

ATTACHMENT B

**An Analysis of the Proposed Use of
Arbitron Data to Define Radio Markets**

**David Gunzerath, Ph.D.
Director of Survey Research
Research & Planning Department
National Association of Broadcasters**

February 26, 2001

An Analysis of the Proposed Use of Arbitron Data to Define Radio Markets

Overview

The Arbitron Company has been in the business of measuring local market radio audiences since the launch of American Research Bureau's¹ Radio Local Market Service to 28 markets in 1966.² Arbitron has subsequently expanded its local market audience measurement services incrementally. With the addition of five new markets effective with the Fall 2000 survey, Arbitron now provides audience estimates for 283 radio markets.

Arbitron was a pioneer in the use of a person-based (as opposed to a household-based) diary survey method for obtaining radio audience estimates. Arbitron continues to this day to utilize the diary as its primary data collection vehicle. Markets are surveyed two to four times each year, with diaries mailed to thousands of selected survey participants. Only a portion of those selected to participate actually complete and return the diary or diaries that Arbitron mails to them.³ From these "in-tab diaries," Arbitron calculates its audience estimates for radio stations within each market among a variety of demographic groupings.

Arbitron's radio audience measurement service originally was conceived as a tool that could assist in the sale of radio advertising airtime on a local basis. Arbitron's

¹ The American Research Bureau (ARB) was Arbitron's predecessor company; the ARB became Arbitron in 1973.

² Beville, H. M. *Audience Ratings : Radio, Television, Cable*. Rev. ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988. p. 46.

³ The typical response rate in recent survey periods for an Arbitron local market is in the 35-40 percent range (based on potential survey participants).

audience estimates continue in this role today, and its *Radio Market Reports* are well established as the primary currency through which buyers and sellers of radio airtime negotiate prices for radio advertising in most local markets.

The Commission's proposal to use information supplied by Arbitron to determine the market definitions it uses to evaluate radio station ownership thresholds,⁴ while perhaps superficially seeming to provide a logical and consistent measure of evaluating the diversity of voices in a market, in fact provides neither. For a number of reasons that will be more fully detailed herein, the use of Arbitron data for this specific purpose would be inappropriate.

As described above, Arbitron *Radio Market Reports* are conceived of and are produced for the limited purpose of providing a means through which commercial radio stations and advertisers can determine the relative value of radio station airtime. This fact is crucial, because all aspects of the information that Arbitron includes in these reports—from the methodologies that are used to survey radio listeners, to the formatting of the information, to the decisions to exclude some types of information and include others, to the ways in which the markets are defined—are driven by this single goal. Arbitron information was never intended to be used for the purpose of determining comprehensive station counts to serve as a basis for applying FCC multiple station ownership rules. Consequently, to use Arbitron data in this manner would lead to results that are inconsistent with the goal of reasonably determining the number of different voices that are available to listeners in local radio markets.

⁴ *In the Matter of Definition of Radio Markets*, Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM), MM Docket No. 00-244, paragraphs 10-11.

Specific Problems Associated with Using Arbitron Market Information

- **The Market Definition Process Remains Subject to Subscribers' Control**

In recent years, Arbitron has revised the process by which it reviews its existing market definitions. Under the previous procedures, client stations could request specific modifications to existing markets, and these requests were typically granted if they were found to cause no harm to Arbitron or to its client stations.⁵ Despite revisions to the procedures that Arbitron follows in determining whether to implement a requested market redefinition, such definitional changes still can be initiated by a group of Arbitron clients within a market (75 percent of subscribing station owners within a market must formally request such a change).⁶

Thus, despite recent changes to Arbitron's policies, one key factor remains that strongly argues against using Arbitron data in the manner the Commission has proposed: changes to market definitions may be initiated at the request of the very same radio station owners who are subject to the FCC's multiple station ownership rules. Moreover, these market definitions are subject to change not at the request of just any group of radio stations within an existing market, but rather at the request of a group of *Arbitron subscriber* stations. Those stations that do not subscribe to Arbitron's service have no voice whatsoever in how their market is defined. The Commission's proposal raises the possibility that select groups of Arbitron subscribers within a market could exert an inordinate degree of influence over the market's composition, to the detriment of

⁵ These requested modifications of markets most typically involve proposals to add a county or counties to the existing market configuration.

⁶ See Arbitron's *Description of Methodology*, pp. 1.2-1.4, for a full description of the current process for evaluating requested market changes (available at <http://www.arbitron.com/radiosurvey/radiodom.pdf>).

competition—both within and outside the market—among other Arbitron subscribers and non-subscribers alike.

- **Differences between Arbitron-Defined Markets and Those of Other Research Companies**

Significant differences exist among prominent industry research suppliers in how they define radio markets and count the stations within them. In many respects, these differences point directly to the fact that Arbitron's information is produced with a specific purpose in mind, and that this purpose bears no direct relationship to the purpose for which the Commission has suggested this information be used.

- **Arbitron versus M Street**

The table on the following page compares the number of radio stations in the country's Top 25 Arbitron markets as reported by both Arbitron⁷ and the latest edition of *The M Street Radio Directory*.⁸ A quick scan of this table reveals that the disparities between the two sources are sometimes marked. For example, Arbitron shows only 44 total stations in the Chicago market (all are home metro stations), while *M Street* lists 107. Even taking into account the fact that Arbitron does not count non-commercial stations, *M Street* still counts 78 commercial stations in the Chicago market, nearly double the number that Arbitron counts.

⁷ *Radio Market Reports*, Spring 2000. The Arbitron Company.

⁸ *The M Street Radio Directory*, 9th ed. Nashville: M Street Corp., 2000.

**Top 25 Arbitron Markets
Arbitron vs. M Street Directory**

Rank	Market Name	/-----Arbitron-----/		/-----M Street-----/	
		Metro Stns.	Total Stns.	Comm. Stns.	Total Stns.
1.	New York	47	51	48	65
2.	Los Angeles	48	57	65	74
3.	Chicago	44	44	78	107
4.	San Francisco	40	42	52	69
5.	Philadelphia	24	47	45	66
6.	Dallas-Ft. Worth	38	39	57	66
7.	Detroit	30	33	40	57
8.	Boston	28	47	47	64
9.	Washington, DC	32	44	42	48
10.	Houston-Galveston	36	38	51	61
11.	Atlanta	28	32	49	57
12.	Miami-Ft. Lauderdale	31	35	50	58
13.	Puerto Rico	54	54	70	70
14.	Seattle-Tacoma	29	36	49	63
15.	Phoenix	30	41	50	55
16.	San Diego	34	40	49	52
17.	Minneapolis-St. Paul	23	37	36	49
18.	Nassau-Suffolk	14	40	31	43
19.	St. Louis	28	32	43	58
20.	Baltimore	19	43	30	35
21.	Tampa-St. Pete	29	39	41	48
22.	Pittsburgh	28	38	44	49
23.	Denver-Boulder	31	36	42	49
24.	Cleveland	20	47	30	39
25.	Portland, OR	28	34	37	46

There are several reasons for the disparities between the station counts of Arbitron and *The M Street Directory*. Some of these are discussed in the later sections of this report that describe how Arbitron chooses to include and exclude certain stations in its markets. The larger point to consider here is that there are significant inconsistencies among those sources of information that are commonly associated with the radio industry as to how radio markets should be defined. Thus, to choose one reference source over another would not necessarily impart a more universally accepted degree of accuracy to the market definition process.

- **Arbitron Markets versus Nielsen Markets**

On a related issue, it should be stressed that Arbitron radio markets are intrinsically different from Nielsen television markets. Nielsen Media Research uses the Designated Market Area (DMA) to define the primary television market for a geographic area. DMAs are comprised of groups of individual counties, with each county in the continental U. S. assigned to a specific DMA based on viewing patterns within the county (as determined by Nielsen's audience measurement services).⁹ Each county in the United States is assigned to one, and only one, DMA; likewise, each station is located in a specific DMA. It is significant to note that because DMAs are defined exclusively on the measured viewing patterns within counties, they are not affected by the preferences of local stations. This stands in contrast to the situation with radio, where, as noted earlier, stations can play a role in defining an Arbitron Metro area.

Arbitron markets are not nearly as all-encompassing, nor as geographically centered, as are Nielsen DMAs. This is partly because of the relatively greater geographic dispersion of radio stations throughout the country compared to television stations. One specific area of difference between Arbitron and Nielsen markets is Arbitron's concept of the "Embedded Market," in which some counties and county groupings actually serve more than one market. For example, because the San Jose Arbitron market is embedded in the San Francisco market, certain stations are considered to be "home to the Metro area" in both San Jose and San Francisco. Similar situations exist in Arbitron's Nassau-Suffolk, New Bedford-Fall River, and Frederick, Maryland

⁹ See Nielsen Station Index *Reference Supplement 1999-2000*, pp. 8-11, for a full description of the DMA assignment process.

markets (which are embedded in the New York, Providence, and Washington, DC markets, respectively), to cite a few examples. In fact, two of the five new Arbitron markets added effective with the Fall 2000 survey period (Middlesex-Somerset-Union, NJ and Westchester, NY) are embedded markets as well.

While every television station is located in a specific Nielsen DMA, not all radio stations in the U. S. are located within an Arbitron market. The Commission notes in its *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* that nearly 80 percent of the U. S. population is located in an Arbitron market.¹⁰ However, it is also vital to recognize that approximately 50 percent of all U. S. radio stations are not located in an Arbitron market.¹¹ Therefore, to adopt the proposal to use Arbitron-defined markets would leave the present situation unchanged for about half of all radio stations. It also would add a new layer of complexity to determining market definitions because it would create a mix of market definition methods—with many stations falling within markets defined by Arbitron, while just as many others would be in markets determined by some other means—that does not currently exist.

- **Problems Associated with the Use of the Arbitron “Metro” Concept**

The Commission’s *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* suggests the use of the “Arbitron radio metro market definition” in determining the number of stations that serve

¹⁰ NPRM, Paragraph 10.

¹¹ According to the BIA’s Media Access Pro database, 2/13/01. BIA defines a station as being located within an Arbitron market if it is licensed to a community that is geographically located within the counties that comprise the market. See *BIA Radio Yearbook 2000*, p. vii.

a particular market.¹² It should be noted that the Metro is the most restrictive of Arbitron's market definitions, and is itself a rather slippery concept that could be interpreted in a number of different ways. Some of these differing interpretations and their possible consequences for the Commission's proposed use of metro market definitions are discussed in the following sections.

- **Defined as Stations Located within Distinct Geographic Boundaries**

Arbitron metro markets generally consist of a group of counties. One way in which to interpret the Commission's proposal could be to include only those stations that are physically located within the geographic boundaries of the metro counties. While the simplicity of such an approach has a certain appeal, it is seriously flawed in other ways. For instance, this interpretation fails to take into account the roles of any other stations that are located outside the market's confines in the competition and diversity that exists within the metro. Arbitron metros can, in fact, include stations from counties that are located outside the geographic confines of the market, if the station identifies itself as within the market and formally requests that Arbitron include it in that market's *Radio Market Report*.¹³

Also, the use of a strict geographic criterion by which to determine those stations that serve a metro fails to recognize the important role that other stations outside the metro might play in the market. For instance, each Arbitron *Radio Market Report* includes listening information for those qualifying stations that meet Arbitron's minimum reporting criteria. While some of these stations are indeed located within the market's

¹² See NPRM, Paragraph 10.

¹³ Arbitron *Description of Methodology*, p. 8.3.

metro area, it is almost always the case that other listed stations (and sometimes a majority of the stations included in the book) are located outside the home metro. For instance, the Spring 2000 *Radio Market Report* for the Reading, Pennsylvania market includes not only the five stations that are considered “home” to the Reading metro, but also an additional 30 stations that are located outside the metro but are eligible to be reported within the Reading market. In such an instance, would the Commission consider the Reading market to have only five “voices,” using this interpretation of the Arbitron metro as its basis for evaluation?

It should be recognized that this situation in Reading is hardly a unique circumstance. In the Spring 2000 survey period, more than 75 Arbitron *Radio Market Reports* included a greater number of “out of market” stations than “home to Metro” stations. It also should be noted that, on average, 27 percent of a market’s total listening is devoted to out-of-market and non-commercial stations,¹⁴ neither of which would be considered under this type of an Arbitron metro definition. Given these facts, it seems clear that to use a purely location-based Arbitron metro approach is not an appropriate means through which to measure the diversity of voices that exists within most radio markets.

○ **Defined as Stations that Arbitron Considers as “Home to Metro”**

A second possible interpretation of a Metro is to consider it to be comprised of those stations that Arbitron treats as “home to the metro.” This would include not only those stations that are physically located within the counties that make up the market, but

¹⁴ *BIA Radio Yearbook 2000*, p. vii.

also those stations that, as mentioned in the prior section, petition Arbitron to be included in the market. But this approach could confuse the situation even more. Because Arbitron requires a station to affirmatively request that it be included in a market in which it otherwise would not be considered, two seemingly identical stations could be treated differently for the purpose of determining the number of stations owned in the market, if one station owner had requested that its station be included in the metro while the other had not. Thus, this approach could easily undermine the goals of consistency and equity in the application of the rules.

- **Defined as “Arbitron-Rated” Stations within the Metro**

If one considers the metro to include all those stations for which Arbitron reports listening within the market, this would solve the problem of accounting for those stations that, while located outside the geographic confines of the market, nevertheless play important roles in contributing to the competition and diversity that exists within the market. But it would create many new problems in its own right, some of which relate directly to the policies Arbitron employs to determine which stations to include in its *Radio Market Reports* (and which again highlight that the purpose for which Arbitron data are intended and the purpose for which the Commission proposes to use this information are incongruous). Some of the most notable of these problems are discussed in the following section.

- **Policies for Station Inclusions/Exclusions in Arbitron Markets**

A crucial problem with using any type of Arbitron ratings-based data for the purpose of defining radio markets is that Arbitron policies allow for the reporting of only a limited subset of stations within a geographic area that meet certain Arbitron-defined criteria. Again, it is somewhat unclear from the Commission's recent *Notice* whether it is suggesting that only Arbitron-rated stations within a Metro market be considered.¹⁵ If this is indeed what the Commission suggests, additional sets of problems arise concerning how Arbitron determines whether to include (or exclude) a station in its ratings books. Some of the standards Arbitron uses in making these determinations are discussed in detail below.

- **Station Reporting Criteria**

Arbitron employs a "Minimum Reporting Standard" threshold to determine whether or not audience estimates for an individual radio station will be included in a *Radio Market Report*. Specifically, a commercial radio station that does not simulcast its signal¹⁶ is eligible to be reported in an Arbitron *Radio Market Report* only if it meets the following standards within the Metro among Persons 12+ during the Monday-Sunday 6 a.m.-Midnight daypart:

- a) The station must have received five or more minutes of listening in a quarter-hour in at least 10 Metro in-tab diaries; and

¹⁵ This was the case with the Commission's similar 1992 proposal to utilize Arbitron markets in applying its ownership restrictions, and the subject is revisited in footnote 18 of the current *Notice*.

¹⁶ Stations that simulcast their signals are subject to a different, yet similarly structured, set of criteria.

- b) The station must have a Metro Cume rating of 0.495 or greater; and
- c) The station must have a Metro Average Quarter-Hour rating of 0.05 or greater for the time the station is on the air during the Monday-Sunday 6 a.m. - Midnight daypart.¹⁷

In other words, Arbitron includes only those stations in its reports that achieve specific levels of listening, according to the diary entries of those survey participants who return diaries to Arbitron. This fact raises a host of problematic issues. For instance, Arbitron employs a diary-based survey technique to measure audiences. Any such sampling methodology includes a certain amount of error, even if the survey is conducted in a flawless manner; the results are labeled as “estimates” for this very reason. And, as a practical matter, no survey such as Arbitron’s can be conducted in a perfect manner. For instance, Arbitron uses a telephone frame sample, which means that households without a telephone have no chance of being selected for inclusion, which adds an additional degree of uncertainty to the “standard error” that is inherent to all survey research. So it is very possible that certain stations might be included in a *Radio Market Report* in a particular survey period, while others might be excluded, simply on the basis of the margin of error associated with the survey measurement instrument itself. Thus, to use the information obtained from this survey to definitively determine the number of stations that serve a market is fundamentally unsound.

¹⁷ Arbitron *Description of Methodology*, p. 8.1.

- **Arbitron's Different Survey Techniques**

In a related vein, it is important to recognize that Arbitron does not treat all markets equally in terms of the survey methodologies it employs for each. Arbitron markets are hierarchical in nature, with “Continuous Measurement” markets surveyed extensively in four different survey periods, covering 48 weeks, per year¹⁸; “Standard Markets” are measured twice each year (in Spring and Fall); and “Condensed Markets” are measured twice each year as well, although in a more limited fashion than are Standard Markets.¹⁹ Thus, the degree of error attributable to the survey methods themselves can differ from market to market, based on the specific methodology used in each instance. Attachment 1 of this report provides a list of all Arbitron markets, an indication for each as to whether it is a “Condensed,” “Standard,” or “Continuous Measurement” market, and the frequency with which each market is measured by Arbitron.

In addition, Arbitron's use of the Minimum Reporting Standards criteria means that stations with light listening, such as those whose programming is narrowly tailored to small, discrete audience segments, are less likely to be included in a *Radio Market Report* than are those stations with programming that attracts larger audiences. Yet it seems clear that these niche stations represent distinct voices that should be considered in any

¹⁸ It should be noted here that only the Metro counties of Continuous Measurement markets are surveyed in Summer and Winter. In Spring and Fall, Metro counties, adjacent counties, and other counties outside the Metro are surveyed. This difference in approach can affect the number of stations that meet Arbitron's Minimum Reporting Standards criteria in each survey period, and thus, the number of stations that are included in each survey period's report.

¹⁹ Arbitron uses smaller in-tab samples in Condensed Markets, which generally means there is a reduction in the reliability of the resulting estimates.

evaluation of the number of stations that serve the market. Reliance on Arbitron could fail to capture the important value of stations such as these.

- **Regular Fluctuations in the Number of Stations Reported by Arbitron**

For the aforementioned reasons and others, the number of radio stations listed in any particular *Arbitron Radio Market Report* tends to vary from survey period to survey period. With the Commission's proposed use of this information in mind, the following table illustrates how these regular fluctuations in the number of metro stations reported in selected markets could alter the ownership tiers under which each of these markets would be considered.

**Number of Metro Stations Reported
Spring 2000, Summer 2000, and Fall 2000 Survey Periods**

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Market</u>	<u>Spring 2000</u>	<u>Summer 2000</u>	<u>Fall 2000</u>
8.	Boston	28	30	30
14.	Seattle-Tacoma	29	28	30
18.	Nassau-Suffolk	14	17	18
21.	Tampa-St. Petersburg	29	29	31
23.	Denver-Boulder	31	28	28
44.	Nashville	31	28	29
74.	Albuquerque	29	31	31
82.	Springfield, MA	15	14	16

In each of the above markets, the ownership tier under which the market would fall changes, depending upon the number of stations included in the *Arbitron Radio Market Report* for that particular survey period. It is clear that the use of such a shifting standard would not enhance the consistent and certain application of the FCC's multiple ownership rules.

- **Station Licensing Criteria**

Arbitron also has specific criteria pertaining to station licenses that it considers in its decisions to report listening estimates for a station, regardless of whether it meets the Minimum Reporting Standards. Only FCC-licensed commercial radio stations are reported in Arbitron *Radio Market Reports*.²⁰ In addition, Arbitron does report audience estimates for foreign-licensed commercial radio stations in those markets where their listening qualifies under the Minimum Reporting Standards criteria (this is common in markets near or adjacent to Mexico and Canada).

Also, with the advent of streamed radio broadcasts available over the Internet, it should be noted that Arbitron's current policies allow for the reporting of streamed radio stations in any *Radio Market Report*, as long as the originating source is a licensed commercial radio station. Thus, should such broadcasts continue to increase in popularity among listeners, it is entirely conceivable that the Arbitron *Radio Market Report* for any particular market could include streamed stations from all geographic areas of the United States, or even from areas far outside the U. S., as long as these are commercially licensed radio broadcasters.

- **Arbitron as Unilateral Arbiter**

One other issue to consider here concerns Arbitron's ability to unilaterally exclude stations from its reports that would otherwise qualify for inclusion under its existing reporting standards. Arbitron retains the right to withhold listening estimates for a station for any number of causes. For instance, all *Radio Market Reports* include a

²⁰ All non-commercial stations, which unquestionably add a significant amount of diversity to many radio markets, are excluded under Arbitron's definition.

section titled “Rating Distortion/Rating Bias Policies and Procedures.” This area includes information on the possible consequences to those stations that engage in activities designed to influence or inflate listening estimates through the use of any number of inappropriate methods, such as airing station promotions that specifically target Arbitron diary keepers. As is stated in this section of the *Radio Market Report*, “Arbitron may delist from its reports, computer media, and other services the call letters and audience estimates of any station determined by Arbitron to have engaged in activities with rating distortion potential.”²¹ While the industry generally recognizes the legitimacy of Arbitron’s need to retain ultimate authority in these matters, the Commission clearly should be cautious in relying upon Arbitron station listings to determine the number of stations in a market. Arbitron’s ultimate authority to “delist” stations once again highlights why Arbitron information is inherently unsuited for the regulatory purpose proposed by the Commission.

Summary

In sum, Arbitron’s radio audience reports are specifically designed as a means through which buyers and sellers can reach agreement on the relative value of radio airtime in the commercial marketplace. They have significant value to the industry in this context, and The Arbitron Company takes great care to ensure that the information it provides to its clients can soundly meet this singular goal. But the application of Arbitron data to other, unrelated purposes—such as defining radio markets and determining the levels of competition and diversity that exist within them—uses this

²¹ See Arbitron’s Spring 2000 New York *Radio Market Report*, p. 12, for an example of this section.

information in ways for which it is poorly suited. For the reasons discussed throughout this report, Arbitron information was never intended to serve the specific use the Commission proposes, and to attempt to adapt it for these regulatory purposes is clearly inappropriate.

METRO RANK	MARKET	WINTER 00	SPRING 00	FALL 00	METRO RANK	MARKET	WINTER 00	SPRING 00	FALL 00	METRO RANK	MARKET	WINTER 00	SPRING 00	FALL 00
227	Abilene, TX	C	C	C	89	Gainesville-Ocala	C	C	C	124	Pensacola	C	C	C
71	Akron	C	C	C	271	Grand Forks, ND-MN	C	C	C	141	Peoria	C	C	C
258	Albany, GA	C	C	C	255	Grand Junction, CO	C	C	C	5	Philadelphia	C	C	C
61	Albany-Schenectady-Troy	C	C	C	66	Grand Rapids	C	C	C	15	Phoenix	C	C	C
74	Albuquerque	C	C	C	280	Great Falls, MT	C	C	C	22	Pittsburgh	C	C	C
207	Alexandria, LA	C	C	C	185	Green Bay	C	C	C	163	Portland, ME	C	C	C
69	Allentown-Bethlehem	C	C	C	43	Greensboro-Winston Salem-High Point	C	C	C	25	Portland, OR	C	C	C
250	Altoona	C	C	C	83	Greenville-New Bern-Jacksonville	C	C	C	119	Portsmouth-Dover-Rochester	C	C	C
189	Amarillo, TX	C	C	C	60	Greenville-Spartanburg	C	C	C	159	Poughkeepsie, NY	C	C	C
168	Anchorage	C	C	C	164	Hagerstown-Chambersburg-Waynesboro, MD-PA	C	C	C	35	Providence-Warwick-Pawtucket	C	C	C
146	Ann Arbor	C	C	C	79	Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle	C	C	C	243	Pueblo	C	C	C
136	Appleton-Oshkosh	C	C	C	263	Harrisburg, VA	C	C	C	13	Puerto Rico	C	C	C
182	Asheville	C	C	C	46	Hartford-New Britain-Middletown	C	C	C	135	Quad Cities (Davenport-Rock Island-Moline)	C	C	C
11	Atlanta	C	C	C	63	Honolulu	C	C	C	48	Raleigh-Durham	C	C	C
140	Atlantic City-Cape May	C	C	C	10	Houston-Galveston	C	C	C	263	Rapid City, SD	C	C	C
116	Augusta, GA	C	C	C	148	Huntington-Ashland	C	C	C	133	Reading, PA	C	C	C
257	Augusta-Waterville, ME	C	C	C	111	Huntsville	C	C	C	221	Redding, CA	C	C	C
47	Austin	C	C	C	40	Indianapolis	C	C	C	128	Reno	C	C	C
91	Bakersfield	C	C	C	268	Ithaca, NY	C	C	C	58	Richmond	C	C	C
20	Baltimore	C	C	C	121	Jackson, MS	C	C	C	29	Riverside-San Bernardino	C	C	C
274	Bangor, ME	C	C	C	273	Jackson, TN	C	C	C	109	Roanoke-Lynchburg	C	C	C
84	Baton Rouge	C	C	C	52	Jacksonville	C	C	C	228	Rochester, MN	C	C	C
242	Battle Creek, MI	C	C	C	99	Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol	C	C	C	53	Rochester, NY	C	C	C
130	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	C	C	C	176	Johnstown	C	C	C	150	Rockford	C	C	C
276	Beckley, WV	C	C	C	278	Jonesboro, AR	C	C	C	27	Sacramento	C	C	C
251	Billings, MT	C	C	C	230	Joplin, MO	C	C	C	127	Saginaw-Bay City-Midland	C	C	C
137	Biloxi-Gulfport-Pascagoula, MS	C	C	C	178	Kalamazoo	C	C	C	217	St. Cloud, MN	C	C	C
170	Binghamton	C	C	C	30	Kansas City	C	C	C	248	St. George-Cedar City, UT	C	C	C
57	Birmingham	C	C	C	151	Killeen-Temple, TX	C	C	C	19	St. Louis	C	C	C
270	Bismarck, ND	C	C	C	70	Knoxville	C	C	C	152	Salisbury-Ocean City	C	C	C
216	Blacksburg-Christiansburg-Radford-Pulaski, VA	C	C	C	237	Lafayette, IN	C	C	C	36	Salt Lake City-Ogden-Provo	C	C	C
234	Bloomington	C	C	C	102	Lafayette, LA	C	C	C	265	San Angelo, TX	C	C	C
260	Bluefield, WV	C	C	C	213	Lake Charles, LA	C	C	C	32	San Antonio	C	C	C
125	Boise	C	C	C	98	Lakeland-Winter Haven	C	C	C	16	San Diego	C	C	C
8	Boston	C	C	C	112	Lancaster	C	C	C	4	San Francisco	C	C	C
206	Bowling Green, KY	C	C	C	117	Lansing-East Lansing	C	C	C	28	San Jose	C	C	C
115	Bridgeport	C	C	C	202	Laredo, TX	C	C	C	169	San Luis Obispo, CA	C	C	C
282	Brunswick, GA	C	C	C	39	Las Vegas	C	C	C	188	Santa Barbara, CA	C	C	C
235	Bryan-College Station, TX	C	C	C	212	Laurel-Hattiesburg, MS	C	C	C	239	Santa Fe, NM	C	C	C
50	Buffalo-Niagara Falls	C	C	C	266	Lawton, OK	C	C	C	195	Santa Maria-Lompoc, CA	C	C	C
229	Burlington, VT	C	C	C	267	Lewiston-Auburn, ME	C	C	C	114	Santa Rosa	C	C	C
126	Canton	C	C	C	106	Lexington-Fayette	C	C	C	80	Sarasota-Bradenton	C	C	C
183	Cape Cod, MA	C	C	C	232	Lima, OH	C	C	C	157	Savannah	C	C	C
283	Casper, WY	C	C	C	173	Lincoln	C	C	C	14	Seattle-Tacoma	C	C	C
205	Cedar Rapids	C	C	C	85	Little Rock	C	C	C	275	Sebring, FL	C	C	C
215	Champaign, IL	C	C	C	2	Los Angeles	C	C	C	134	Shreveport	C	C	C
86	Charleston, SC	C	C	C	54	Louisville	C	C	C	254	Sioux City, IA	C	C	C
166	Charleston, WV	C	C	C	180	Lubbock	C	C	C	211	Sioux Falls	C	C	C
37	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill	C	C	C	149	Macon	C	C	C	165	South Bend	C	C	C
224	Charlottesville, VA	C	C	C	122	Madison	C	C	C	94	Spokane	C	C	C
107	Chattanooga	C	C	C	187	Manchester	C	C	C	200	Springfield, IL	C	C	C
279	Cheyenne, WY	C	C	C	260	Mankato-New Ulm-St. Peter, MN	C	C	C	82	Springfield, MA	C	C	C
3	Chicago	C	C	C	219	Marion-Carbondale (Southern Illinois)	C	C	C	147	Springfield, MO	C	C	C
195	Chico, CA	C	C	C	277	Mason City, IA	C	C	C	138	Stamford-Norwalk, CT	C	C	C
26	Cincinnati	C	C	C	65	McAllen-Brownsville-Harlingen	C	C	C	245	State College, PA	C	C	C
199	Clarksville-Hopkinsville, TN-KY	C	C	C	209	Medford-Ashtland, OR	C	C	C	87	Stockton	C	C	C
24	Cleveland	C	C	C	97	Melbourne-Titusville-Cocoa	C	C	C	240	Sussex, NJ	C	C	C
96	Colorado Springs	C	C	C	45	Memphis	C	C	C	78	Syracuse	C	C	C
249	Columbia, MO	C	C	C	190	Merced, CA	C	C	C	162	Tallahassee	C	C	C
93	Columbia, SC	C	C	C	281	Meridian, MS	C	C	C	21	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater	C	C	C
174	Columbus, GA	C	C	C	12	Miami-Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood	C	C	C	193	Terre Haute	C	C	C
34	Columbus, OH	C	C	C	33	Middlesex-Somerset-Union	C	C	C	252	Texarkana, TX-AR	C	C	C
253	Columbus-Starkville-West Point, MS	C	C	C	31	Milwaukee-Racine	C	C	C	81	Toledo	C	C	C
269	Cookeville, TN	C	C	C	17	Minneapolis-St. Paul	C	C	C	184	Topeka	C	C	C
132	Corpus Christi	C	C	C	90	Mobile	C	C	C	198	Traverse City-Petoskey, MI	C	C	C
6	Dallas-Ft. Worth	C	C	C	123	Modesto	C	C	C	139	Trenton, NJ	C	C	C
191	Danbury, CT	C	C	C	49	Monmouth-Ocean	C	C	C	210	Tri-Cities, WA (Richland-Kennewick-Pasco)	C	C	C
56	Dayton	C	C	C	238	Monroe, LA	C	C	C	62	Tucson	C	C	C
95	Daytona Beach	C	C	C	77	Monterey-Salinas-Santa Cruz	C	C	C	64	Tulsa	C	C	C
259	Decatur, IL	C	C	C	145	Montgomery	C	C	C	181	Tupelo, MS	C	C	C
23	Denver-Boulder	C	C	C	192	Morganstown-Clarksburg-Fairmont, WV	C	C	C	218	Tuscaloosa, AL	C	C	C
92	Des Moines	C	C	C	100	Morristown, NJ	C	C	C	143	Tyler-Longview, TX	C	C	C
23	Des Moines	C	C	C	220	Muskegon, MI	C	C	C	154	Utica-Rome	C	C	C
7	Detroit	C	C	C	175	Myrtle Beach, SC	C	C	C	108	Visalia-Tulare-Hanford	C	C	C
186	Dothan, AL	C	C	C	44	Nashville	C	C	C	197	Waco, TX	C	C	C
225	Dubuque, IA	C	C	C	18	Nassau-Suffolk (Long Island)	C	C	C	9	Washington, DC	C	C	C
222	Duluth-Superior	C	C	C	167	New Bedford-Fall River, MA	C	C	C	241	Waterloo-Cedar Falls	C	C	C
236	Eau Claire, WI	C	C	C	101	New Haven	C	C	C	262	Watertown, NY	C	C	C
244	Elizabeth City-Nags Head, NC	C	C	C	171	New London, CT	C	C	C	161	Wausau-Stevens Point, WI (Central WI)	C	C	C
204	Elmira-Corning, NY	C	C	C	42	New Orleans	C	C	C	51	West Palm Beach-Boca Raton	C	C	C
73	El Paso	C	C	C	1	New York	C	C	C	59	Westchester	C	C	C
160	Erie	C	C	C	142	Newburgh-Middletown, NY (Mid-Hudson Valley)	C	C	C	226	Wheeling	C	C	C
144	Eugene-Springfield	C	C	C	38	Norfolk-Virginia Beach-Newport News	C	C	C	88	Wichita	C	C	C
156	Evansville	C	C	C	179	Odessa-Midland, TX	C	C	C	247	Wichita Falls, TX	C	C	C
214	Fargo-Moorhead	C	C	C	55	Oklahoma City	C	C	C	68	Wilkes-Barre-Scranton	C	C	C
129	Fayetteville, NC	C	C	C	75	Omaha-Council Bluffs	C	C	C	256	Williamsport, PA	C	C	C
155	Fayetteville (Northwest Arkansas)	C	C	C	41	Orlando	C	C	C	76	Wilmington, DE	C	C	C
158	Flagstaff-Prescott, AZ	C	C	C	272	Owensboro, KY	C	C	C	177	Wilmington, NC	C	C	C
120	Flint	C	C	C	113	Oxnard-Ventura	C	C	C	223	Winchester, VA	C	C	C
203	Florence, SC	C	C	C	153	Palm Springs, CA	C	C	C	110	Worcester	C	C	C
246	Florence-Muscle Shoals, AL	C	C	C	231	Panama City, FL	C	C	C	194	Yakima, WA	C	C	C
131	Ft. Collins-Greeley, CO	C	C	C	233	Parkersburg-Marietta, WV-OH	C	C	C	105	York	C	C	C
72	Ft. Myers-Naples-Marco Island	C	C	C						104	Youngstown-Warren	C	C	C
118	Ft. Pierce-Stuart-Vero Beach	C	C	C										
172	Ft. Smith, AR	C	C	C										
208	Ft. Walton Beach, FL	C	C	C										
103	Fl. Wayne	C	C	C										
201	Frederick, MD	C	C	C										
67	Fresno	C	C	C										

NOTE/Metro ranks listed above are based on Fall 2000 market definitions. The survey frequency of some markets may change.



■ — denotes Continuous Measurement Markets
 ● — denotes Standard Radio Market Report
 C — denotes Condensed Radio Market Report