

From: Richard Spencer
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/5/03 9:32AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Richard Spencer (spencer.nai@rcn.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner,

I have just sent a detailed e-mail to the Chairman and wanted to write to you as well regarding the upcoming legislation that would further consolidate our "public" airwaves in radio and television. I want to express my opinion that **we** should have a lengthy and public debate on the issue and not have it railroaded through by June. This is too important an issue for America to have it done quickly. Fewer media sources is not healthy for our democracy. If one would look at history, one thing in common with many of the worst regimes in the world is that the airwaves are controlled by a very few in power and they only let out the message that they want heard. That is not healthy and is a very slippery slope that we are on.

Thank you for your time.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 208.58.250.39
Remote IP address: 208.58.250.39

From: Bruce Sims
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/5/03 12:50PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Bruce Sims (ubetchaiam@cox.net) writes:

Since the ECFS system won't allow my sending of comment, I'll write some of what I said directly to you:
Bottomline: NO to more concentration of media ownership and the public-contrary to Chairman Powell- is NOT informed on this issue nor understanding of it.
And Powell's statements about enhancing local content thru more concentration of ownership is not only disingenous but outright falsehood.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.8.183.98
Remote IP address: 68.8.183.98

From: Carole Wilson
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/5/03 3:12PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Carole Wilson (vox@mindspring.com) writes:

If the FCC has a mandate to educate the public how come Bill Moyers has to tell us the first we hear about this consolidation of the media business?

thanks

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.167.165.152
Remote IP address: 66.167.165.152

From: Dr. Catherine Barrett
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/6/03 3:19PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Dr. Catherine Barrett(carolinabarretts@aol.com) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein:

I am deeply concerned by large media and the proposal to allow media groups to control national media by extending ownership regulations. My concerns extend to recent media boycotts of those opposed to the war. This is America, and the Republican Regime that is also so closely connected with big media threatens our basic constitutional rights. Please, please vote responsibly and consider the constitution by NOT allowing more big media to control the airways. Eventually, we will be no better than those whose airways are controlled by dictators. Thank you for your efforts.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 152.163.189.70
Remote IP address: 152.163.189.70

From: George Caplan
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/6/03 7:07PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

George Caplan (gcaplan@channel1.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Adelstein:

I am opposed to further consolidation in the communication industry. I believe that you are too.

Please keep up the good work.

Also, please let me know what **else** I can do to prevent further consolidation and to make my views know

I await your reply.

Thank you.

George Caplan
Three Highland Rd.
Acton, MA 01720-2009
Office Phone: 781-283-3374

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 205.240.180.171
Remote IP address: 205.240.180.171

From: bob keskula
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 4/6/03 9:49PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

bob keskula (rjamkesk@worldnet.att.net) writes:

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

I am writing this to express my great concern regarding the media ownership changes being considered by the FCC. The proposals being evaluated to allow a smaller number of media conglomerates greater ownership of local and national broadcast/newspaper/radio are exactly the wrong thing the American public needs. The greatest benefit to America and its' citizens would be accrued by reducing the ability of large entities to control so much access/dissemination of information. One need only look at the self interest exhibited by the major networks and how there has been almost no coverage of this issue by the big three. It was also not very long ago when the major networks were given huge slices of the public airwaves, to the great consternation of very few brave members of Congress (such as Sen. John McCain) and there was absolutely no coverage of this issue by the newtork news organizations. Regarding newspapers, they are starting to blend into copies of each other. In my ! area, the NY Times owns the Bost on Globe and also the Worcester Telegram and Gazette. The rich variety of news/opinions I once could enjoy and evaluate in order to keep myself informed on issues no longer exists as each local paper runs many stories as they were run in the NY Times. Stories on local events are being lost in the effort to "economize and increase operational efficiencies". Local radio stations are being run by corporate parents located thousands of miles away, on air personnel are fired, local issues are not considered as necessafy for the "bottom line". All of this results in greater profits for the corporations - but LESS BENEFIT AND VARIED INFORMATION FOR THE CITIZEN!! Recent events regarding this issue have given dramatic proof to the huge chilling effect this trend has on our democracy. As you have stated, if journalists are feeling threatened explicitly or implicitly to refrain from doing a story on the FCC evaluations we are all headed into a nightmare. This nightmare will be one! where information on the t! ruth is controlled by only monied and powerful. The information will be slanted and one sided, the citizenry will be directed to think the way that is most beneficial to the powerful interests. I thought we fought the Cold War to prevent that? I think we are fighting a war in IRAQ now to topple that type of dictatorial media controllpropaganda? These rule changes must not be made - we all will be less free, we will all be more controlled.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 12.91.29.223
Remote IP address: 12.91.29.223

From: Rich12332@cs.com
To: Rich12332@cs.com, Mike Powell, KathleenAbernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 3/29/03 1:26PM
Subject: War

New York Times
March 25, 2003
Channels of Influence
By PAUL KRUGMAN

By and large, recent pro-war rallies haven't drawn nearly as many people as antiwar rallies, but they have certainly been vehement. One of the most striking took place after Natalie Maines, lead singer for the Dixie Chicks, criticized President Bush: a crowd gathered in Louisiana to watch a 33,000-pound tractor smash a collection of Dixie Chicks CDs, tapes and other paraphernalia. To those familiar with 20th-century European history it seemed eerily reminiscent of. . . . But as Sinclair Lewis said, it can't happen here.

Who has been organizing those pro-war rallies? The answer, it turns out, is that they are being promoted by key players in the radio industry - with close links to the Bush administration.

The CD-smashing rally was organized by KRMD, part of Cumulus Media, a radio chain that has banned the Dixie Chicks from its playlists. Most of the pro-war demonstrations around the country have, however, been organized by stations owned by Clear Channel Communications, a behemoth based in San Antonio that controls more than 1,200 stations and increasingly dominates the airwaves.

The company claims that the demonstrations, which go under the name Rally for America, reflect the initiative of individual stations. But this is unlikely: according to Eric Boehlert, who has written revelatory articles about Clear Channel in Salon, the company is notorious - and widely hated - for its iron-fisted centralized control.

Until now, complaints about Clear Channel have focused on its business practices. Critics say it **uses** its power to squeeze recording companies and artists and contributes to the growing blandness of broadcast music. But now the company appears to be using its clout to help one side in a political dispute that deeply divides the nation.

Why would a media company insert itself into politics this way? It could, of course, simply be a matter of personal conviction on the part of management. But there are also good reasons for Clear Channel - which became a giant only in the last few years, after the Telecommunications Act of 1996 removed many restrictions on media ownership - to curry favor with the ruling party. **On** one side, Clear Channel is feeling some heat: it is being **sued** over allegations that it threatens to curtail the airplay of artists who don't tour with its concert division, and there are even some politicians who want to roll back the deregulation that made the company's growth possible. On the other side, the Federal Communications Commission is considering further deregulation that would allow Clear Channel to expand even further,

particularly into television

Or perhaps the quid pro quo is more narrowly focused. Experienced Bushologists let out a collective "Aha!" when Clear Channel was revealed to be behind the pro-war rallies, because the company's top management has a history with George W. Bush. The vice chairman of Clear Channel is Tom Hicks, whose name may be familiar to readers of this column. When Mr. Bush was governor of Texas, Mr. Hicks was chairman of the University of Texas Investment Management Company, called Utimco, and Clear Channel's chairman, Lowry Mays, was on its board. Under Mr. Hicks, Utimco placed much of the university's endowment under the management of companies with strong Republican Party or Bush family ties. In 1998 Mr. Hicks purchased the Texas Rangers in a deal that made Mr. Bush a multimillionaire.

There's something happening here. What it is ain't exactly clear, but a good guess is that we're now seeing the next stage in the evolution of a new American oligarchy. As Jonathan Chait has written in *The New Republic*, in the Bush administration "government and business have melded into one big 'us.' " On almost every aspect of domestic policy, business interests rule: "Scores of midlevel appointees . . . now oversee industries for which they once worked." We should have realized that this is a two-way street: if politicians are busy doing favors for businesses that support them, why shouldn't we expect businesses to reciprocate by doing favors for those politicians - by, for example, organizing "grass roots" rallies on their behalf?

What makes it all possible, of course, is the absence of effective watchdogs. In the Clinton years the merest hint of impropriety quickly blew up into a huge scandal; these days, the scandalmongers are more likely to go after journalists who raise questions. Anyway, don't you know there's a war on?

Copyright 2003 The New York Times Company

From: JHRook
To: Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, Alex French, James Assey
Date: 3/31/03 1:18AM
Subject: Clear Channel

March 31, 2003

War Puts Radio Giant on the Defensive

By JOHN SCHWARTZ and GERALDINE FABRIKANT

Clear Channel Communications has long been the company that the music industry loves to loathe, so aggressively dominant as the nation's biggest radio broadcaster that some critics refer to it as the Microsoft of music. Now, though, Clear Channel finds itself fending off a new set of accusations: that the company is using its considerable market power to drum up support for the war in Iraq, while muzzling musicians who oppose it.

The company's executives insist they have no political agenda, and even some of its most outspoken business antagonists say many of the latest accusations do not stand up to scrutiny. But the criticism has grown sufficiently loud that Clear Channel hired a crisis communications firm last week to help it handle the uproar.

One former Clear Channel executive said that the company's rapid rise - from 43 radio stations only eight years ago to more than 1,200 now - had not prepared it for the bruising life at the top of the industry. "They don't recognize the playing field they are playing on now," this person said.

The critics, whose views have been expressed in newspaper articles and columns, and on Salon.com and other Web sites, cite an unusual series of pro-military rallies drummed up by Glenn Beck, whose talk show is syndicated by Premiere Radio Networks, a Clear Channel subsidiary. He has convened the rallies in part to counter antiwar comments by celebrities.

The company's critics also point out that some Clear Channel country music stations stopped playing the Dixie Chicks earlier this month after the group's lead singer, Natalie Maines, told fans during a London concert, "We're ashamed the president of the United States is from Texas."

Clear Channel's opponents either imply or say outright that Clear Channel has taken these steps to build support within the Bush administration at a time the Federal Communications Commission is considering regulations over how many radio stations a single company can own.

John Hogan, the president and chief executive of Clear Channel's radio division, dismissed the idea of a corporate political push as "laughable," saying, "I won't kid you and tell you that Clear Channel is above criticism, but the brush that is painting us as evil and mean-spirited, and with some sort of onerous political agenda is one that I have a hard time getting my arms around." Clear Channel, he said, is purely a company that builds audiences through entertainment so that advertisers can sell goods and services to them. "We're in the business of having the largest possible audience," Mr. Hogan said, not "the most politically unified audience."

Even some Clear Channel critics say they doubt there are Citizen Kane orders emanating from headquarters in San Antonio, where the publicly held company's founder and chairman, L. Lowry Mays, and two sons, Mark and Randall, preside. (The Mayses declined to be interviewed.)

"I don't believe that there's a conspiracy," said Jenny Toomey, the executive director of the Future of Music Coalition, which campaigns against the merger rush among media companies. She said that the political activities simply represented a conservative company's world view.

And yet, even if Clear Channel's political effect is nothing more than a cultural homogenization that leaves little room for boat-rocking and that gives little airplay to antiwar songs like current ones by Lenny Kravitz and Michael Stipe of R.E.M., Ms. Toomey is not ready to concede that all is well in radioland.

"This is just enlightened self-interest in some ways," she said, "or darkened self-interest."

A reason so many detractors are willing to believe the worst about Clear Channel may be the company's sheer size and reach. Along with Mr. Beck, the company also syndicates the talk-radio fixtures Rush Limbaugh and Dr. Laura Schlessinger, as well as Carson Daly, the ubiquitous D.J., among others. The widely diversified company's **\$8.4** billion in annual revenue also flows from hundreds of thousands of billboards around the world, dozens of television stations and management of sports figures like Andre Agassi and Michael Jordan.

But it is Clear Channel's bare-knuckle dealings with the music industry, and the way the company can leverage its broadcasting power to the advantage of its concert-promotion business, SFX Entertainment, that may explain why, for the haters, all roads lead to Clear Channel.

Some Web sites, for example, reported last week that Clear Channel's concert promoters threatened to throw the activist singer Ani DiFranco off the stage of the New Jersey Performing Arts Center if she allowed representatives of antiwar groups to speak. Clear Channel did arrange the concert, held on March **19**, but it was the managers of the arts center that tried to ban the activism, according to Jeffrey Norman, a spokesman for the center. In fact, the speeches - and the show - did go on.

As for the Dixie Chicks boycott, it turns out that Clear Channel stations were only sporadically involved

More unified were the actions of Cumulus Media, which owns **262** stations, and has at least temporarily stopped all **42** of its country stations from playing the Dixie Chicks. The company's chief executive, Lewis W. Dickey Jr., denied the move was part of a political agenda. "We pulled the plug out of deference to our listeners," he said.

At one rally promoted by a Cumulus station in Shreveport, La., a bulldozer crushed Dixie Chicks CDs. Mr. Dickey described it as "an event that was precipitated by listener demand." He predicted that after a cooling-off period, the group's music would return to Cumulus stations.

A program director for another broadcaster, Cox Radio, also said that much of the political activity was bubbling up from the listening audience. "Country music is a very patriotic format," said Michael Cruise, program director for two Cox Radio stations in Houston, KKBQ-FM and KTHT-FM. "I didn't want to come out on the wrong side of the issue."

At Clear Channel, Mr. Hogan said that the company issued no order that local stations take the Dixie Chicks off the air and that he did not know how many stations had made their own decisions to do so

He does acknowledge, however, that the Clear Channel stations' carefully defined formats circumscribe the universe of songs that they might play. "The country programmer who would choose to play Lil' Kim," he said, referring to leatherclad hip-hop singer, "probably is not long for the world as a country programmer."

More difficult is explaining away the **18** "Rally for America!" events that had been held through last Friday at the urging of Mr. Beck and co-sponsored by one of his advertisers, Bills Khakis. Thirteen of those rallies were co-sponsored and promoted by local Clear Channel stations, including one held March **15** in Atlanta that was sponsored by Clear Channel's WGST and attended by an estimated **25,000** people. Further

plans for rallies include events in Tampa; Lubbock, Tex.; and Dothan, Ala

Such rallies are highly unusual, said a longtime radio executive at another company, who, citing Clear Channel's power, spoke on condition of anonymity. "It flies right in the face of the fact that the government has always said that radio stations should have a balanced view of what is going on, serve the public interest and not take sides," the executive said.

Clear Channel, which hired Brainerd Communicators, a financial communications and crisis-management firm, last week to help deal with the controversy, did not make Mr. Beck available for an interview. But in a draft op ed article he circulated, Mr. Beck described the rallies as a grassroots response to his personal broadcast call to "Mr. and Mrs. America" to urge their local radio stations to hold rallies. "There is no corporate conspiracy, hidden agenda or grand design," he wrote. He derided criticism of his campaign as "a concerted media effort to marginalize the voices of patriotic Americans."

Clear Channel was a small collection of stations until 1996, when Congress largely deregulated the industry and lifted many of the longstanding restrictions on how many stations a single company could own. A review of those rules is now pending at the Federal Communications Commission.

With the help of the investment banker Thomas O. Hicks, who sits on the Clear Channel board and has close ties to President Bush, Mr. Mays went on a buying spree. The basic pattern was to buy stations and cut costs by sharing programming and other resources with other Clear Channel stations whenever possible - and then to sell ads across all of the company's media offerings, including radio, billboards and television. Clear Channel reported an operating profit of \$2.19 billion for its most recent fiscal year, with nearly \$1.6 billion of that coming from radio.

Clear Channel creates some of its image problems, said Paul Kedrosky, a former Wall Street analyst and adjunct professor at the University of California at San Diego. "Generally, when the company errs, it errs on the side of being ham-handed," he said.

One practice that galls record companies is Clear Channel's frequent demand that rising artists play at live concerts promoting individual Clear Channel stations. A seasoned recording executive said there was often an implication that a station would continue playing the group's music only if it appeared at the concert.

Record companies often resent such concerts because they must bear the group's expenses. And the musicians often grumble that such appearances dilute the audience for their own concerts.

Even Clear Channel's critics acknowledge that other radio companies use similar tactics, but they say the company's dominance makes it a magnet for resentment. Mr. Hogan, of Clear Channel, denied that the company links airplay of songs to musicians' willingness to appear at its concerts.

Professor Kedrosky said many of the arguments voiced within "that wonderful echo chamber that is the 'I hate Clear Channel' community" are a kind of liberal nostalgia. A lot seems to be "wouldn't it be wonderful if the future looked more like the past?" he said.

A nostalgic view of politically charged music and the history of radio might recall the way that in the 1960s and 70's, the diversity of broadcast ownership could allow protest songs like Buffalo Springfield's "For What It's Worth" and Crosby, Stills, Nash & Young's cry of outrage about the Kent State shootings, "Ohio," to find their way onto Top 40 stations.

And yet, in the current era of the Internet and other new distribution technologies, broadcast radio is no longer the only way for recording artists to make themselves heard.

Professor Kedrosky, who is writing a book on deregulation and the media industry, said that dominance today by no means guarantees dominance tomorrow. Owning billions of dollars worth of radio stations could end up being a liability in the future, he said, because evolving technologies like in-car Internet links

and satellite radio are making it possible to choose from an unlimited bounty of music from just about anywhere. "It may not be the kind of lock-in that you get from owning Microsoft Windows," he said.

Indeed, companies like Sirius Satellite Radio, are rethinking the notion that broadcasting has to be broad. Because the company offers 100 channels of basic programming, Sirius can offer something for every listener, said Jay Clark, the company's vice president for entertainment and information programming. Activist music is readily available on Sirius and its rival, XM Satellite Radio Holdings.

And the company has started two new channels for political commentary, "Sirius Right" and a "Sirius Left." "Whatever a customer wants to get into," Mr. Clark said, "it's available somewhere on the platform."

Some music industry executives say there are some performers who would not fit on mainstream radio, regardless of their views. Tracy Mann, a publicist for Ani DiFranco, said, "Ani is not played on commercial radio, anyway." She added, "It's not relevant to the work that she does."

Ms. DiFranco's fans seek her work out on the Internet or in concert. Ms. Mann said. "Her audience is going to be there whether she's on the radio or not."

March 31, 2003

On Minot, N.D., Radio, a Single Corporate Voice

By JENNIFER S. LEE

MINOT, N.D., March 29 - Across the sparsely populated prairie, radio signals connect people in far-flung communities to one another and the world outside. They carry valuable updates on weather, commodity prices and tornados as well as recipes and birth announcements. And for those who spend a lot of time outdoors doing things with their hands, radio is a medium that is taken very seriously.

Even as the radio industry has consolidated, station owners say that it remains one of the least concentrated media sectors. The nationwide leader, Clear Channel Communications, owns about 1,200 of the 11,000 radio stations in the country.

But here in North Dakota, where there are about 80 commercial stations, Clear Channel owns 23 of them. And through a quirk in the rules governing radio concentration, it owns all six commercial stations in Minot, the state's fourth-largest city, with a population nearing 37,000. (There is a public radio station, and a Christian station in the city as well.)

As the Federal Communications Commission reconsiders media ownership rules for television and newspapers, many are examining the effects of the radio industry's consolidation, speeded by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Opponents may try to drive the debate over media consolidation to the edges. Minot is one of those edges.

Clear Channel's stronghold in Minot has become a political lightning rod. In January 2002, a train derailment at 1 a.m. spilled a vast white cloud of suffocating anhydrous ammonia fertilizer over Minot. One person died.

The police were unable to reach anyone by phone at the local radio station, KCJB, that is the designated

emergency broadcaster. Station employees had to be roused from their homes, causing a big delay.

The police said that because Clear Channel was piping in a satellite feed from elsewhere, human presence at the station was dispensable - an assertion that Senator Byron L. Dorgan, a North Dakota Democrat, repeated in hearings on media consolidation. Clear Channel said that someone was always on duty during the night, but busy phone lines and technological misunderstandings resulted in the emergency failure.

Local officials now acknowledge that may have been true, but the event seems to have crystalized a sense of anxiety here and elsewhere over Clear Channel's grip on Minot and many other small cities and towns around the country, where the effects of consolidation can be disproportionately felt.

"Over time, concentration of markets means less competition and we know that less competition is always bad for consumers," Senator Dorgan said. "The question is, Where does this stop?"

Clear Channel says it is simplistic to say that its radio monopoly in Minot threatens to squelch competing voices. After all, residents can receive satellite radio signals; they have access to television, newspapers and the Internet. And radio signals blow like the wind here, so listeners in Minot can receive some programs from other areas.

"We have to compete with television, newspapers, billboards," said Rick Stensby, general manager of Clear Channel's Minot stations. "If we got out of whack, we would be whacked with the advertisers."

Still, now that one company controls all the stations in town, some say that the quality of local news coverage has declined. "The old radio stations used to cover the local news," said Fred Debowey, the Minot police chief. "We very seldom hear local news anymore."

Ken Crites, a Minot Daily News reporter who used to work in radio, also complained about the situation. "I get up in the morning and it's a disc jockey reading A.P. copy," he said. "The Canadians could come over the border, and we would never know it."

Among the six stations, Clear Channel now has only one full-time news employee, who is often heard reading statewide and national wire service dispatches. Local reporters feign shock when they see him at news conferences.

Former radio employees say Clear Channel has also trimmed its nonnews staff, something the company disputes. "They don't nearly have the quality of employees that they used to have," said Rod Romine, 71, a retired general manager at KCJB.

On a recent afternoon, two of the working disc jockeys were students studying broadcasting at Minot State University. Some days, they run around substituting as D.J.'s at different stations when others are out. That can take some adjusting, given the six separate program formats: country, oldies, classic rock, adult contemporary, top 40 and news talk.

"It gets confusing sometimes," said J. D. Black, a 20-year-old with a vibrant voice who also works full time at Clear Channel. "You have to keep which station you are on in your head."

Even as Clear Channel has monopolized the market, advertising rates have not gone up noticeably. But advertisers note something else - the stations do not offer ratings information anymore.

"There's no audience ratings done because they control all the stations," said Charlie Ferguson, a former general manager of three of the stations, who now buys a lot of radio advertising for local businesses. "They say, We're the only ones here."

Clear Channel says it stopped buying ratings information because it is expensive and not statistically accurate for a market as small as Minot's.

How did Minot's stations end up under a single owner?

The 1996 telecommunications act lifted ownership limits on the radio industry, which was then floundering financially from the proliferation of media. Instead, the limits were replaced by a sliding scale that was supposed to restrict a single owner to 8 commercial radio stations in a market with 45 stations, up to 7 stations in a market with 30 stations, and so on. But idiosyncrasies in the F.C.C.'s method for defining radio markets have resulted in unexpected pockets of concentration.

In defining the market, the F.C.C. lumped Minot with Bismarck, the state capital about 100 miles away. While some signals overlap, commercially they are far apart. The combination puts the market at 45 stations, most in Bismarck; Clear Channel owns 8, most in Minot.

Similar concentrations, while not as dense as in Minot, pop up all over the state. Of roughly a dozen commercial stations operated out of Fargo, for example, six are owned by Clear Channel and five are owned by Triad Broadcasting.

The technicalities that allow media companies to stretch the limits are not restricted to rural areas. Clear Channel used the rules to propose that it own nine stations in the Youngstown, Ohio, metropolitan area. But Youngstown has only 23 commercial stations as defined by Arbitron, the commercial rating service, causing the F.C.C. to delay action to ask for public comment.

From a business standpoint, it makes sense to cluster radio stations so they can share overhead costs. Clear Channel has stations in 250 markets, an average of five stations an area. In 2000, Clear Channel bought the six Minot stations from two companies, West Dakota Radio and Reiten Broadcasting.

"I was shocked that the F.C.C. allowed them to buy all six," said Mr. Ferguson, Reiten's former radio general manager.

Clear Channel says the consolidated ownership has been good for the Minot stations and listeners, as it has been for troubled stations across the country.

Under one owner, Clear Channel has been able to diversify into six formats. Earlier competition between groups had led to redundant country stations.

"To some degree, the advertising pool has grown because we are tapping into listeners that weren't there before," said Rick Stensby, Clear Channel's general manager for Minot.

Clear Channel has also invested money to spruce up the stations, spending \$1.5 million to buy a new building to consolidate two stations. It bought computers to bring the stations into the digital age and installed air-conditioning.

Perhaps most important for the radio die-hards, Clear Channel bought a new transmitter for KCJB, replacing a clunky one dating from 1958.

"They had a rubber band holding them on the air," said Alan Brace, a Clear Channel engineer who upgraded the system, explaining that the rubber band held a critical switch in place. "Where is the reliability in this?"

CC: Guy Zapoleon, Bill Tanner, Swanson. Jack C., Bob Pittman. Pepper. Vincent, Ken Orchard, Al Hochstadt, Steve Herling

From: Thom Hartmann
To: KathleenAbernathy
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:48 AM
Subject: deregulation

Please do not further weaken the already feeble ability our democratic republic has to regulate powerful corporations in their control of the media.

Please also consider reinstating mandatory rules for radio and TV broadcasters to carry both sides of political debates. This would be so vital to democracy.

Best regards,

Thomas Hartmann
41 Northfield St.
Montpelier, VT 05602

From: Eric Fanning
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:48 AM
Subject: No further deregulation

SUBJECT:
Upcoming meeting to ease regulations on media ownership

Please reconsider any weakening of the already famished regulations the FCC has toward broadcast and media outlet ownership.

Over the past few years since the last loosening of rules the US media consumer has received a more and more homogenized vision of news corresponding more with the huge wealthy corporations that own the media outlets than with the truth.

You may or may not agree but I and many others, who care, have to find other outlets, be they foreign or listener sponsored, to find out the entire picture of what is going on in the world today.

If we want better "entertainment" from media or advertising of products supported by the owners of media conglomerates, easing regulations is the right direction but as it is, news coverage has gotten perilously close to being a corporate, and with this administration in office now, governmental media machine.

At your meeting I suggest you discuss ways to widen the ownership of smaller, listener sponsored stations and media outlets and find ways to regulate the "entertainment" money out of media owned news so a fair and balanced reporting of current events can be found at all stations and in all newspapers in the US unless specifically labeled entertainment.

This is America and it is supposed to be of the people for the people not of the corporation for the corporation.

Eric Fanning
Whittier CA

From: imom2gg@yahoo.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:48 AM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

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.

Please make this an issue of morals and principles and not an issue of generating revenue.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Gorden-Platek 33247 N. Algonquin Wildwood,
IL 60030

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Gorden-Platek
33247 N. Algonquin
Wildwood, Illinois 60030

cc:
Representative Philip Crane
Senator Richard Durbin
Senator Peter Fitzgerald

From: imom2gg@yahoo.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Apr 21 .2003 9:48 AM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps.

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.

Please make this an issue of morals and principles and not an issue of generating revenue.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Gorden-Platek 33247 N. Algonquin Wildwood,
IL 60030

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Gorden-Platek
33247 N. Algonquin
Wildwood, Illinois 60030

cc:
Representative Philip Crane
Senator Richard Durbin
Senator Peter Fitzgerald

From: Thom Hartmann
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:48 AM
Subject: deregulation

Please do not further weaken the already feeble ability our democratic republic has to regulate powerful corporations in their control of the media.

Please also consider reinstating mandatory rules for radio and TV broadcasters to carry both sides of political debates. This would be so vital to democracy.

Best regards,

Thomas Hartmann
41 Northfield St.
Montpelier, VT 05602

From: imom2gg@yahoo.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:48 AM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

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.

Please make this an issue of morals and principles and not an issue of generating revenue.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Gorden-Platek 33247 N. Algonquin Wildwood,
IL 60030

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Gorden-Platek
33247 N. Algonquin
Wildwood, Illinois 60030

cc:
Representative Philip Crane
Senator Richard Durbin
Senator Peter Fitzgerald

From: bonniejihanna@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:55 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising,

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Hanna
307 Henry Street
Fairview, New Jersey 07022-2010

From: bonniejihanna@aol.com
To: KathleenAbernathy
Date: Mon, Apr 21, 2003 9:55 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Hanna
307 Henry Street
Fairview, New Jersey 07022-2010

From: gjtmkt@cox.net
To: Michael Copps
Date: Mon. Apr 21.2003 12:00 PM
Subject: Concerned American

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

George & Marion Teisan