

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Eli Harrison  
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjmwebb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein  
Date: Fri, Mar 7, 2003 4:07 PM  
Subject: Media Deregulation

ORIGINAL

02-27 7 RECEIVED

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear FCC Chairman and Commissioners,

I would like to express my displeasure with the current course of media deregulation. While it has benefited big-media conglomerates like Clear Channel, it has led to the collapse of local media that is in touch with the public.

This is especially true in radio. Quite often, hit songs will be played on both modern- and classic-rock stations, and both light-pop and heavy-metal stations. While I applaud music that can reach a large audience, I'm suspicious when it spans two sets of polar opposites, especially when nobody I know has bought the CD or even downloaded it illegally for free. This would not happen if station owners cared about what listeners wanted, or simply understood the concept of musical genres.

Big media claims they perform localized research to make programming choices. However, nobody from Big Media has asked me to be in any focus groups. I don't even know someone who knows someone who has participated, I sure don't want to hear six hours' worth of the Howard Stern Show every morning, or watch it again endlessly every night. I could care less about what's on one channel of NBC, let alone three. Media programming nowadays has nothing to do with what the people choose to hear, read, or watch. **It's** only about what media executives decide to force upon **us**.

The popularity of the Internet is often used to justify media de-regulation. Unfortunately, this is a bogus claim. Internet consolidation is squeezing out the few remaining independent voices just as rapidly as with television, print, and radio. Incumbent service providers like Ma Bell and AT&T ultimately control the content people can look at. Furthermore, many Americans just don't have access to the Internet in what is known as the "Digital Divide," a phenomenon that is very real and much more significant than Michael Powell's "Mercedes Divide."

Media ownership rules were imposed as a response to the totalitarian control of media in communist and fascist countries. My grandparents' generation saw how a monopolized media led to a **loss** of liberty, so they created ownership restrictions to prevent that from happening here. Why, then, are these rules being rolled back? Whether media is monopolized by the government or a corporate entity is inconsequential because the result is the same: poor quality, fewer choices, and an erosion of freedom.

Freedom of the press is our First Amendment right. By taking media out of the public's hands and putting it into those of a few large corporate conglomerates, deregulation stands in defiance of the Constitution of the United States or America and threatens our cherished democracy. We need to reinstate ownership rules, not repeal them further.

Sincerely,

I

Eli Harrison  
Seattle, WA

1

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**ORIGINAL**

**EX PARTE OR LATE FILED**

02-277

**From:** steve hall  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 2/16/03 1:11PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: The FCC is going to Screw You

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Note: forwarded message attached

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day  
<http://shopping.yahoo.com>

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

**RECEIVED****MAR 18 2003****Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**

From: David Meinert  
To: david@fuzedmusic.com  
cc:  
Subject: The FCC is going to Screw You

Media consolidation has been happening quickly since the passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. One of the FCC's main purposes is to promote competition, diversity and localism in the media. But if you know anything about radio, you know just the opposite has been happening. One company owns VH-1, MN, BET and hundreds of radio stations. Another owns most of the larger concert venues in the US and over 1,200 stations (many stations in almost every market). Now the FCC, under it's Bush appointed Chairperson Michael Powell, is trying to loosen restrictions limiting further consolidation and cross ownership. We will soon face a time when one or two companies will own all the TV, Radio, Newspaper and Billboard outlets as well as all of the concert venues and possibly all the record labels. To read about the effect consolidation has already had, read the article below. This story is typical of what is happening in every city across the country. Please write to the FCC at the email addresses below and also go to their website and send them the message that to protect democracy in America, and to promote diversity, competition and localism, rules limiting media consolidation should be strengthened not loosened. Each letter sent will make a huge difference. Please forward this.

Chairman Michael K. Powell: mpowell@fcc.gov  
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy: kabernat@fcc.gov  
Commissioner Michael J. Copps: mcopps@fcc.gov  
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin: kjmweb@fcc.gov  
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein: jadelste@fcc.gov

send comments to the FCC at The FCC website by going here:  
<http://www.fcc.gov/ownership/>

<http://www.sfbayguardian.com/37/18/news-ed-monopoly>.

San Francisco Bay Guardian

January 29, 2003

Editorial

Fighting Media Monopoly

If you want to see a perfect example of exactly what's wrong with big national chains taking over and consolidating control of local news media, tune your radio to 106 FM, where KMEL once broadcast as one of the most important and groundbreaking commercial stations in the country.

Ten years ago, KMEL, which dubbed itself "the people's station," helped bring hip-hop to the mainstream, helped launch the careers of a number of big local artists, and offered valuable political shows. As Jeff Chang reports, during the mid 1990s, a heated competitive battle between

KMEL and KYLD encouraged cutting-edge innovation-- and gave local rappers abundant chances to get their music heard.

Then Clear Channel (a giant media conglomerate) bought both stations. The competition ended-- and so did the innovation. Local artists were ignored. Public-affairs programming became little more than an afterthought. Today KMEL and KYLD share the same playlists and offer the same sort of drab, predictable material much of the time.

And while infuriated community activists in San Francisco fight an uphill battle to make Clear Channel executives in San Antonio, Texas, pay attention to their local needs, the Federal Communications Commission is preparing to change the rules of media ownership-- in a way that will guarantee that Clear Channel's destruction of KMEL is repeated over and over again nationwide.

As Camille T. Taiara reports, the FCC is considering eliminating the rule that now prohibits that same company from owning daily newspapers and TV stations in the same market, as well as the rule that bars any one broadcast company from owning stations that reach more than a combined 35 percent of the households in the country. and the rule that prevents the four major broadcast networks from merging with one another.

Together the changes represent (even by the FCC's own account) "the most comprehensive look at media ownership ever undertaken" by the agency. In theory, the new rules could allow General Electric (which owns NBC) to merge with Westinghouse (which owns CBS) and Disney (which owns ABC) -- and then buy Clear Channel, which owns more than 1,200 radio stations in the country. If that giant company bought or merged with, say Hearst Corp., then KNTV-TV, KGO-TV, and KPIX-N (along with KGO and KCBS radio) would be owned by the same company that controls the San Francisco Chronicle-- which would also own seven local radio stations.

The community would lose what little diversity of viewpoints remains among competing voices. The companies would gain the huge profits that come from monopoly control of a market

FCC chairman Michael K. Powell likes to say that ownership rules are no longer needed in the Internet era, when media choices abound. But that's just silly: the vast majority of people in the United States still get all or most of their news-- the information they need to make decisions, from voting to shopping and a whole lot in between-- from one daily newspaper and one TV news show. And increasingly, the big players in the Internet (including Web site operators and providers of online access and broadband) are controlled by the same handful of big communications corporations.

By most accounts, the FCC's decision is a foregone conclusion. The panel, chaired by Bush appointee (and rabid deregulator) Powell, will almost certainly go ahead with the rule changes. The only real chance to restore the regulations lies with Congress-- and that's a long shot at best.

There are some steps local communities can take: San Francisco, for example, can demand as a condition of its cable TV franchise that AT&T

open its lines to all Internet service providers. The city can also demand more -- and better -- local programming on AT&T's community channels.

The San Francisco Board of Supervisors -- along with every county board and city council in California -- should also pass a resolution opposing the FCC rule changes and calling on Congress (and their local congressional representatives) to pass strong legislation restoring tight controls on media ownership. The media companies have immense power; only a strong grassroots counterattack can begin to prevent the next big step in the wholesale consolidation of news media in the United States.

P.S.: The big media chains aren't the only ones trying to crush Competition. As Savannah Blackwell reports, federal and state attorneys general filed charges this week accusing the SF Weekly's parent company, New Times Corp., of illegally colluding with Village Voice Media to end alternative newspaper competition in Los Angeles and Cleveland. The New Times-WM deal was, and is, an embarrassment to the alternative press and a sad indication that an industry that grew up challenging and competing with the big-monopoly dailies has become increasingly dominated by companies that act just like the monopolists

Jeff Chang article: [http://www.sfbayguardian.com/37/18/cover\\_kmel.html](http://www.sfbayguardian.com/37/18/cover_kmel.html)

Camille T. Taiara article:  
[http://www.sfbayguardian.com/37/18/news\\_fcc.html](http://www.sfbayguardian.com/37/18/news_fcc.html)

Savannah Blackwell article:  
<http://www.sfbayguardian.com/37/18/news-newtimes.html>

ORIGINAL

02-277

**From:** Carla Conrardy  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Mar 6, 2003 10:48 PM  
**Subject:** PUBLIC HEARING ON MEDIA CONCENTRATION

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

Dear Chairman and Commissioners of the FCC:

MAR 18 2003

Re: Field Hearing Set for Friday, March 7 in Seattle, WA

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I am writing to express my views on the topics being discussed at the hearing scheduled in Seattle regarding media concentration. I am a concerned citizen who is not able to attend the hearing you have scheduled in Seattle, Washington (I live in Colorado!).

I ask that you not allow media consolidation of television, radio and newspapers for two reasons. My first reason is that many jobs would be lost due to such consolidation. I am concerned that the large media companies who are supporting media consolidation are planning to cut many jobs in order to provide themselves and their stockholders with short-term profits. While large media companies may argue that this would be good for the economy; profits gained solely for this purpose are not long-term. Corporate profits do not justify the number of jobs that would be lost due to media consolidation.

My second reason is in regards to the quality and quantity of information we receive because there are separate news rooms for newspapers, radio and television. Please look at the reasons that originally shaped the decision to keep these various medias separate. These were good reasons. Knowing that there is competition keeps us working harder and doing a better job. Obviously, I am not a reporter, writing isn't my thing. But I do appreciate good writing and good reporting and getting my news from various sources. Losing this variety due to media consolidation gives me less confidence about the future quality and quantity of the information that will be available to the average citizen.

As is noted in your hearing notice, this is an issue that will have a major impact on all of us for many years to come. I appreciate your time and consideration. Please do not rush your decision.

Respectfully,

Carla Conrardy

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
Lid ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_



ORIGINAL 02-297

**From:** Chappy Valente EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 2/1/03 7:34AM  
**Subject:** fair news

**RECEIVED**

MAR 18 2003

Michael K. Powell

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Chairman

Federal Communications Commission  
 445 12th Street, SW  
 Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am writing to tell you of my opposition to the proposed changes by your agency to the current Media Ownership Rules.

Further concentration of media ownership does not serve our democratic society based upon democratic principles, but instead undermines it. Following World War II, our government placed restrictions upon news media outlet ownership because of how totalitarian regimes used controlled media concentrated in the hands of a few corporations and government agencies to control their people and move the world towards war. The proposed changes to the current Media Ownership Rules completely undermines this principle that so many Americans have fought to defend from our country's birth to the present.

Furthermore, the series of reports released by the FCC about the current media marketplace are focused almost entirely on the economic impact of relaxing the ownership rules. They ignore the public's interest in a diverse and independent press. You have also scheduled only one public hearing regarding this issue. The FCC has barely publicized the proposed changes, and combined with a very short public comment period I can only surmise that you hope to sneak these changes past the American people. I certainly didn't find out about them as a result of anything that was done by your agency.

You should be ashamed that an agency under your leadership is not using what is in the best interests of the American public as its guiding principle, but instead is thinking of what is most profitable for a few huge corporations who only care about the bottom line, not about what is good for democracy.

Sincerely yours,

Stuart Brewington

706 south 7th street 28401

willmington nc

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

[sbrewing9@yahoo.com](mailto:sbrewing9@yahoo.com)