

02-277

From: Mary Werenger Warbasse
To: Mike Powell
Date: 1/31/03 3:34AM
Subject: hearings

EX PARTE QR LATE FILED

I am against allowing one corporation to own more stations than the current limit. It is one of the largest threats to democracy and free speech in our time. As an individual who has sought to get information into the hands of the public concerning government services at times, I have found that media owners have a great deal of power.

The only reason I was able to get on any radio station was that my husband at the time was the **sales** manager. No other media in the area, including the newspaper, was willing to publish or broadcast information regarding the local Headstart program!

When I worked for the HUD program under the Regan administration, I faced the same difficulty in another much larger town. The station ownership from one to another responded very differently to my requests. These individuals are very powerful people. They control what we know about our country. Huge conglomerates endanger our freedom and serve to deny the little guy the opportunity to be heard.

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

From: Kathy Hill
To: Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Mar 4, 2003 11:20 PM
Subject: Democracy over corporate efficiencies (PNW hearing comment)

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

Dear Commissioners Michael J. Copps, Jonathan S. Adelstein and the FCC.

Thank you for holding hearings in Seattle about proposed changes in FCC rules governing media consolidation.

As a lifelong resident of the Pacific Northwest and a citizen who depends on the news media to provide investigative reporting on issues that affect my voting, I urge you to fashion rules that enhance democracy and not corporate efficiencies, that will oppose media consolidation and further limit concentration of media ownership. We cannot trust corporations to do what is best for our democracy. A diverse and independent media is needed to keep our country and economy strong.

I worked for Ma Bell through its 1984 breakup: Phone company efficiencies were not the primary concern in that case, nor should business efficiencies be a primary concern with the media.

I live in Spokane, a city where owners of the only local daily newspaper (and a TV/radio station) are in hot water over a parking garage business deal they made with the city that is affecting local taxes and the city's ability to fund services. Without the independent media outlets we have here and a few very brave independent reporters, my neighbors and I would have gotten little if any unbiased information about the deal. The daily newspaper already has bought the local business weekly. In Spokane, advertisers have been manipulated by media sales persons pushing exclusivity agreements. I go to foreign media sources to find out what the US is doing when I should be able to trust our national media to report with full disclosure.

And when it comes to entertainment value, the Muzak approach offered by media conglomerates undermines innovation and variety. Local college stations that played alternative music have shut down or can't expand their tiny range in Spokane. Thank goodness we have public radio, but government funding too frequently is under political attack.

I urge you and the other commissioners to protect media diversity, investigative reporting (not reporting that depends on handouts that compromise media integrity), and democracy (not *laissez faire* market economics). Government needs to actively watchdog the media; do not allow the fox to guard the hen house.

Thank you for requesting community comment.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hill

Spokane WA

MSN 8 with e-mail virus protection service: 2 months FREE*

CC: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB

From: Drew Spencer
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/31/03 5:03PM
Subject: Please protect choice in American Media

Members of the FCC.

I recently read several articles that alluded to your "loosening" of the restrictions placed on American Media companies' ability to monopolize local markets. This concerns me as an individual that chooses to support several smaller local newspapers, radio stations and television stations who are already fast losing their small holds in their respective markets.

The things I've read you intend to do place all Americans at a disadvantage and infringes on our right and ability to be exposed to all aspects of the American diaspora. I hope that you will take my message to you as a plea for protecting independent viewpoints and the opportunity for all Americans to broadcast their opinion.

Kind regards,
Andrew Spencer
Los Angeles, CA
drew@tsakemo.com

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: murielw
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/5/03 1:57PM
Subject: Mergers of MEdia Companies

Dear Commissioner Powell:
Please control the present laws that limit the mergers of media companies. Thank you. Muriel Wernor, Los Angeles, Calif.

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

From: Victor W Pickard
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/5/03 10:41PM
Subject: Public hearings in Seattle

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

I recently learned of the upcoming University of Washington public hearing being held concerning your plans for media ownership deregulation. I hope you plan on attending. I understand your predicament -- that you tried hard to prevent your plans (and your sponsors' plans) from being publicly deliberated. But as a protector of the public interest (I know --you don't really believe in such an antiquated notion) your presence at the hearing is needed. We have a few questions for you. Perhaps you can explain to **us** -- with a straight face -- how a Clear Channel scenario for newspapers and television stations will actually benefit consumers, media diversity and U.S. democracy. Maybe you could clarify for **us** your thinking on this **issue**.

I know you don't really believe in the public interest. But do you care about the way history remembers you?

I truly hope you have a change of heart. You could either be remembered as the one who helped turn our national media system into a monopolistic system --at a time when we need a plurality of voices more than ever -- or you can be remembered as someone who helped defend our democracy.

The choice is yours

I hope to **see** you in Seattle

Sincerely,
Victor Pickard

CC: Kathleen Abernathy

From: Rgodfrey22@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/9/03 10:13AM
Subject: why not just change the name of FCC to "clear channel"?

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Since they own and control the public airwaves, i.e. six radio channels in North Dakota.

The FCC is supposed to encourage radio that supports the public interest. How does Clear Channel do this? They do not cover important local news. They do not allow individuals to have a voice, and discuss and debate ideas. They do not promote a range of artists. It's now accepted that Clear Channel is more important to the FCC than listeners, so why not just let them run your office?

RECEIVED

From: Mike and Sue Ziegler
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/10/03 8:13PM
Subject: Debate on altering rules concerning concentration protections

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am writing to express my concern that proposals to remove or seriously modify existing protections against undue concentration of control of media are not being publicly debated. I believe that such changes will seriously undermine free debate in this country, and wish to see any proposed changes discussed and debated in Congress. I strongly oppose measures which would result in a substantial decrease in the diversity of media coverage and opinion that is available. Concentration of control in fewer and larger corporate interests is not in the public interest, and the public and its elected representatives must be allowed to hear the arguments and join the debate.

Suzanne Ziegler
Oakland, California

CC: Michael Copps

RECEIVED

From: Roy Sandgren
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/11/03 2:21 PM
Subject: Communityradio

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Friend,
congratulations to the job as a chairman of FCC. You are right about the ownership in radio and TV.
It has to be splitted up into more local ownership and independed from multicompanies and other groups
Here in sweden we do have communityradio but on FM only.
Coverage is a municipality and blockprograms. commercials legal.
I'm fighting to even open the am to communityradio.
In your country is part 15 am of 100mw, I'm recomending an icreasing power to 10 watts. More power ro
reach more local listners and small buissniess can afford to by commercials.
If i want to open up a radiostation in swedish in the LA area, can it be a powerful communityradio???
My proposal is part 15 am increased to 10 watts, that's a minimum.

Hope by this letter you will understand my english well.
Positive, have after more than 60 years, by searching in internet, find the lost part of my family. My dadd's
cousin lives at Coos Bay OREGON
He is soon 73 and my dadd 82
He's name is Robert Emil Sandgren and has 3 nice dauthers, my second cousins. gran'dad had two
brother moving to California 1910-14.
That's happy news!!!

Hope to hear from you very soon

Roy
From Roy Sandgren

Box 14006

S-20024 Malmoe Sweden

Mail: roy.sandgren@amradio.nu
<www.amradio.nu>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.449 / Virus Database: 251 - Release Date: 2003-01-27

From: Charles W Rhodes
To: Mike Powell
Date: 2/12/03 2:01AM
Subject: democracy and media ownership restrictions

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,
Please vote against the relaxing of media ownership laws.

Please do not allow the robber-barons of media to further consolidate media ownership in America. This cannot be good for democracy, and it is your job to guard against the tyranny of a situation where all significant America media is in the hands of a few billionaires.

Below is a letter I've sent to many in Congress.

Thank You

Chuck Rhodes

Letter:

The FCC is about to change the rules that limit the ability of a single entity to own multiple media outlets in a given region or market.

These rules were created in the **40s** in order to prevent a small group of people from monopolizing our media. Of course, for the most part, it's too late. But to allow the FCC to do undo these last remaining safeguards would be a great **loss** to our stability and security.

We need many more voices in our democracy. Currently, **10** wealthy corporations own 90% of the media capacity in the US. It is not an exaggeration to say that the ultra wealthy already control what most people hear. And these ultra wealthy are the same people giving large political contributions and getting people elected to office - to do their bidding.

So, when too few voices dominate, the media are unresponsive to complaints about the federal government, and unwilling to take up legitimate causes and inquiries that challenge the federal government.

When the media do not question and appropriately embarrass the federal government, the government becomes unresponsive to citizens and increasingly corrupt. The media and government are already unresponsive to very legitimate, widely held grievances.

When grievances go unaddressed, resentment, alienation and disenfranchisement build. The result is often instability and violence - or as in our current situation; egregious spin, omission, distraction and intimidation from an increasingly monolithic media-government. Of course this deception will only hold back public resentment temporarily.

And the situation is going from bad to worse

The Bush administration is systematically dismantling the checks and balances necessary for our democracy to work:

There is a blatant sell-out of our federal government to big industry. (Enron wrote our national energy policy; pharmaceuticals get the Congress to maximize their profits, the feds install a Unocal executive as president of Afghanistan to insure success of a new pipeline, etc.)

There's the abuse of secrecy (Cheney's Enron notes, permanent impoundment of presidential papers).

There are the foxes in the henhouses (Gale Norton, Harvey Pitt, John Poindexter, Henry Kissinger, etc)

There are the Religious extremists in positions of great power (Ashcroft, Rumsfeld, Carl Rove, Bush himself, etc.).

There are the blatant conflicts of interests (Bush and the Carlyle Group; Cheney and Haliburton, etc.).

There is the intimidation of Congress through warmongering

There is the ongoing packing of judicial positions with strident pro-wealth political allies

There is the widespread placement of religious ideologues into **government/council** positions of great scientific authority.

There is the widespread placement of religious ideologues into important policy making positions, especially with regard to women's' health and reproductory matters.

There is systematic intimidation and disenfranchisement of minority voters (The Florida "felon"-purge, misinforming and intimidation of Florida and other southern minorities, voting machine fraud, etc.)

There is intentional creation of federal budget deficits so that later deep cuts in Social Security, Medicare, and all social programs will seem unavoidable. This is deliberate deception by the Executive and Legislative branches.

There is the proposed Faith-Based Charity program which would give government money to churches, surely to include the Democrat-hating Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, and Sun Myung Moon, a big Bush family benefactor. So the wall of separation between church and state will be undermined.

There is increased spying on American citizens - in the past, these spying frenzies have turned into operations focusing on political dissidents.

There is the erosion of habeas corpus, and the recent decision of the FISA court to allow federal spying on citizens for domestic matters as well as the traditional foreign matters. This gives Ashcroft a secretive way around the traditional court system for obtaining warrants - no public record.

And of course, there are the thousands of right-wing radio programs, spreading hatred and intolerance toward anyone who espouses a compassionate or progressive social agenda, and spurring death threats against outspoken liberals. We need the FCC to strengthen and enforce ownership rules and start looking for other ways to foment diversity and civility in our airwaves. The equal time law has been abandoned, and needs to be reinstated.

Don't you realize where all this abuse of power is leading? Do you have the conviction and courage to stand for what is right, like the late Paul Wellstone?

The wealthy cannot lead this nation by themselves. Their attempt to do so will end in disaster unless people in positions of authority and power begin to turn the tide back toward real democracy. It will take courage and conviction to re-establish democracy, and it will take many dedicated people with these qualities. But the spiritual rewards will be great for those who take up this most honorable of causes.

I am a 48-year-old 21-year employee of Public Service of Colorado (Xcel Energy), make over \$100k per year, and am an influential voice in my community. I was an architect of Xcel's Windsorce program and of the Renewable Energy Trust. I have won Denver-wide awards for music composition and theatre work. I have two children plus a wife, I own two guns, own a home plus a separate 35-acre parcel of mountain land, drive a pick-up truck, do carpentry, believe in a higher power, give money to homeless individuals, and I vote in every election.

Speak up against this unraveling of our democracy (any aspect of it), bolster what remains of our safeguards against tyranny, and I'll speak up for you!

I demand my democracy back!

Respectfully, Sincerely and Urgently,

Chuck Rhodes

Denver

From: Eric & Donna Davies
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon. Mar 3, 2003 11:00 AM
Subject: media ownership limits

RECEIVED

02-277

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Powell-

I am writing in concern for the proposed lifting of current media ownership limits. Removing limitations on media ownership will have a drastic impact on the independence, accuracy and diversity of national and local media and could severely limit an individual's access to multiple sources of information. This sets up the perfect scenario for the demise of democracy and the freedom of speech.

Overturning the current ownership rules would be insane

I hope you are aware of the implications and can help bring a swift end to the last straw of corporate ownership of America.

The FCC must reconsider its efforts to lead the nation down such a dangerous path and must open the process to further public comment and scrutiny. It is an outrage that the FCC expects to make a decision with such profound and irrevocable consequences on the basis of two public hearings. Extending the regulatory process to allow for a series of public hearings across the minimum the FCC must do to ensure the fairness of the process. If the FCC is responsive to the public will, not just to corporations, it will preserve the current media ownership rules.

Thank you for considering my point of view.

Sincerely,

Donna Sigl-Davies

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Mon, Mar 3, 2003 4:08 PM
Subject: Fwd: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

From: neczyporuk@mindspring.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Mar 3, 2003 4:08 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in **less** original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Kim Neczyporuk
2307 Hardwood Drive
Hillsborough, North Carolina 27278

cc:
Representative David Price
Senator John Edwards
Senator Elizabeth Dole

From: David A Kavanagh
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Mar 3, 2003 4:23 PM
Subject: Proposed Media Ownership Rules

RECEIVED

Dear Chairman Powell:

MAR 10 2003

I have recently read that the FCC expects to further liberalize rules regarding ownership of newspapers and radio and television stations, thus allowing for even more mergers that will greatly affect how news and entertainment are made available to US citizens.

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I want to go on record as ADAMANTLY OPPOSED to such a step. Communications industry mergers have already put FAR TOO MUCH POWER IN THE HANDS OF CORPORATE MEGALITHS. Corporations, not citizens, control most of what our government does - because they have the funds to hire lobbyists, fund campaigns, etc. The FCC is just one of the government agencies regularly subjected to such pressure, and I beseech you to resist it. Corporations serve only corporate and stockholder interests ("special interests"), which generally are at odds with what's best for the citizenry as a whole.

The massive organizations that control today's communications media are already far too large - they wield far too much power (see previous paragraph) through their near-monopoly status. Their stock is often controlled by large organizations (such as pension funds) whose only interest is profits. Of necessity, corporations lack morality (because corporations are neither people nor answerable to the people). Profitability is NOT an adequate measure of what is best for us and the future of our children.

I beg you, DO NOT PERMIT FURTHER CONSOLIDATION IN THE COMMUNICATIONS/MEDIA INDUSTRY.

Very sincerely,

David A. Kavanagh
148 Holiday Lane
Canandaigua NY 14424
585-394-0553

RECEIVED

From: Bobbie's mail
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Mar 3, 2003 6:19 PM
Subject: media deregulation

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am opposed to any further deregulation in this area. Too few companies control the media. Please don't make it even more of a problem.

Please let me know the progress of this regulation:

Elizabeth Kaminsky
3812 Wingleaf Ct.
Rockville. Md. 20853

Thank you very much

From: Sara Chester
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Mar 4, 2003 12:20 PM
Subject: Proposed Media Deregulation

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

I am writing to you to express my opposition to the proposal to further deregulate the media regulations. I think the reason you haven't heard from more people is because no one knows about it because the media is already too deregulated. Already too few mega-corps own far too many media outlets. It truly worries me and I am fearful what will become of our country if the proposal goes through.

To go one step further I truly believe the Communication Act of 1996 signed by President Clinton should be amended. **We as** consumers and more importantly, CITIZENS, have lost choice and that is a very sad thing.

I request that you enter this letter into the record regarding this issue.

Sincerely,
Sara Chester
PO Box 9517
Cinti, OH 45209

From: Leon Kresl
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Mar 4, 2003 5:19 PM
Subject: Restrictions on Media Ownership

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

We feel that less regulation will be a huge windfall for a few giant media corporations

If the windfall was only money it would not be so bad. The worst part would be that it would allow a few people even more control of American news media than they already have. Judging from our actions in the middle east it is obvious our mass media is out of step with the rest of the world.

WE FEEL THERE SHOULD BE MORE RESTRICTIONS ON HUGE MEDIA OWNERSHIP RATHER THAN LESS.

Leon & Virginia Kresl
7618 Grover St.
Omaha, Ne 68124

RECEIVED

From: Leon Kresl
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Mar 4, 2003 5:34 PM
Subject: Restrictions on Media Ownership

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

WE FEEL THERE SHOULD BE MORE RESTRICTIONS ON HUGE MEDIA OWNERSHIP RATHER THAN LESS.

We feel that less regulation will be a huge windfall for a few giant media corporations.

If the windfall was only money it would not be so bad. The worst part would be that it would allow a few people even more control of the American news media than they already have. If a few people can control the news media they can work together to control our minds.

Leon and Virginia Kresl
7618 Grover St.
Omaha, NE 68124

RECEIVED 02-277

From: Stephen Cann
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 12:46 PM

Subject: Please minimize deregulation

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

MAR 1 0 2003

A free society is based on an availability of diverse information. Radical deregulation may speed technologic development, but limit information sources to a few companies. They may show diversity in content, e.g. oldies, sports, drama, but it remains the output of super-large corporations. If we trust Adam Smith, increased demand will eventually fuel technologic development, even if improved profitability (with later increased consumer costs due to oligopoly) may spur development sooner. My vote is to preserve competition by SLOWING DEREGULATION. Sincerely, Stephen R. Cann, M.D.

From: kristiewang@yahoo.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Feb 25, 2003 1:38 PM
Subject: Protect TV for kids

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

As a mother of a young child, I am writing to urge the FCC to consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Kristie Wang
5096 South Forestdale Circle
Dublin, California 94568

cc:
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Richard Pombo

From: mrsdoos@hotmail.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Feb 25, 2003 5:14 PM
Subject: STOP DEREGULATION OF OUR MEDIA!!

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th St., SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in **less** original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Kerri Diener
2660 Grove Way
Castro Valley, California 94546

cc:
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Barbara Lee

From: Front746@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Feb 26, 2003 1:53 PM
Subject: Keep Diversity In the Reporting of News

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

Mr. Powell:

It is highly important that diversity be an integral part of News Reporting. **Be** it television, radio, newspaper, whatever.

The citizens of this great nation will not stand for anything **less** than the truth. If the news reporting is managed by certain people, we will have nothing **less** than a dictatorship. Of course this is what this administration is all about.

Richard

From: BARRY SALTZMAN
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Feb 26, 2003 4:44 PM
Subject: no media consolidation

Media diversity should be a top priority for the FCC, and that media concentration cripples democracy. I urge the FCC to preserve, and refrain from weakening, the rule prohibiting cross ownership of newspapers and television stations in the same market.
Thank you.

Barry Sabman

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Tax Center - forms, calculators, tips, more
<http://taxes.yahoo.com/>

RECEIVED

From: Samborski, Bruce A
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 4:35 PM
Subject: Public Comment on Cross Ownership and Advertising to the FCC's Chairman Michael Powell

MAR 10 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mr. Powell, my comments here are regarding some possibly not well recognized implications of "cross ownership" that is currently being discussed today in Washington. Channel 61 and the Hartford Courant in Central Connecticut are a vibrant example of cross ownership by the Times Mirror Company..

As an aside to media control issues that predominate the discussions, I would offer you the awareness that Channel 61, in the past several months, utilizes their television news at 10 PM each night to advertise newspaper articles of interest in the next day's Courant. To the average person, this, in no uncertain terms, is TV advertising to sell more copies of the next day's morning Courant paper.

My questions:

- 1) Is advertising of this "cross-ownership" nature legal from a state and federal perspective?
- 2) Is Channel 61 legally required to charge the Hartford Courant for this advertising?
- 3) If yes to #2, are the appropriate income from this obvious Channel 61 advertising being declared to the Federal Government by Channel 61 and are the appropriate taxes on this income being paid to the State and Federal government?
- 4) If no to #2, is this cross ownership advertising concept an unfair advantage to other businesses that advertise or could advertise (like the Journal Inquirer) on Channel 61? It seems especially unfair if no advertising fees are exchanged between the two cross owned entities.

This e-mail is being cc'ed to Ms. Elizabeth Ellis of the Journal Inquirer (Manchester, CT) as well as Mr. Richard Blumenthal the State of Connecticut Attorney General's Office. I would respectfully also request that Mr. Blumenthal carefully review my comments.

These questions have been on my mind for several months now and Ms. Ellis's comments in the February 26, 2002 JI propagated writing this e-mail.

Thank you

Bruce A. Samborski
18 Markwood Lane
Manchester, CT 06040
(860) 557-4747

CC: 'attorney.general@po.state.ct.us', 'eellis@JournalInquirer.com'

From: B. Eastlund
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 5:35 PM
Subject: America needs diversity in media ownership

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

If you truly care one iota about this country and its ideals and freedoms you will do everything in your power to prevent the further consolidation of media. **We** must have a free press in order to remain free. I don't know what the corporate oligarchy is offering you for your support but **I** assure you it is not worth the stain that will remain on your legacy if you do not alter your course.

You do care about this country, don't you?

Patriotically yours,

Philip S. Eastlund
Eugene, Oregon USA

RECEIVED

From: Bill Woodward
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Feb 27, 2003 6:25 PM
Subject: my letter to Michael Powell, FCC

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

Media diversity is a must in a free society. You have a high responsibility to lead within the system. I hope and trust that FCC will reverse the trend toward media consolidation. I understand that ownership of the major media lies with under 10 corporations, perhaps under 5. Communication scholar Robert McChesney is one source, Bagdikian another. Please act to reduce cross-ownership among stations. We in academic have to spend increasing amounts of time pointing out students away from the mainstream media. We have to rely increasingly on the alternative press and the international press to find out what is happening. U.S. journalism is a disgrace, thanks to the weakening of it by regulations lobbied for by media industry under influence of corporate advertising. I speak as a historian of science and psychology, trained in sifting truth from distortion.

Professor William R. Woodward
Department of Psychology
University of New Hampshire
10 Library Way
Durham, N.H. 03824 U.S.A.
woodward@cisunix.unh.edu; 603-862-3199(O); 603-862-4986 (FAX);
www.unh.edu/psychology/Faculty.html

CC: nhpeace@ecommunity.uml.edu

From: Judith Katz
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Feb 28, 2003 1:21 AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Judith L. Katz
P.O. Box 617511
Chicago, IL 60661

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

RECEIVED

From: Josdee@aol.com
To: president@whitehouse.gov
Date: Mon, Mar 3, 2003 12:23 PM
Subject: FCCs new rules for radio station ownership?

MAR 10 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I have been a loyal supporter and a conservative Republican, but I am concerned about some of the policies of your government. The latest attempts to change radio station ownership rules by the FCC is a good example. I absolutely do not want indecency allowed over the airways. Nor do I want a few companies to monopolize radio station ownership. Mass ownership reduces the station format to mass appeal programming, and reduces the local programming that would occur on a locally owned station. That will simply encourage me to start listening to satellite radio stations and avoid the "junk talk" format of so many stations.

Please keep the station ownership rules as they are! It is obvious that M. Powell is supported by powerful financial interests that do not care about the local radio listener.

Thank you, Kathryn Storms 704-522-0660 (Charlotte, NC)

CC: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein