying, so even, whether, whether the other study 1 2 3 showed that or not, that's what I think your point 4 S. DEREK TURNER: Right. KEVIN MARTIN: You, I had a couple other quick follow-ups, you also said that outside of the very largest markets there's no benefit on the duopoly issue, can you tell me what you mean by very largest, what is very largest to you?

S. DEREK TURNER: Well when you, so we 5 6 7 8 9 10 had data on financial, data for financials for every single station in all the nation's 210 markets, you 11 12 do see a positive effect when the New York DMA is 13 included and the Los Angeles DMA is included. You do see a positive effect on the revenues of duopoly stations and cross-owned stations. 14 15 16 However, if you exclude those from the analysis, you see no effect and, in fact, if you 17 18 look specifically at markets that are, have very few 19 20 voices, you actually start to see a negative effect on the bottom duopoly station. 21 KEVIN MARTIN: Sure, I wanted to, in 22 0142 light of following, in light of that answer about the very largest stations, New York and LA, for example, actually I wanted to ask Reverend Jackson 3 4 5 because we were talking about this right before we started and actually Bob Edwards I think you 6 mentioned even the impact on Chicago, could you all tell me, do you think that there's any difference 8 that we should be making between the largest markets ĕ and when we're talking about cross-ownership issues 10 or ownership issues.
So do you think that there's still a 11 12 problem with cross-ownership in large markets like Los Angeles? Reverend Jackson or Bob Edwards, you 13 14 were talking about Chicago and the negative impact 15 that happened there. REV. JESSE JACKSON: Of course it is. 16 17 We, we live in a pleasuristic democracy. The reason I ask and I hope you consider it even now, independent bipartisan minority ownership task force 18 19 so that you can pull all of this together and kind 20 of hear us collectively, come up with some plan is 21 22 that the cross-ownership monopoly lends us -- you 0143 know, there are so many good journalists who have now been reduced to PR workers for a corporation. 2 They can't get a job, they're locked out. Voices are locked out. Many of the largest 3 4 5 (inaudible) majority are black and Latino. That's the (inaudible) back to reality of our nation and 6 7 there must be some consideration in the marketplace 8 of that diversity. You know, they're fighting a war right

Page 52

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 10 now in Iraq. You know (inaudible) have more Sheite 11 concentrated ownership at the expense of 12 (i naudi bl e). Reason for democracy means some shared participation, that Sheites and Kurds should own access to (inaudible) constitutional positions because you just can't (inaudible) monopolizing everything by ethnicity or by, shared by money and 13 14 15 16 17 18 power. So let's take a lesson from our own 19 (inaudible) by the (inaudible) for democracy. 20 KÉVIN MARTIN: So, and I just wanted to make sure, so you, like you said, you think that's the same even in those largest markets, there's no 21 22 0144 distinction that we should be making and that we 1 may, we end up doing is even for those big places? REV. JESSE JACKSON: I guess the real bottom line remains that too few people, whether New York, Chicago, LA (inaudible) part of controls or radio, TV and newspaper, their own publishers who 5 6 7 affect editors who affect writers who affect 8 assignments who affect outcomes, that's absolute 9 control. 10 Let me give you, just an example of what happened this past week. There was a lot of 11 excitement because a young man, Genaldo Wilson, had 12 13 been set free in Georgia, a kind of jaded justice and it finally became nationally permanent. On the same day a reporter in Seattle, Washington, in 1944, 14 15 there was a fight on the, at the Lorton Military Base and, let's just say it was a riot, and a young Italian (inaudible) deputy was killed, some said killed, some say committed suicide, but the (inaudible) Watergate fame had all the black 16 17 18 19 20 21 soldiers condemned, court marshalled, jailed and 22 gi ven di shonorable di scharges. They were wiped out, 0145 came out in last Sunday's New York Times newspaper.
It came out that Mr. Watson withheld
information, much like they did in north (inaudible) 1 a few months ago, but the outcome is these men lived six years without their honorable discharge, most of 4 5 them died, except one, Mr. Sam (inaudible) is alive, he's 83 years old, I recall he said, you know, we 6 7 8 never did it. I was not even on the scene. 9 start crying on the phone. I called several military executives about this story who says it's 10 old news, what's, what's the deal there. They're dead and he's old and (inaudible) was a hero, (inaudible) there was no news in connecting with 11 They' re 12 13 having those (inaudible) soldiers in the American war in '44 to (inaudible) jaded justice. 14 15 Well that may not have been of interest 16 to a handful of people in New York, but the last 17 seven Americans, our honor is at stake, our 18 Patriotism is at stake, yet it's not been on TV yet, not a one. (Inaudible) there's nothing New York 19 20 21 Times Sunday morning headlines, not on one TV 22 station yet. 0146 KEVIN MARTIN: Andy, I had one quick 1 question for you, did you, did you actually say, I just want to make sure I heard you that the Page 53

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 commercial radio stations in San Diego were having 5 to carry the non-commercial feed because they didn't have anything local for their news there? I mean I thought that's what you said.

ANDREW SCHWARTZMAN: Yes, the principal 6 7 ANDREW SĆHWARTZMAN: Yes, the principal radio service in San Diego during the emergency was 8 9 10 KPBS. There's almost no local origination capacity in the market. 11 12 KEVIN MARTIN: Yes. Unless there was, unless there was anything else, I think that we were 13 14 going to, again, thank all the panelists for 15 participating today and open up, open up the public 16 comment. (Applause)
REV. JESSE JACKSON: Will you still 17 18 19 consider our appeal for the independent minority 20 ownership panel? 21 KEVIN MARTIN: What's that? 22 REV. JESSE JACKSON: I'd like you to 0147 consider, I'd like you to consider the independent minority, proposed independent minority owned, 1 minority panel ownership. KEVIN MARTIN: You know, yes, and we'll continue to said, what I've said all along is I 4 5 6 7 actually, I don't have any problem with any kind of panel to be able to make recommendations to the 8 Commission, although I don't think that should stop us from proceeding on issues that we have in front of us, whether it's on issues that can end up 9 10 helping on some of the localism issues, whether it's 11 on issues related to changes to low powered FM or potentially on some of the ownership issues, so that I think we're still debating among the 12 13 14 15 Commissioners 16 REV. JESSE JACKSON: Yeah, I'm saying how quickly we pull together to support it and then if it is, if it's doing this work, it did have it 17 18 completed when this comes back with this report and will you address it in a meaningful way?

KEVIN MARTIN: Oh, I think that we would always, yes, I think we would address it in a 19 20 21 22 0148 1 meaningful way. I think so. REV. JESSE JACKSON: How quickly will 3 you do that? I'm asking, I'm trying, the Commission needs to be at work pretty quickly and then get back to you before we shouldn't be meeting, if you will, and then a conclusion reached while we're still, while it's still outstanding. 4 5 6 7 KEVIN MARTIN: 8 Well I think that the, I don't think that necessarily any groups that want to 9 make any recommendations can end up preventing the 10 11 Commission from moving forward as it ends up seeing fit on a variety of issues, but I think that we would always end up taking serious action, taking 12 13 serious action and take seriously the 14 recommendations that would end up coming in, so.

But the, but, again, I think I appreciate everyone's participation and I think that 15 16 17 we do need to open it up to public comment for a few 18 19 hours. 20 Thank you.

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you very much, fellows. 22 0149 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me, Mr. Martin, who picked the panel and why were there so few women? Where were all the women on the 4 panel, sir? LOUIS SIGALOS: The public comment 5 6 period will open in just a moment. I will remind 7 everyone and I want to tell everyone as we 8 transition to the public comment period, I need to 9 recognize a few representatives of organizations that we would have liked to have included on the panel but due to space and time limitations, we 10 11 12 could not. 13 Just as for all members of the audience 14 who have signed up to speak to the Commissioners, each of these individuals will be limited to two 15 16 mi nutes. 17 After the transition a little bit here, 18 we'll get started with a few of these special 19 speakers and then join, begin the public comment 20 list. Would everyone please be seated at this 21 22 time. We want to begin with the public comment 0150 Again, due to time and space limitations on the panel, there was a few people we'd like to recognize initially before we begin with the public 2 3 commentors, those people are Joe Torrez who was to be speaking on behalf of the National Hispanic Media Coalition, George Tedesci with the International Brotherhood of Teaminists Media 4 5 6 7 8 Alliance for Community Media. 9 These people, if you would step forward, 10 will have two minutes each. 11 I'd like to have everybody notice we do 12 have a timer clock there that I'll be strictly enforcing the time limit on the speakers at this point, so I would request that Joe Torrez. 13 14 Mr. Torrez, thank you. JOE TORREZ: 15 16 Good afternoon, my name is Joe Torrez, Government relations manager for Free 17 Press, and I read this statement on behalf of the 18 National Hispanic Media Coalition. 19 20 The National Hispanic Media Coalition, a 21-year-old non-profit Latino civil rights media 21 22 advocacy organization based in Los Angeles, 0151 California, whose goals include increasing Latino 1 2 ownership in the media. 3 Today the FCC is discussing the issue of 4 5 For the National Hispanic Media localism. Coalition, the issue is the lack of minority media 6 It is an outrage that FCC Chairman Kevin ownershi p. Martin reportedly seeks a vote in December on eliminating the media ownership limits when the FCC is unable to accurately assess the true state of female and minority broadcast ownership. 8 9 10 In its entire history, the FCC has 11 never accurately kept track of women and minority 12 broadcast ownership, even the most recent studies in 13 July failed to count this important data. 14 In fact, Page 55

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 commentors hired by the Commission to study the problem were unable to do so because the data 16 17 provided to them was, quote, useless. 18 Without minority and women ownership data, it is impossible to have an adequate understanding of how different policies governing 19 20 media ownership in general would impact minority 21 ownership specifically. 22 0152 We do, however, have some data regarding 2 3 minority and women ownership thanks to our media ally Free Press. They are as equally concerned about the lack of diversity and ownership in the 5 media. 6 Two important studies from Free Press, Out of The Picture and Off the Dial, is to 7 8 demonstrate the, illustrate the alarming state of 9 female and minority ownership, the alarming state of 10 female minority ownership. In respect to the Latino community, the 11 first study finds that only 1.1 percent of all full powered commercial television stations are owned by 12 13 Latinos. The second report on radio documents that Latinos own just 2.9 percent of full power 14 15 16 commercial radio stations. These statistics are 17 unacceptable. 18 Both studies confirm that relaxing the 19 ownership rules will cause a further decline in female minority ownership. How far do we have to obefore the FCC stops neglecting the issue of minority, of the -- neglecting the media diversity 20 How far do we have to go 21 22 0153 1 cri si s? 2 We join FCC Commissioner Jonathan 3 4 5 6 7 Adelstein who has called for an independent non-partisan task force to address the minority media crisis LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you. JOE TORREZ: But basically he has called for an independent task force and not to move forward with the rules until the work of the task 8 9 10 force is completed. Thank you. LOUIS SIGALOS: 11 12 Thank you, Mr. Torrez. 13 Go ahead, please. GEORGE TEDESCI: 14 Good morning, I am George Tedesci, I am vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and president of the Union's graphic communications conference representing 60,000 employees, 2,000 are tribune workers in Chicago, New York, Baltimore and LA. 15 16 17 18 19 The Teamsters have submitted comments to 20 the FCC about our localism and diversity concerns. 21 22 I am here today to urge the FCC to not be too quick 0154 to grant the tribune application. This would 1 violate FCC rules and policies.
Section 310D of FCC rules forbids a broadcast licensee from giving third parties control over stations, personnel, programming and finances. 4 5 The owners of a station must be the ones who have ultimate management responsibilities. The tribune's Zell's transactions calls Page 56

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 these rules into question. Sam Zell clearly would 10 control the tribune as Chairman of the Board, but 11 would not be an owner. The trust establishment for the benefit of Zell's family would hold notes and warrants, but neither Zell nor his family's trust would be owners of the tribune stock. The real 12 13 14 owners of the tribune company would be the tribune's employees through an ESOP. The employees hold 100 15 16 17 percent of the tribune's stock, but as proposed, the employees will have no role in the selection of the 18 19 tribune's directors to establish company policy and appoint the officers who run the company and will have no opportunity or ability to select or replace 20 21 the tribune ESOP trustee who votes all the plan 22 0155 stock. 1 2 This separation of ownership and 3 management is unprecedented and would set a new, very low standard for compliance with the Act's 5 6 7 public interest requirements, which are for the localism and diversity principles in broadcasting. Thank you. 8 (Appl ause) 9 LOUIS SIGÁLOS: Thank you. Mr. Wassenaur. 10 MIKE WASSENAUR: 11 Good afternoon, 12 Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my name is Mike 13 Wassenaur, I'm the national chair of the Alliance 14 for Community Media and the executive director of the St. Paul Neighborhood Network in St. Paul, 15 16 Mi nnesota. 17 Localism lies at the heart of the work we do across the country. At community access television city, centers, we work with community 18 19 20 groups and independent producers that use our 21 training and production facilities and cable 22 channels to reflect the concerns of their community 0156 and to help educate their fellow citizens. 1 Most importantly for these hearings, they come to us because they have little or no access to significant community forums on local 3 4 5 broadcast outlets. 6 7 For example, in Minneapolis, St. Paul, there's a population of 60,000 Somali Americans who have made their community our community since being displaced by wars in East Africa. This is a 8 9 community with many significant educational and economic needs. Local access television has 10 11 responded to those needs by supporting
10 regularly-produced TV series on vocational
training, acculturated, health education and other
topics of vital importance to our entire community. 12 13 14 15 16 These programs provide approximately 20 hours of programming a week by, for and about the 17 Somali American community. 18 Just as significantly, local broadcast outlets have failed to address those information 19 20 needs of those citizens because the community is not 21 22 deemed to be a viable market. 0157 When they have made an effort as in the case of the laudable efforts of our local PBS Page 57

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 affiliate, they have relied ironically upon 4 producers and programming from community-accessed 5 television. This is one small example of why we believe that local needs are important, are in many ways unaddressed by local television.

Our concerns as we look at the future 6 8 landscape of media production and distribution in 9 10 the United States is that the significant remaining 11 local outlet, community access television will be 12 weakened or eliminated as a result of administrative rule-makings on franchising in many of the 13 localities around the United States. 14 This only heightens the need for significant action on your part to ensure that local television addresses more than the entertainment 15 16 17 needs of the people.

Thank you. 18 19 (Appl ause) 20 21 LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you. Okay, now it's time for the public 22 0158 1 comment portion of the program. Before I review the ground rules, would the following people please make your way to one of the two closest aisle microphones, there's one there 3 and there's one right there. Carolyn Byerly, Kevin 5 6 7 McCarron, James Coleman, Kate Blofson, Sarah Sieberberg, Dylan Wrynn, Bruce Levinson and Nedia 8 Benj ami n. Okay, the time limit is two minutes for each speaker. Please organize your thoughts so you can get your important points through within that time frame. Again, we have those two microphones set up, I've called a number of people just so that 10 11 12 13 we can move quickly from person to person.

Remember, we have the time clock there 14 15 and I'm going in the order that you registered and from time to time I'll let you know where we are on 16 17 18 that list. Having said all that, Carolyn Byerly. CAROLYN BYERLY: Thank you very much. 19 20 Chairman Martin, members of the Commission, I'm very 21 22 pleased to be here today. My name is Carolyn Byerly 0159 and I'm a member of the Howard University Department 2 of, School of Communications. I conduct research on women and minority ownership and on the ethnic 4 5 minority news audience, among other things.
Our nation has before it both a civil 6 7 rights and a women's rights crisis in media ownership. Our failed Federal communications policy 8 has enabled those with great wealth and power to buy and control more than 90 percent of our public 9 10 airwaves. These powerful owners have a narrow 11 demographic, they are nearly all male and they are 12 whi tě. 13 The predicament of gender and racial inequality in ownership is discriminatory on its 14 face. Let me share with you some of the effects at 15 the local level. In research that we conducted in Washington, D.C., last year, in a variety of 16 17 neighborhoods, residents told us that they believe 18 19 local television news ignores the things that they Page 58

most want to know about. 21 These things include neighborhood redevelopment, lack of jobs, lack of health care for 22 0160 themselves and their families and public safety. 2 They want to know about crime, yes, but they want to know why there is so much crime and they want to know what's being done about it and 3 4 5 6 7 they want more visibility for the things they know full well are going on in their neighborhoods to address it. 8 We also found that black radio listeners 9 prefer African-American controlled stations. They told us these stations, quote, know what's going on and, quote, tell me the truth. 10 11 12 My current research on women broadcast owners is still underway, but two early findings are 13 14 worth sharing with you today. First, women owners 15 emphasize that they are committed to providing local news, thus, we conclude that women's ownership 16 17 fulfills an essential local public interest. Second, women owners say that they strive to hire and mentor other women. We conclude that preserving women's ownership is vital to giving 18 19 20 other women entree into the industry. 21 Thank you very much. I strongly urge 22 0161 you not to further de-regulate this already 2 3 4 5 concentrated industry. (Appl ause) LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you. Kevin McCarron. 6 KEVIN McCARRON: I'm just, I'm not, I'm just representing myself, I'm here today on my own 7 8 9 Before I came down to D.C., I earned my time. graduate degree in economics up in New England after 10 a six-year stint in the service. 11 My graduate work in economics was to bring the fundamentals of democracy into the real  $\mathbf{m}$ 12 of economics and I want to talk briefly about 13 democracy in broadcasting. We all know if you studied political science that the founding fathers 14 15 16 sought to keep power in check in three ways, three fundamental ways, at least. 17 You know about the checks and balances, 18 19 or supposedly the paying between the three different branches of the Federal Government. 20 The second way 21 was to attempt to allow States some powers vis-a-vis the Federal, in the Federalist system and the third 0162 way was of course through the 10 amendments limiting the power of Government over the citizens, over our 2 3 4 ci ti zens. Well the prime and principal of limiting 5 power, keeping power in check also applies in 6 7 economics. This was at the founding of the academic discipline. Anybody with a degree with this knows 8 thi s. 9 Competition inherent in perfect, in perfectly competitive markets hopefully was designed 10 to hopefully prevent individual producers from 11 12 escaping the constraints of these free markets and, 13 thus, thereby commit social injustices.

Page 59

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 Now, this leads directly to

de-regulation of ownership. The de-regulation media consolidation threatens the design of free markets and allows broadcasting corporations to overcome a system of checks and balances in the economic realm, same principle. We need more regulation in media ownership, not less. The current consolidation ownership is bad for democracy and what's bad for democracy is bad for economics.

22 0163 1

2

5 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

3 4 5

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

0165

15

16 17

18 19 20

21

LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you.

James Coleman. JAMES COLEMAN: Good day to you all. Mν name is the Reverend Dr. James Coleman. l'm president of the Missionary Baptist Ministers Conference of Washington, D.C., Maryland, Virginia vicinity. And I wish to express sincere gratitude for the opportunity to share a clergy perspective on the matter of media ownership.

Respectfully, I must report that our organization cannot support media consolidation because such consolidation does not pass the theological or moral test required for social justice.

As pastors, we wish to note the fact that women, racial and ethnic minority groups and people with disabilities historically have been excluded from or wrongfully stereotyped in the media.

It is the church responsibility to make the case that God has supplied the airwaves as a gift to all human kind. He requires of us to be

good stewards over the airwaves and ensure that media reflect in a balanced fashion the views, opinion and ethnic values of all segments of soci ety.

As the media systems have increased in size over the last few years, media owners have become more powerful with the potential for good as well as evil. Our society has become dependent on media owners to supply needed information in an honest, accurate and reliable manner.

However, growing concern is that news reports are no longer reliable, no longer honest and it seems news reports have become more entertainment than serious reporting. Seemingly some newscasts sent all across the nation spotlight controversial and embarrassing circumstances people have participated in.

The personal issue and event is foreign to what's going on in our particular locality. News stories of local communities and our community are often overlooked for the more sensational entertaining scripts as we pastors attempt to

address the sensational and false messages that we receive by way of packaged media stories. LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you ver Thank you very much. And I see my time is up, JAMES COLEMAN:

so I --

(Appl ause) LOUIS SIGALOS: Kate Blofson. Page 60

1 2

4 5 6

```
FCC Hearing 10.31.07
                    KATE BLOFSON:
                                     Hey, Commissioners, hey,
 9
     Chairman Martin, hey everybody.
10
                    (Hey)
                    KATÉ BLOFSON: Happy Halloween. We are
11
     the FCC cheerleaders and we are so totally psyched to be here today. I'm sure you guys are really glad
12
13
14
     that we made it, too.
15
                    So, me and Sarah got here at like 4 a.m.
     this morning and so we're going to go back to back
16
17
     so we can finish all of our cheers.
18
                    By the way, I really love the music
19
     before the first panelists, like behind the TV
20
     thing, we totally use that same music for one of our
21
     like best ever routines.
                    I'd just like to reiterate that we're
22
0166
     for the FCC, that's why we are the FCC cheerleaders.
 1
     The guards out there seemed to be confused like
 3
     we're here to disrupt something or distract from
 4
     this process.
 5
                   We are totally for media consolidation,
 6
7
     okay, and we're here to cheer you on and support you
     110 percent while you give 110 percent of the media
 8
     to big corporations.
 9
                    So, we've been working really hard since
     last Wednesday night to get these cheers down.
10
11
     Normally we'd have like way more time than that to
12
     like meet and practice and stuff, but I guess we
     just heard about it a week ago, so.
13
14
                    (Us too).
15
                    (Chearl eaders).
                    Ready, okay.
Two, four, six, eight, who do we
16
17
     consolidate, media, media, more media.
18
                    KATE BLOFSON: By the way, that would
19
20
     have been way better with our pom-poms, they like
21
     took them at security, so.
22
                    One more cheer, let's do it. All right.
0167
 1
     So --
 2
                    LOUIS SIGALOS:
                                      Thank you.
 3
                    KATE BLOFSON:
                                     You're welcome, we're
     going to do our last cheer now, thank you so much
      for the opportunity and you guys are doing a totally
 5
 6
     awesome job.
 7
                    LOUIS SIGALOS:
                                      Sarah.
                   Sarah Sieberberg, please.
SARAH SIEBERBERG: We're doing a cheer.
LOUIS SIGALOS: Okay, start the clock,
 8
 9
10
11
     this is Sarah.
12
                    (Chearl eaders).
                    Ready, okay. One million, two million,
13
     three million dollars, all for Clear Channel stand up and holler, M-O-N-O-P-O-L-Y, monopoly, monopoly
14
15
16
     gets us high.
17
                    LOUIS SIGALOS:
                                      Thank you. I believe
     now we are up to Dylan Wrynn. Yes.

MICHAEL SHAY: For personal reasons,
Dylan and I switched positions, I'm Michael Shay, so
18
19
20
     I'm going to be in his position, he'll be in mine. I was 26, I think, so.
21
22
0168
                    Could I have two minutes?
```

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 2 3 LOUIS SIGALOS: Yes, please. MI CHAEL SHAY: I'm Michael Thank you. 4 5 Shay from WRYR, the LPFM almost first to ever go on. We've been on the air five years out in the Chesapeake Bay. We've been doing localism, we know what localism is, but, you know, we, I'm here despite the efforts of the National Association of 6 7 8 Broadcasters and National Public Radio. And 9 10 100 watts is not going to fill the vacuum that is created by the mega broadcasters that want more of 11 the spectrum and it really is unbelievable that our 12 local communities don't have any frequency 13 14 avai I abl e. And I can share with you instance after instance of the good work that we've been doing in our community for over five years, but I would like to share one particular instance that kind of drives 15 16 17 18 home an amazing point.

And the NPR players with Susan Sandberg 19 20 and Carl Kassell, they do radio theater drama at, in 21 Easton and, you know, it's our radio station that 22 0169 hosts it so that they can call it Radio from Downtown. Without our station, it really wouldn't 2 3 be Radio from Downtown. When I interviewed Susan Sandberg, and 5 I've interviewed many people from Presidential candidates to very important people in our community, and when I told Susan the story about how National Public Radio tried to keep my station from happening and is still trying to keep other stations from happening, community radio, she thought I wasn't telling the truth. She didn't believe it. 6 7 8 9 10 11 It's an unbelievable story and it's the only 12 interview that I've ever had anybody walk away from. 13 You know, the, we have done a study, the 14 15 Miter Corporation -- excuse me, my time's up, but 16 we're going to continue to do good work in our 17 community. Thank you.
LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you very much. 18 19 Before I announce the next speaker, 20 would the following people come forward to the 21 22 microphones, please, Melanie Campbell, John Arnold, 0170 1 Liz Humes, Susan Meehan, Epham Rams and Rosa 2 CI emente. Bruce Levinson. BRUCE LEVINSON: 4 Bruce Levinson with the 5 Center for Regulatory Effectiveness. 6 In the recent data in a recent filing by 7 consumers union indicated that the number of full 8 powered minority-owned commercial television 9 stations has increased by 25 percent between 2000 10 and 2006, the same time period during which they stated the consolidation has increased. 11 There's been an attempt to use the current issues of localism and minority and female 12 13 ownership to try and, to justify ownership caps; however, there is not reliable data supporting that 14 15 It's actually just the opposite.

Ownership caps decrease the value of the connection. 16 17 assets of female- and minority-owned stations. They 18 Page 62

```
FCC Hearing 10.31.07
19
      need those assets to bond against, to investimate
20
      businesses, to improve programming management and to
      buy new, to buy additional station properties.
21
22
                    You're not going to help minority and
0171
      female broadcast investors by decreasing the value
 1
      of their assets. Decreasing station values may
      nominally make other additional people able to buy
      stations, but that's true regardless of gender or
 5
6
7
                   It simply opens it up to more white
      males.
                    Moreover, reducing station values
 8
      discourages investors, it discourages investors of
      every ethnicity. You need to reduce regulation in order to make the process more welcoming and more
 9
10
      opening to all investors and potential investors in
11
12
      the broadcast industry.
                    Thank you.
LOUIS SIGALOS:
13
14
                                        Thank you.
15
                    Nadia Benjamin.
                    SAMANTHA MILLER:
                                          Hi, I'm actually
16
      Samantha Benjamin speaking on behalf of Nadia
Benjamin and Code Pink, Women for Peace. I'm
17
18
     dressed today as a corporate media whore because I feel that our (inaudible) have been sold to the
19
20
      highest bidder.
21
22
                    When the media is consolidated into a
0172
      few profit-driven hands, it is at the cost of our
 1
      democracy. I belong to a women's peace organization called Code Pink that has been working to stop the
 2
      war in Iraq and to prevent a war with Iran. We represent the majority sentiment in this country,
 5
 6
7
      but one would never know that by turning on the
      news.
 8
                    Our voices have been completely
 9
      marginalized by the corporate media. The lack of
10
      diversity of opinions and analysis in the media is a
     life and death issue. The media sold the Iraq war to the American public which has now cost the lives of almost 4,000 U.S. troops and over one million Iraqi civilians, not that you'll ever hear that on
11
12
13
14
15
      the news.
                    Now they're trying to sell us a war with
16
      Iran, acting as if somehow Iran has made threats
17
18
      towards us.
19
                    How can we call ourselves a democracy
      when we have a media entirely controlled by large
20
21
      corporations and often the same corporations
      profiting from the war in Iraq.
22
0173
 1
                    To have a real democracy we must have an
      informed population, we must have true public
 2
3
4
      discourse with the diversity of voices in the media.
      The FCC must stop corporations from silencing the
 5
      voices of the people and protect public interest.
 6
7
      It's time to stop prostituting our airwaves to
      corporations.
 8
                     (Appl ause)
 9
                     LOUIS SIGALOS:
                                        Thank you.
10
                    Melanie Campbell.
                    CAROL JENKINS: Hi, I'm representing
11
12
      Melanie Campbell who is not able to make it, I'm
                                               Page 63
```

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 13 Carol Jenkins from the Women's Media Center. 14 belong to a group called Dignity and Diversity. We've been having phone calls every single Tuesday morning since the Imus incident took place in April. 15 16 So far the group has initiated a Congressional hearing and is making its effect known 17 18 19 in the world in terms of women of color, diverse 20 women in the media. Here's the thing, today we witnessed yet 21 22 again a scenario where there were 10 men and 2 0174 women. There are 4 Commissioners who are male and 1 2 only 1 Commissioner who's a woman. There's a hallway full of Commissioners who are all white men, well mostly white men, so that I, the issue that we would raise because of the women's media center, 5 6 7 we're talking about the representation of women in the media and we might say, too, at the FCC. 8 You have to have diversity more than a 9 2 to 10 in terms of expressing the opinions of 10 what's going to take place with these publicly-owned airwaves, both television and radio. 11 So we would, we still say we are the invisible majority, more women in the country than 12 13 men, we now in mainstream media still occupy only 14 15 3 percent of positions of clout and own an infinitesimal amount of radio stations and 16 17 television stations in this country. And I think that as you begin to think about how you present yourself, you are a representative of mainstream media in the 18 19 20 unfortunate way of not showing women of color, of not showing women in their true representative state 21 22 0175 in this country and until women are included, you 234567 have only a part of the story and at this point not the most important part of the story of what's happening in America. Thank you very much. (Appl ause). LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you. John Arnold. 8 John Arnold. 9 Liz Humes. LIZ HUMES: Hi, I'm Liz Humes and I'm here to speak on behalf of WRIR LPFM and before I 10 11 12 begin my speech, I have to say that I probably agree with every single speaker who was up here in support 13 of localism, but because of time constraints, I'm here to talk to you about one small aspect of what LPFM can do for our local communities. We can sav 14 15 We can save 16 17 Li ves. 18 WRIR LPFM Richmond independent radio and 19 the City of Richmond, Virginia, have a unique 20 partnership to work together in times of crisis. 21 have a five-year agreement in which WRIR will 22 broadcast emergency information and instructions 0176 from public officials over our airwaves. I have a letter to give to you from our Mayor and Former 2 3 Governor of Virginia, Doug Wilder I also want to quote this letter when he says, "WRIR LPFM is vital to Richmond's response and recovery efforts." At the end of the letter he goes Page 64

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 on to say, "Broadcast radio guarantees emergency management officials the ability to connect immediately and effectively with the public en mass. 8 9 Locally-owned, locally-operated public broadcast stations like WRIR LPFM are an ideal tool for communication between municipalities and the 10 11 12 communities they serve." 13 WRIŘ was neither the first station nor 14 15 the second station, but we were the only station that accepted this partnership with the City that we live in. The other stations, full powers, didn't 16 17 want to give up their airwaves to serve the City they operate. WRIR will allow the chief of police, the fire department, the Mayor's press office and the head of public utilities to discuss whatever 18 19 20 21 22 needs to be done to restore peace in our lives. 0177 I am asking you today to do the next right thing for response and recovery efforts and 3 allow the expansion of LPFMs on the radio dial, because at least in Richmond, Virginia, we're the only station willing to use our airwaves to save lives and I'd like, and I'd like to submit the letter from Doug Wilder, okay.

LOUIS SIGALOS: Yes, I'll take that. 5 6 7 8 (Power to the women). 9 LOUIS SIGALOS: Susan Meehan. 10 11 SUSAN MEEHAN: Good afternoon, to dilute the number in diversity of medias and experiment, 12 that places America at great risk of losing one of 13 its most fundamental freedoms, the freedom of press.

The ultimate reduction, result of this reduction of media is a loss of freedom in speech. 14 15 16 This was brought home to me most strikingly when I 17 spent a Summer years ago living in Spain when it was still under the control of Dictator Francisco 18 19 20 Freedom of speech was not even a luxury at 21 that time and place. It was a concept entirely 22 unacceptable, untolerated and impermissible under 0178 any circumstances. 2 One member of the family with whom I 3 lived in high-rise public housing there greatly disliked Franco and protested bitterly against him. 5 His orator always frightened the family greatly 6 because they knew if it was heard and reported, all of them could be imprisoned. So when they began to 8 rail against the Government in their own home, they 9 forced him into a closet, a clothes closet. Dissent could only take place in a tiny room in the dark and 10 surrounded by garments and galoshes, not other 11 12 humans. I wouldn't want to live like that ever 13 14 again and I am afraid that media consolidation is 15 herding us in that direction. If media ownership laws are changed to 16 allow even more consolidation, a few immensely rich businesses will control what is said and democracy 17 18 19 will suffer. Issues in which the rich have viewpoints different from the poor will not be 20 covered fairly or eventually at all because it will 21 22 not be in their financial interests to do so.

0179

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 Severe consequences for democracy will 2 3 be the result and closets will once again become the only place for protests. People on the airwaves and democracy requires that the greatest possible variety of opinion should be brought to the attention of all. 4 5 6 7 8 9 Thank you. LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you. (Appl ause) 10 LOUIS SIGALOS: Before I announce the next speaker, I'd like to call the following people forward, Nanz Riccard, Tim Gibson, Christian Melendez, Alex Allen, Carol Jenkins, Adam Lynn and Michael Halperin. E. Faye Williams.

ROSA CLEMENTE: I'm Rosa Clemente. 11 12 13 14 15 You're next. 16 LOUIS SIGALOS: 17 E. Faye Williams. 18 ROSA CLEMENTE: You haven't called me. 19 LOUIS SIGALOS: You're next up, Rosa, 20 Rosa Clemente. 21 ROSA CLEMENTE: Hi, okay. My name is 22 Rosa Clemente and I'm a hip hop journalist, activist 0180 and community organizer. I'm a mother and as a black Peurto Rican woman, I'm outraged, I'm outraged at a bunch of white men over the age of 45 that 1 control 95 percent of the material. In this 5 material within the hip hop industry puts out the 6 7 most degrading, misogynistic and depicts my daughter's father, my partner, an African-American man with three jobs, but according to the majority 8 media, he is lazy, violent, a drug dealer, weed smoker, saggy-bag wearing Nigger. Yes, because even 9 10 if the mainstream media would not use this word, 11 everything they put out there portrays him as a 12 13 Ni gger. 14 As a women of color, what Don Imus said Why, I don't expect anything 15 did not bother me. from a racist bigot. What angered me was that not 16 one woman of color progressive or moderate was to be found on their airwaves after his nasty comments.

As a hip hop generation baby, I am aware 17 18 19 that what is portrayed on the mainstream media is 20 21 not hip hop, but a distorted, twisted fantasy 22 version of the rap industry so men who don't look 0181 like me or my daughter or the majority of the 1 2 American population can live in multi-million 3 mansions while they put out the most violent and public safety nasty music out there so that they can 4 5 live lavish lives. 6 7 One year after the infamous Tsunami song aired on Hot 97 we met with John Demic, a white man. 8 He said to us I don't let my listen -- my kids 9 listen to anything on the radio that comes out of this station that I program. John Demic said as a 10 hip hop programmer he does not allow his own children to listen to it. 11 12 So I ask the Commissioners, and 13 respectfully, especially to Chairman Martin, this is not a joke for us, this is our lives and I ask you 14 15 how will you sleep tonight, tomorrow or for the rest 16 17 of your life if you allow this to happen. Page 66

```
FCC Hearing 10.31.07
                   LOUIS SIGALOS:
                                     Thank you.
19
                   (Appl ause).
20
21
                   LOUIS SIGALOS:
                                     Nanz Riccard.
                   NANZ RICCARD: Good afternoon,
     Commissioners, I'm Nanz Riccard, I'm executive
22
0182
     director of the District of Columbia's public access
 1
 2
     television community network, DCTV, which transmits
 3
     over 130 original local program hours each week on
     non-commercial channels devoted to public discourse.
 5
                   As big media has gotten more and more
 6
7
     consolidated, they have pushed local diverse forces
                     Community access channels fill an
     off the air.
     important void. Community programmers speak with
their communities. Community channels are where the
tableau is being broken that has caused minor girls
 8
 9
10
11
     who were infected with AIDS by adult men to be
12
     ostracized by their communities.
                   Here is where conversations among youth
13
14
     to resolve gang violence is being held.
                                                    This is not
     to ensure the commercial viability of these channels, but to meet vital local communication
15
16
     needs and make our communities better places to
17
18
     Live.
19
                   And yet at the same time the Commission
     is looking towards further media consolidation.
20
21
     two recent hearings on cable TV franchising are
22
     chipping away at the one true local television
0183
     system that exists within a reasonable regulatory
 1
     framework.
                   The issue before us is one of resolving
     how out of balance our information distribution
 3
4
5
     systems have become relative to our goals as a
     democracy.
 6
7
                   The Chairman listed many proposals and
     amendments.
                    They may be a start, but they do not by
 8
     themselves undo the results of overvigorous media
 9
     consolidation and its detriment on localism and
10
     diverse views.
11
                   Mr. Goodmon spoke of looking at the
     picture as a whole in order to achieve true localism. The imbalance is caused by the devil
12
13
14
     that's in the details and the cumulative effect of
     the many pieces discussed here today.
15
16
                   The Commission acts in the public trust
17
     by guiding the use of some of the nation's most
18
     valuable publicly-owned assets. In this light we
19
     respectfully request the Commission to halt further
     need of consolidation and adopt rules to encourage reversal of its effects to date.
20
21
22
                   Additionally, any further rules should
0184
     encourage and ensure the continuance of new local
 2
     ownership with clearly-defined local programming,
 3
     public interest requirements and the framework
 4
     should be restored and extended to broadcast
 5
     satellite, radio and emergency technologies as a
     mean of ensuring the unnecessary citizens-based discord in each of those broad-based media, the
 6
 7
     framework that public access has been over these
 8
 9
     years.
                   I thank the Commission very much.
10
11
                   LOUIS SIGALOS:
                                     Thank you.
                                            Page 67
```

```
FCC Hearing 10.31.07
                     Tim Gibson.
                                      Tim Gibson.
                                                       Christian
13
      Mel endez.
      CHRISTIAN MELENDEZ: Good afternoon Commissioners, Chairman Martin, I'm Christian
14
15
      Melendez, I'm a student at the University of Maryland. I'm also here to represent the
16
17
      underrepresented today, the youth, to urge you to promote localism by not relaxing media ownership
18
19
20
      rules, by encouraging low powered FM and by
21
      protecting that word neutrality.
                     You are probably aware that economists
22
0185
      from your Commission said that local ownership of TV
      stations had healthy implications for healthy news,
 3
      however as Senator Barbara Boxer has noted, that
 4
5
      study was suppressed.
                     If evidence from the FCC is not enough,
 6
7
      try the story about two Fox reporters who are being
      fired for doing a story on a dangerous growth hormone by Monsanto who happened to be an advertiser
 8
 9
      for Fox News.
10
                     If the only outlet that's in an area
      decide to sensor the news, where, where's the public
11
      going to get this information from?
12
                     Again, I'm a student from the University
13
      of Maryland and many students there have never heard
14
15
      the terms media consolidation, never heard of
16
      neutrality, low powered FM.
      I'm a DJ at the University's radio station, WMUC FM, College Park, it's America's
17
18
19
      oldest college radio station and a community outlet
      that has decided it would not duplicate the
20
      corporate infotainment that's perpetuate -- or
21
      excuse me, it's just repeatedly put out there on the
22
0186
      airwaves every single day.
 2
                     We strive to bring all sorts of musical
 3
      genres, local artists, fresh news to the students of College Park. We don't expect big media to let the
 4
5
      public know what's really going on. For example, the amount of coverage in 2003 to the Commission's rule changes was very limited, so then how am I
 6
 7
 8
      aware of these such things? Because of
      participatory and not one-directional medium, the
 9
10
      Internet.
11
                      The explosion of original user-generated
      content which is due to network neutrality is
12
      stealing revitalization of our democracy. In College Park, for example, where I'm from, there's a major development initiative being undertaken by the
13
14
15
      University listeners and blogs like we think College
16
      Park are generating community awareness and involvement. And I'll finish real fast, these are
17
18
19
      reasons to promote localism everywhere. I want you
      to expand local powered FM, promote diversified
20
21
      ownership, protect the network neutrality. Please
      don't let big media choke the oxygen out of our
22
0187
      dwindling democracy and please don't let the public leave thinking what the "F" CC.
 2
3
                     Thank you.
LOUIS SIGALOS:
                                          Thank you.
                     Alex -- Alex Allen.
```

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 6 7 ALEX ALLEN: I wanted to address Chairman Martin. 8 9 LOUIS SIGALOS: Excuse me, what's your name, sir? ALEX ALLEN: Alex Allen, but I wanted to talk to Chairman Martin, but if he's running --10 11 LOUIS SIGALOS: 12 We're on the record. ALEX ALLEN: All right, I just wanted to 13 say that, I really like Chairman Martin and they 14 15 print these dot matrix photos of him in the Wall Street Journal from time to time and I look at him 16 17 and he's got such an innocent face and he's so soft spoken and so I think we're in good hands here, but 18 19 then I hear about devious and devilish things that this Commission reportedly wants to do, like relax 20 the newspaper, broadcast cross-ownership ban and 21 22 then when this hearing is a week before the election 0188 1 scheduled on five minutes notice, it's not really 2 conducive to getting a fair sampling of public 3 comment. 4 5 With that said, I would say that basically the, the situation, the media environment in this country as it's demonstrated by corporate interests, by the merchant class, every religion in 6 7 8 the world warns against the merchant class because 9 it's, it's very dangerous. 10 With that said, I'd like to, I'd like to build up, there's an old skit in Monte Python, an 11 old skit in Monte Python where a health inspector 12 walks into a chocolate shop and this chocolatier is making chocolates with Lark's vomit and -- my apologies, I'm glad you heard me, though.

And basically the health inspector says, 13 14 15 16 you know we have to take this stuff off the market. 17 And he says but our sales are, or we have to tell 18 the public, we have to label; and he said our sales 19 would plummet. The health inspector says to hell with your sales, we've got to protect the public and 20 21 22 I think that the Commission has got to protect the 0189 public and the best way to do that is to not relax 1 2 3 4 5 any rules. Thank you and --LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you very much. Carol Jenkins. 6 7 Adam Lynn. ADAM LÝNN: I believe the public trust has been lost and that only the profit motive 8 9 remains for media companies. The Commission is tasked with ensuring the commercial media system recognizes that they foster the life blood of 10 11 12 democracy and I believe you are failing in this 13 regard. 14 You can look back to the quote of Laurie 15 Maze saying something to the effect of that he's not in the business of providing information to listeners, he's in the business of making money. And I think that's when we need to step in and tell 16 17 18 him he's wrong on that account. 19 If, if some of you don't believe me in this regard, let me give a little evidence to the 20 21 effect of why this is the case. You can start with Page 69

9

14

15

16

staff cuts. There's been 4,000 journalists at least since 2000 that those jobs have been cut due to consolidation. If you go to look at what's replaced these journalists, you'll see that fluff has replaced these journalists.

I turned on Fox 5 this morning before Icame down here and what did I see, I saw a journalist dressed up as Ghostbuster walking around doing a news report and that is not, not journalism to me and that is not what I want to hear about from my community. If you look even further, you'll see well what else they've replaced it with is fake news or video news releases

We, you know, I mean the fact, even regardless of disclosure, it's a travesty that this is even around and I'll report that the GAO site, it showed that from '98 to 2002 feed material increased from 14 percent to 23 percent, which is absolutely horrific. And let me just, just say that on top of that, you know, you have, you just see the loss that, the loss of journalism that this has created.

What, you know, what you see, you look

to radio and the voice tracking and all these things, that's what the next thing is in TV if you allow consolidation. So I don't think, you don't need to imagine it. You see it, it's happening, no local news and if you want this homogenized content, this lack of local news and a public that lacks the means to inform themselves on issues of importance, then you, then you go ahead and consolidate, but otherwise you should think twice about that.

And I just want to extend an open invitation to all Commissioners that if you believe anything the NAB or --

LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you very much. ADAM LYNN: -- NAB or NAA is saying about consolidation, I'm available day or night to prove you wrong

LOŬIS SIGALOS: Thank you very much. ADAM LYNN: Thank you.

LOUIS SIGALOS: Before I announce the next speaker, would the following people come forward, please, Nickey Guerra, Josh Silver, Wendy Thompson, Alexandra Russell, Garland Nixon, Mike

Shay, or Dylan Wrynn, Patricia Omana and Lynn Erski ne.

Michael Halperin.

MICHAEL HALPERIN: Good afternoon, I come today in strong opposition to further media consolidation. I come today as an individual but in my day job by work is to expose Government corruption. We depend on investigative reporters to bring to light stories of corruption, not stories of wild fires, but stories about political appointees who manipulate endangered species, scientific documents or bring into light staged FEMA press conferences.

Media consolidation really stifles meaningful investigative reporting with media outlets being forced to depend on wire stories and Page 70

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 17 the few reporters that have not been relieved of 18 their duties. This is not streamlining, it is 19 dilution. It's no wonder the former editor of the Wall Street Journal has formed an investigation to 20 21 22 employ investigative reporters and make their 0193 1 articles available free of charge to do the job 2 local media struggle with more and more every day. 3 Consolidation also significantly reduces 4 local editorial satire. The number of professional 5 working editorial cartoonists has decreased 6 7 substantially in recent years to approximately 100 in the entire nation. 8 With this decline comes a decline in 9 attention to local issues, mail order corruption, 10 school board hi-jinx, local company layoffs, the critical, but local issues, are all but ignored. 11 12 Furthermore, under increased consolidation, local media outlets are more likely 13 to feel pressure from national owners to go soft on big advertisers, where the politicians or political appointees who create conditions favorable to their 14 15 16 17 profits. 18 Now this is not the media companies fault, it's not because of lazy reporters or 19 20 editors, the situation comes from a failure to 21 govern. 22 John F. Kennedy's FCC Commissioner 0194 Newton Minnow said I did not come to Washington to 2 idly observe the squandering of the public's ai rwaves. 4 5 6 7 I'd employ you to do the same and to save this industry LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you. Nickey Guerra. NICKEY GUERRA: 8 Hello, Commissioners, as demonstrated by all the speakers today, media consolidation clearly undermines the fundamental values of a truly deliberative democracy. My parents fled a totality State in 1959 in search of freedom and a democratic State, most of all 9 10 11 12 13 democracy for their children.
I fail to see this democracy that they 14 15 16 Our mass media fails to protect us and undermines the values of the founding fathers that 17 they need to promote democracy, free speech, public deliberation and public access to information.

It's clear that consolidation only 18 19 20 21 worsens media's tendency to sometimes omit information that's inconvenient and marginalize 22 0195 1 opinions that are oppositional. 2 3 So, please, I implore you not to further these faults in our mass media by further relaxing the consolidation rules. LOUIS SIGALOS: 4 5 Thank you. Josh Silver. 6 7 JOSH SILVER: Hi, Commissioners, I'm 8 Josh Silver, I'm actually the co-founder and 9 executive director of Free Press and I've never 10 testified to the FCC, so this is exciting. Page 71

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 I just wanted to tell you why in two minutes, this will be a miracle if I can do this, 12 why I helped found Free Press and it was really out 13 of exacerbation over the state, particularly of 14 television news. And everything we've heard and everything we see across the board shows that 15 16 consolidation, further consolidation is just going 17 to make matters worse. 18 I'm struck by how truly bipartisan, when I go out across the country, and I'm not talking to 19 20 politicos, but I'm talking to real people and I do 21 22 it a lot, probably more than most people in the 0196 country, that people on the right and the left 2 really can't stand this idea of further consolidation and I, I put that to you as a warning 3 that this is not popular in any way. And I guess I'd conclude by saying it's 6 7 very clear that while we might not be seeing yet the kind of backlash that we saw in 2003, I see it starting to percolate and people across the country really care about this and they're watching closely and I really hope that you will listen to the 99 percent of public comments that you've received 8 9 10 11 opposing consolidation and do as the public would 12 13 have you do. 14 Thank you. 15 (Appl ause) LOUIS SI GALOS: Thank you. 16 Wendy Thompson. WENDY THOMPSON: 17 18 Well when I start this, good afternoon, my name is Wendy Thompson and I am the vice president and general manager of Telemundo 19 20 Washington, D.C., which is owned and operated by CGS 21 Communications, one of the very few minority-owned 22 0197 1 broadcasting companies. 2 My station has over 30 employees and every one of us have been a wavering commitment to serve our audience. Through our nightly local news at 6 and 11 and Washington's only Spanish Language public affairs program (spoke in Spanish), the 4 5 6 Hispanic community in this region is kept informed 7 8 of current issues. We are the communities vehicle 9 to learn about the services and opportunities 10 available in our region. Last night, for example, we offer our 11 12 viewers the opportunity to contact a panel of 13 experts in domestic violence to learn of the services available in the region for victims of domestic violence. Without having the support from 14 15 the FCC, communities will not be able to receive the 16 17 much needed local information. 18 In our case, we are the bridge that connects and keeps our community informed. Both Commissioners McDowell and Commissioner Adelstein 19 20 21 have visited our station and have seen firsthand the 22 commitment and the work that we do to help our 0198 1 communities. 2 That is why we devote so much efforts toward educational projects such as our read to succeed literacy campaign, voting health and

Page 72

financial education. We're very proud to be a 6 Hispanic-owned broadcaster and proud still of the 7 difference we make in our community. Our motto says 8 it all (spoke in Spanish) the voice of the 9 community. 10 We hope the FCC recognizes the importance of localism and acts to preserve it. 11 (Appl ause) 12 13 LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you. 14 Alexandra Russell. 15 ALEXANDRA RUSSELL: Hi, good afternoon, 16 oh, thanks. My name's Alexandra Russell and I'm a citizen activist and as your very own cheerleaders told you this morning, folks were lined up outside 17 18 the building from 4 a.m. on ready to testify and even more people rallied outside this morning to 19 20 21 call on you to put people in better local diverse 22 news ahead of corporate interests and big media. 0199 1 These are our public airwaves, it's something we sometimes forget, but they're ours and corporations have an obligation to put the public interests first, but what we're finding as big media companies get even bigger is that more local news is 5 getting stifled and the most important part of that 6 is that women and people of color are getting pushed out, our ownership levels are down. Women are more 7 8 9 than half the population of this country, but we are 10 less than 5 percent of TV broadcast stations and less than 6 percent of radio. This is simply 11 12 unacceptabl e. I urge you as all the folks outside this morning and in here to put people, the public and 13 14 local diverse news ahead of big corporate profits. 15 Thank you. LOUIS SIGALOS: 16 17 Thank you. 18 Garl and Ni xon. Yes, I'm a radio talk 19 GARLAND NI XON: show host with Pacifica Network and basically I started to kind of talk about myself, but I decided just to say this, I think all you have to do really 20 21 22 0200 is look, if you look at the people who are walking 1 2 up here, these are normal, every day people. This really is not about corporations 4 and radio, it's about democracy. If we look at our 5 history, if we look at the Boston Tea Party, what did we have, we had a lot of regular every day citizens who said, you know, we don't like things this way and they all, they all came together to do 6 7 8 9 something. 10 And we ask ourselves who was right, the 11 big people in power or the every day people who said 12 we don't like this. We look at the civil rights 13 movement, what did we have, a bunch of people who walked up to the Government and said, you know, this isn't right, let's do things a different way.

Our history tells us that when the 14 15 16 citizens, the normal every day citizens, the motley 17 crew you have here in sneakers and hats and tennis 18 shoes walk up and say this is the way we think it 19 20 should be and on the other side you have people, you have corporate millionaires in 5,000 dollar suits 21 Page 73

FCC Hearing 10.31.07

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 saying we want things another way, our history tells 22 0201 us that every single time democracy should have gone 1 on the side of the every day people.

So, rather than say my story, I'd just simply like to say I'd like you to think about democracy and think about history and think about 5 6 7 what if you were back there making that decision, sitting there and there were people in power and 8 there were people up, walking up off the street just 9 saying, you know, can you look at it our way, we 10 don't have any money and power. Thank you. LOUIS SIGALOS: 11 12 Thank you. Dylan Wrynn? Mike Shay, Dylan Wrynn. 13 14 Patricia Omana. 15 PATRICIA OMANA: Good afternoon, my name is Patricia Omana, and I am the general manager of 16 WIOC AM radio station owned by CGS Communications 17 which is 100 percent Hispanic owned. 18 WIOC, we're basically, we are an AM band 19 but we operate as a music station. Looking at our community, our Hispanic community in the area, in the metro, we internally have created a lot of 20 21 22 0202 programming, we have opened our microphone and 1 2 3 opened our studio to profit, non-profit organizations to educate and empower this community. 4 This community needs a lot of 5 information and we are providing that for them and that's what localism does, not only for the Hispanic community, for any community that exists in the 6 7 8 United States 9 Thank you. LOUIS SIGALOS: 10 Thank you. Before I announce the next speaker, I'd like to call up the 11 12 following people, Francwa Sims, Sandra Levin, 13 Natalie Fannie and Shireen Mitchell. 14 Lynn Erskine. LÝNN ERSKINE: Hello, my name is Lynn Erskine, I'm a long-time resident of Washington, 15 16 17 Thanks for giving me the opportunity to speak. 18 I'm concerned that I don't see many local TV stations covering this hearing and it's hard to change the media if the media isn't willing 19 20 21 to cover themselves. 22 Traditional media remains highly 0203 profi tabl e. The economics across ownership and 2 consolidation within media have played a central 3 role in the debate over limits on media ownership. Media owners have argued that 5 6 7 consolidation and conglomeration from an economic efficiency and result in a more vibrant media marketplace. This assertion is challenged by 8 reality, however. Newspaper and television properties are highly profitable when compared to nearly every other industry. Newspapers, for example, generally have profit margins of 20 percent 9 10 11 or more and regularly sell at multiples of 10 to 12 12 13 times cash flow. 14 The biggest problem facing traditional 15 media is to develop profitable ways to distribute Page 74

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 their content online, a problem that isn't solved by 17 consolidation. In fact, increased head-to-head competition on the Web between independent local 18 newspapers and TV stations can enrich the news content of local markets. 19 20 21 While newspapers and broadcasters need 22 to develop better strategies to attract viewers and 0204 readers, there's no evidence that combining local 1 2 3 newspapers and TV will help. There are quality newspaper models that 4 5 6 7 work. Thank you. (Appl ause) LOUIS SIGÁLOS: Thank you. 8 Francwa Sims. 9 FRANCWA SIMS: Right here. Okay. okay, I'm Francwa Sims, I'm a local D.C. Blogger and 10 as an African-American male, I understand what it's 11 like to be underrepresented and marginalized. 12 As a content provider, I also understand competition and with other bloggers in the 13 14 professional so-called credentialed media, and it's very hard for bloggers to get our revenue. I also 15 16 understand that it is special powerful interests 17 that control the pockets of the FCC, Congress, the 18 19 White House and the judiciary. They own the airwaves and the pockets of the FCC. 20 I'll make this point again, the FCC is 21 on the take and I don't blame them. I wish somebody 22 0205 would offer me money for my blog.

After spoke, that the decision has already been made and all this public testimony is 2 4 5 just a matter of procedure. If the FCC cannot serve the public interests, then it should be abolished 6 and replaced by a more democratic body. The FCC is not really in control here, Congress is not in 8 control, nor is the executive branch and the ŏ judiciary. This is really a one-sided discussion.

The FCC is a puppet and the corporate interests is pushing for media consolidation. It is 10 11 12 amazing how the current administration can advocate a free press of media in Iraq while we're losing it 13 14 here at home. 15 Thank you. 16 (Appl ause). 17 LOUIS SIGÁLOS: Thank you. 18 Sondra Levin. 19 SONDRA LEVIN: Yes, good afternoon, my name is Sondra Levin, I have been a journalist for 20 15 years and I grew up in Silver Spring. I'm 21 22 motivated to speak because of my outrage of the 0206 direction of media. 1 2 More and more large corporations and monopolies have taken ownership of the media business. This has resulted in a huge decline in presentation of voices, the number of voices and 3 4 5 6 7 Democracy depends on freedom of the press i deas. and free speech. 8 Any, I oppose any FCC actions to enable the consolidation of media ownership. It runs Page 75

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 10 counter to free speech and free press. 11 The FCC should, in fact, go the opposite direction. I'm shocked and appalled by the amount of propaganda, lies and lack of enough environmental 12 13 and social justice issues presented in the media.

As a journalist I'm appalled by the 14 15 lowering of standards in my profession. Due to 16 17 consolidation, there is less opportunities for me as 18 well. I'm appalled by the lies and misinformation 19 and bias in media reports. 20 I participated in a march against the 21 war in mid-September and the newspapers failed to 22 report the number correctly. There was 0207 misinformation and they weren't even following the 2 3 basic journalistic principles of who, what, where, when and why. 4 When I sit in the cafe, the radio is 5 playing and I hear information about celebrities I 6 have no interest in hearing about, Brittney Spears and other non-singers that I do not want to hear about goes on for 5, 10 minutes and I'm so angry that I turn off the TV and I turn off the radio, but 7 8 9 10 opting out is not a reason to do -- it's not 11 something that I should do or anybody should do, we should try to get a media that listens to everybody 12 13 and has a variety of voices, so that's why I'm here 14 to speak. 15 I don't want to opt out, I want to speak out and say we need a diversity of voices, that's 16 17 what the founding fathers would want. Thank you. LOUIS SIGALOS: 18 19 Thank you. Natalie 20 Afanni e. Natalie? 21 Shireen Mitchell. 22 SHIREEN MITCHELL: Thank you and good 0208 1 afternoon, I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I'm from the organization called Digital Sisters and we're an organization that focuses on media and technology and its impacts on self-sufficiency for women and children who are 4 5 6 repeatedly underserved. 7 I want to thank you today for supporting 8 our issues around women of color who, stop the 9 violence against women of color by having everyone 10 wear the tag for red and the V standing for victim, we appreciate that, so as we move forward, basically I'm also part of a coalition of women's, the women's coalition of dignity and diversity, you heard a little bit about them earlier, and focusing on 11 13 14 issues that are happening in the media and how they 15 impact women and how they impact particularly women 16 17 of color. 18 This media issue is a big issue and I 19 think someone said it earlier, when you start to see people come in to do the things you see today, that means that something's wrong. We've got to speak 20 21 22 out, we've got to make some changes and that's why 0209 1 I'm here today. Although I heard someone say that they're happy about digital TV and digital radio, Page 76

FCC Hearing 10.31.07 we're also not happy about how it came about. As 5 one speaker said, he's not sure what will happen to 6 7 those stations that aren't able to make the transition from analog to digital. We are clear that that is the problem, you don't know what's going to happen, we're going to mute those voices. 8 9 10 The small local stations will lose their ability to broadcast to local communities, the wait 11 12 and see what happens motto is the reason we have the 13 lack of diversity in the media ownership right now, 14 and women and minority broadcasters as well. 15 Media consolidation will further decrease diversity and not allow the local issues that are important to local communities to be broadcasted. Although many people can get access to local issues online, we continue to forget that 16 17 18 19 20 there are too many women and people that still don't 21 have online access to anything and actually rely on 22 their local community television stations and radio 0210 1 coverage. With less local stations available, it means that less local news for those communities and families. Diversity of voice is important. Of all 4 things, we just need to make sure that we are 5 6 7 addressing this issue and not spending time on issues like Imus. We can no longer wait and see and 8 have, and make sure that everyone has a voice. 9 have to make local issues an important part of what's going on so that these people who have, are impacted by media in their daily lives can see 10 11 what's going on. 12 13 LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you. SHIREEN MITCHELL: Whether it's about 14 15 local jobs to re-development or the fact that the 16 average single mother isn't on welfare and works two jobs and wants to know what's going on in her 17 18 schools in her community, we've got to make a 19 difference today. LOUIS SIGALOS: Thank you. 20 And I want to thank you, all of today's 21 22 public commentors. 0211 This concludes the Commission's 6th 1 2 hearing on localism. Thank you for your attendance 3 4 5 6 7 and for your participation. (Public Hearing concluded.) 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

19 20

| 21<br>22<br>021  | 2 |
|--|---|
| 21<br>22<br>021<br>1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>21<br>22<br>22 |   |
| 6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   |   |
| 11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   |   |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19   |   |
| 20<br>21<br>22   |   |

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, Monica Voorhees, do hereby certify that this transcript was prepared from tape to the best of my ability.

I am neither counsel nor party to this action nor am I interested in the outcome of this action.

Moni ca Voorhees