

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL **COPY**

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. **RECEIVED**

DEC 03 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of:)
)
Cross-Ownership of Broadcast)
Stations and Newspapers)
)
Newspaper/Radio Cross-Ownership)
Waiver Policy)

MM Docket No. 01-235 /

MM Docket No. 96-197

COMMENTS OF MEDIA GENERAL, INC.

(Volume 1: Comments and Appendices 1 – 8)

John R. Feore, Jr.
Michael D. Hays
M. Anne Swanson
Scott D. Dailard
Kevin P. Latek

Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, PLLC
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 776-2000

December 3, 2001

Table of Contents

Volume 1

Summary

v

- I. The Media General Experience: Common Ownership of Newspaper and Broadcast Television Outlets in the Same Market Creates Tangible Public Interest Benefits. 3
 - A. Media General Has Built on Its Long-Standing Mission of Disseminating Information in Local Markets To Become One of the Nation's Leading Practitioners of Convergence. 3
 - B. Media General's Experience in Its Specific Convergence Markets Demonstrates That Common Ownership Yields Tangible Public Interest Benefits.6
 - C. The Size of the Market Is Irrelevant for Convergence, and Media General's Efforts in Its Smaller Markets Are Producing the Same Types of Benefits. 9
 - D. Quantitative Program Studies Demonstrate That Converged Properties Deliver Increased Non-Entertainment Programming. 11
 - E. Convergence Is More Effectively Achieved Through Common Ownership.13
- II. Media Diversity Has Materialized Over the Last Quarter Century, and Removing the Ban Will Have No Adverse Effect on Viewpoint Diversity. 18
 - A. In 1975, the Commission Based Adoption of the Rule on Sheer Speculation That It Would Foster Diversity Rather Than in Response to Any Demonstrable Showing of Harm to Diversity from Common Ownership. 18
 - B. Since 1975, the Media Marketplace Has Experienced an Explosive Growth in Diversity; the Availability of a Wide Variety of Outlets and Owners in Media General's Converged Markets Reflects This Increase. 19
 - C. Locally Established Internet Sites Create a Substitute for Local Newspapers and Offer a Very Inexpensive and Quick Method for Reaching Consumers in Every Market with General Interest as Well as Specialized Niche Information. 26
 - D. Media General's Experience in Operating Co-Owned Newspapers and Television Stations as Well as FCC Precedent Addressing Structural Ownership Regulations Show That There Is No Correlation Between Common Ownership and Any Loss in Diversity of Viewpoint. 30
 - 1. Second Report and Order. 30
 - 2. FCC Precedent. 31
 - 3. Real World Experiences. 34
 - E. The FCC's Concern Over the Effect Newspaper-Broadcast Ownership May Have on Diversity Is Misplaced and, in Any Event, Cannot Be Measured. 36

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(continued)

	Page
1. The Ban on Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Is Inconsistent with Broadcasters' Acquisitions of Unregulated Assets Related to Broadcasting or Licenses for Other Parts of the Non-Broadcast Spectrum.	36
2. The FCC Lacks a Valid Method for Measuring Diversity.	38
III. Repealing the Archaic Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Ban Would Not Harm Competition in Local Markets.	42
A. The FCC Has No Evidence of a Competitive Problem.	42
B. The Lack of Definitive Empirical Data and The Fact-Specific Nature of the Market Definition Process Make Development of Consistent Product and Geographic Market Definitions To Achieve in the Rulemaking Context.	46
C. If a Competitive Problem Were Ever To Develop, the Federal Antitrust Agencies as Well as State Antitrust Authorities Have the Expertise, Procedures and Willingness To Address the Problem.	52
D. Any Concern Over Competitive Harm Is Assuaged by the Operational Synergies and Other Benefits Derived from Convergence.	56
IV. The 1996 Telecommunications Act Sets a High Standard of Proof for Retention of the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Ban and Places That Burden Squarely on the Commission.	58
V. Fundamental Principles of Administrative Law Require Repeal of the Cross-Ownership Ban.	60
VI. The Rule Violates the First Amendment and Equal Protection Clause and Must Be Repealed.	66
A. Spectrum Scarcity No Longer Exists and Cannot Serve as the Basis for a Diminished Standard of First Amendment Protection for Broadcast Licensees.	66
B. The Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Ban Cannot Survive Either Strict or Intermediate First Amendment Scrutiny.	72
C. Equal Protection Considerations Also Mandate That the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Ban Be Abolished	76
VII. The Ban Cannot Be Retained, Regardless of Market Size.	80
VIII. Conclusion.	86

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Page

- Appendix 1 Television Stations Owned by Media General, Inc.
- Appendix 2 Daily Newspapers Owned by Media General, Inc.
- Appendix 3 Selected Articles Concerning Media General's Convergence Efforts in Tampa
- Appendix 4 James K. Gentry, Ph.D., *The Public Benefits Achievable from Eliminating the FCC's Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule*, Dec. 2001.
- Appendix 5 Samuel Robert Lichter, Ph.D., *Review of the Increases in Non-Entertainment Programming Provided in Markets with Newspaper-Owned Television Stations*, Dec. 2001.
- Appendix 6 Temporal Comparison of Television Stations and Cable Penetration (1975 to 2000).
- Appendix 7A Temporal Comparison of Radio Stations and Cable Penetration (1975 to 2000).
- Appendix 7B Temporal Comparison of Radio Stations and Cable Penetration (1994 to 2000).
- Appendix 8 Percent of Households with Computers and Internet Access, by State. 2000.

Volume 2

- Appendix 9 Availability of Media Outlets in the Tampa/St. Petersburg, Florida, DMA.
- Appendix 10 Availability of Media Outlets in the Roanoke-Lynchburg, Virginia, DMA.
- Appendix 11 Availability of Media Outlets in the Tri-Cities, Tennessee/Virginia, DMA.
- Appendix 12 Availability of Media Outlets in the Florence-Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, DMA.
- Appendix 13 Availability of Media Outlets in the Columbus, Georgia, DMA.
- Appendix 14 Availability of Media Outlets in the Panama City, Florida, DMA.