

*Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554*

In re Matter of)	
)	
Expansion of Online Public File)	
Obligations to Cable and Satellite TV)	MB Docket No. 14-127
Operators and Broadcast and)	
Satellite Radio Licensees)	
)	

Directed To: The Commission

COMMENTS OF EAGLE BLUFF ENTERPRISES

Eagle Bluff Enterprises, licensee of a number of AM and FM stations in Missouri, by its attorney, hereby submits Comments with respect to the above-referenced proposal to expand the online public file requirement to radio broadcasters.

As do many other broadcasters, Eagle Bluff questions the propriety and necessity of expanding the Commission's online public file requirements, and believes the proposed exemption for small broadcasters should be a permanent exemption. The net effect of the FCC's well-intentioned proposals is to place unreasonable, unfair demands upon broadcasters, particularly the small broadcaster. The unintended effect of such regulation will be to force such broadcasters to pare back or abandon operations altogether. The end result is that the FCC will unwittingly cause a diminishment of service to the very constituencies to which they pledge to protect and serve. In short, if ever imposed upon small broadcasters, the FCC's proposed rules will make it more difficult for radio stations to serve the public interest.

There also is the question as to the fundamental fairness of imposing unduly burdensome regulations when other media (internet broadcasting, magazines, newspapers, etc.) are not or

cannot be held to anything resembling the same standards. If these content/advertising providers are not held to the same standard, additional regulation by the FCC of the broadcaster alone will force many out of business altogether. It is firmly believed that the burdensome new filing requirements will require stations that are subject to the new regulations to hire additional staff. The administrative load will increase significantly and will have little effective payback. It is likely that time and resources now spent in community outreach and participation may decrease as attention is diverted towards administrative filing requirements. Eagle Bluff has experienced very few instances during its time as a broadcaster where the public has expressed any interest, whatsoever, in viewing its public file. To set up new regulations, which create burdens on the FCC as well as the broadcaster, seems misguided and unnecessary.

As to what parties should be subject to the new requirements, if new requirements are adopted, Eagle Bluff supports exempting small broadcasters from this regulatory burden. Small stations need to allocate its personnel and resources to the *actual operation* of their radio stations, and to present as much programming in possible in the way of entertaining or informational programming to serve their listening audiences. In today's climate, that is hard enough to do already, without adding additional regulatory burdens upon such broadcasters.

To the extent such obligations nevertheless are adopted, Eagle Bluff supports (i) the FCC proposal to itself upload much of the information to the online public file (NPRM ¶ 63); (ii) the FCC proposal to not establish any particular formatting for documents (such as issues/programming lists) posted to the online public file (NPRM ¶ 31), and (iii) adopting a lengthy phase-in period for broadcasters not in major markets. It also is proposed that to the extent files are posted online, to balance the burdens on broadcasters, that the FCC eliminate the

requirement for such broadcasters to maintain physical copies of their public files at their main studios.

Conclusion

It is the goal of the proposed FCC rules to ensure that broadcasters provide information to members of the public to show that stations meet the needs of the local audience, including those communities that are traditionally underserved. It is the small market radio stations that do this well, offering specialized programming, including religion, religion, foreign language, ethnic and alternative programming of a variety of forms. These types of stations also serve as gateways for new entrants seeking business opportunities in broadcasting, increasing ownership among those traditionally underrepresented. The financial disincentives created by the FCC's proposed rules will create barriers to entry that will threaten these segments. The net effect is the opposite of that intended by the FCC, and service will be both diminished and less diverse.

In summary, the FCC should not punish or impose burdens on the many when only a few may require it. Broadcasters need the flexibility to adapt the FCC's well-intentioned goals to the dynamics of the individual markets served. While there is no disagreement with the underlying intent of the FCC's proposal, it is necessary for broadcasters to have flexibility in how the goals are met.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully requested that these Comments be accepted.

Respectfully submitted,

EAGLE BLUFF ENTERPRISES

By: ____/Dan J. Alpert/_____
Dan J. Alpert

Its Attorney

*The Law Office of Dan J. Alpert
2120 N. 21st Rd.
Arlington, VA 22201
703-243-8690*

March 16, 2014