

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Original



Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Received April 22, 2003

To: Docket # 02-277

200 Documents

To Chairman & Commissioners

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

02-277

From: Marimik&@cs.com

To: john-mccain@mccain.senate.gov, russell_feingold@feingold.senate.gov
 Copps, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KIM KJAWEB

Date: Tue, Apr 1, 2003 12:45 PM

Subject: Re: Proposed FCC rule changes (station ownership)

APR 22 2003

Dear Sirs--

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

I would like to give you a glaring example of the reason ownership of television stations should be limited to one station per market, and ownership nationally should be limited to reaching no more than 35% of the public.

In a word, the reason is the Sinclair Broadcast Group

Locally, this group owns two of the eight broadcast stations I can receive-- WLFL (WB22) in Raleigh, NC and WRDC (UPN28) in Raleigh, NC. I don't know just how this came to be.

For the past few nights, on the owner's new Newscentral news service, WB22 has been airing a comment made by a Columbia University professor to the effect that he "wishes there would be a thousand Mogadishus" in Iraq. I would love to hear the fuller context, but you'll admit it sounds pretty inflammatoty on its face.

Newscentral then broadcasts this person's office telephone number with the suggestion that "if you disagree with him, call him and let him know." I would assume he has been assailed with death threats and god knows what since this piece has been airing-- I've seen it twice this week so I assume they are giving it out nightly.

I support free speech and would uphold the right of the station to disagree with this man's position as strongly as they wished. They have an editorial voice, after all. But to promote his being harassed at work is a suppression of his rights through demagoguery, and compares to publishing the home addresses of abortion doctors.

I don't want Sinclair to own any more stations than the two already in my area. I can't imagine how they came to own that many here. I would be happy to register a complaint against them and their gutter tactics. But you can turn them on tonight and see for yourselves how they employ the freedom of the press-- they already own sixty other stations around the country.

Michael Elvin
 Fuquay-Varina, NC
 919-552-3272

CC: jcox@newsobserver.com

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Tom & Karen
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 3, 2003 8:41 AM
Subject: deregulation

RECEIVED

APR 22 2003

Mr. Powell,

I just want to let you know that I think your plan for further deregulation of the media stinks. You should try to remember that our government is of, by and for the people-not the corporations. If this action takes place I will refuse to get any of my news and information from the media giants. Internet search engine statistics show searches for alternative news sources are skyrocketing. This should provide a clue about how little trust Americans put in today's media.

You could become an American hero if you reversed your position on media regulation.

Thank you for your time

Tom Brennan

1966
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20541

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Casey Nees
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 3, 2003 6:58 PM
Subject: Proposed loosening of rules

RECEIVED

APR 22 2003

Mr Powell

Office of Administrative Commission
Office of Secretary

Your excuses for why we need even less competition in the media are an insult. It is policies like this one that have made the American media the but of jokes around the world. Think long and hard what you do because you may find that Americans are more savvy then you think and they will turn off rather then be lied to by a media controlled only by the wealthy.

Casey A Nees

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Mike Gormley
To: Kathleen Abemathy
Date: Sat, Apr 12, 2003 1:34 PM
Subject: Media Consolidation

APR 22 2003

The FCC's reported proposal to lift or loosen restrictions limiting further consolidation and cross ownership of the media in the U.S. is antidemocratic. You should promote diversity, competition and localism. Rules limiting media consolidation should be strengthened not loosened.

Thank you,

02-27

Mike Gormley

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Bjerke, Carsten
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 4, 2003 4:27 PM
Subject: Oppose the rule change

APR 22 2003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

It is important to limit corporations from owning a disproportionate share of media outlets. If the rules are changed this will lead to even more bias in the media and limit voices of decent. Individual corporation already have too much influence in the media market. Please oppose this proposed rule change.

Thanks,
Carsten

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Broadaxel@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 7:39 AM
Subject: Dear Commissioner Copps

Dear Commissioner Copps,

Please let this letter serve as my formal complaint and objection to any pending FCC rulings which may lift restriction's on mergers between TV broadcast networks and the number of local N o r radio stations owned by one company. Such deregulation threatens to further stifle the diversity of programming for consumers, advertisers and producers. One of the main charges of the FCC is to promote diversity, which doesn't just refer to people of color, it refers to many different types of programming. We applaud you Commissioner Copps for attempting to draw attention to this problem. I would like to go on record as being opposed to increased or further media deregulation and wish for you to act on my behalf and STOP further media deregulation.

Respecfully yours,

Sara Sharpe
broadaxel@aol.com

RECEIVED

APR 22 2003

File
Federal Communications Commission
Apr 13 2003

RECEIVED

From: Karen Sirridge
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 10:00 AM
Subject: Opposition to further consolidation

APR 22 2003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

We oppose any further consolidation of the media and expect you to act in the citizens of this nations best interest. It does not serve us to have the ownership of these companies funneled into fewer and fewer hands.

The Sirridges
Arizona

From: Lycaon pictus
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 10:52 PM
Subject: proposed deregulation

RECEIVED

APR 22 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell,

We strongly oppose deregulating the media industry. Democratic rights can only be safeguarded when independent voices (i.e., those NOT controlled by large corporations) are heard. With increasingly more media controlled by corporate America we have seen a decline in unbiased news coverage and an increase in info-tainment. With fewer seriously informative options, of course people are watching, listening, and reading what is available even if they are not satisfied.

The public should be made aware of all the proposed changes and given the opportunity to engage in debate. The FCC has no right to take away the rights of the people. It is interesting to note that the biggest supporters of the proposed changes are those corporations that have the MOST TO GAIN. They also own the very networks that are NOT reporting this story!!! Deregulation is a smack against the very democratic principles the administration says it wants to uphold. Please do the right thing!

Sincerely yours,

Kim McCreery, Ph.D. & Robert Robbins, Ph.D

From: Beth Lux
To: Mike Powell, KathleenAbernathy, Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon. Apr 7, 2003 10:04 AM
Subject: deregulation

Good Morning,

I am writing as a concerned citizen. I am urging you to allow more public input before making a decision regarding how many stations a particular company can own. Please consider that currently only a handful of major companies own the majority of the networks/cable stations in addition to owning radio stations and newspapers. Take Viacom for instance. If you look to see exactly how much of the media that one company owns you should be disturbed. It means that most of my news and information is coming from one source. I have to search far and wide to find objective information - and with the future of NPR at risk, my choices will be slim to nothing. Please, I urge you to carefully consider what the future may hold for us if ultimately ALL MEDIA could be owned by one company.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely yours,
Beth A. Lux

Beth A. Lux

RECEIVED

APR 22 2003

Commissioner

RECEIVED

From: DeeAnn Grummett
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 7, 2003 4:27 PM
Subject: Proposed change on media concentration regulations

APR 22 2003

APR 22 2003

Commissioner Powell:

This is to express my strong opposition to further concentration of the media by relaxing the current regulations. Your job **is** to ensure real diversity, meaningful competition and protection of local media. Rather, your focus appears to **be** to assist the huge corporations with their quest to undermine a truly free media in their selfish pursuit of profit. Your claims that huge amounts of capital are necessary to provide good news are untrue and are leading to this dangerous concentration of power over news dissemination. The very proof of this fact is the (1) failure of most of the major television outlets to cover this important story at all and (2) the failure of the FCC to ensure a meaningful opportunity for the public to comment on these changes through full media coverage and numerous hearings throughout the country.

It is an absolute conflict of interest for you and other members to accept ANY financial assistance, gifts or benefits such as travel, lodging etc.. from those for whom you are responsible to provide OBJECTIVE oversight.

D. Grummett
Juneau, Alaska

From: dale graver
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 7, 2003 7:54 PM
Subject: Caps on Media Ownership

I am opposed *to* rule changes ~~that~~ would remove caps on media ownership.

Rocie Carballo-Graver
Chapel Hill, NC

From: Maureen Kane
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 9, 2003 4:56 PM
Subject: Don't allow monopoly of media channels

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Numerous reports agree that the Federal Communications is planning to loosen longstanding rules governing control of the media that bring news and views to the American public. This will inevitably lead to monopoly, by a few large corporate giants, of TV stations, newspapers, and broadcast networks.

I urge you, Commissioner Powell, to halt immediately any implementation of these these FCC plans that threaten public access to diverse views and information.

Sincerely,

Maureen Kane
1906 Greene ST
Beaufort, SC 29902

From: baileya@bellsouth.net
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu. Apr 10, 2003 10:47 AM
Subject: Pending FCC ruling

mcopps@fcc.gov,

Please let this letter serve as my formal complaint and objection to any pending FCC rulings which may lift restriction's on mergers between N broadcast networks and the number of local N o r radio stations owned by one company. Such deregulation threatens to further stifle the diversity of programming for consumers, advertisers and producers. One of the main charges of the FCC is to promote diversity, which doesn't just refer to people of color, it refers to many different types of programming. We applaud you Commissioner Copps for attempting to draw attention to this problem. I would like to go on record as being opposed to increased or further media deregulation and wish for you to act on my behalf and STOP further media deregulation.

Respectfully yours,

Amanda Bailey
baileya@bellsouth.net

Amanda E. Bailey, MSN, RN, ACNP
Acute Care Nurse Practitioner
Vanderbilt Stallworth Rehabilitation Hospital

From: gayle@cwa9410.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 10:48 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

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,

Cayle Crawley
240 2nd street
San Francisco, California 94105

From: kalimompro@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 11:34 AM
Subject: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell,

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,

Wendy Nelson
2768 Osmundsen Road
Fitchburg, Wisconsin 53711

From: Josh Engelhardt
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 3:05 PM
Subject: New FCC laws

Please do not allow radio and tv owners to own more stations. The rules that were lifted in the early 90s destroyed radio. Growing up radio was a thing that brought you new ideas and inspired people and helped musicians reach people. Now it is just a constant run of advertising. Even the music is advertising. Please dont dumb down America's youth with these horrible deregulations.

Thank you
Josh Engelhardt
906 N 35th st
Seattle WA 98103

From: Josh Engelhardt
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 3:07 PM
Subject: new deregulations

Please do not allow radio and tv owners to own more stations. The rules that were lifted in the early 90s destroyed radio. Growing up radio was a thing that brought you new ideas and inspired people and helped musicians reach people. Now it is just a constant run of advertising. Even the music is advertising. Please dont dumb down America's youth with these horrible deregulations.

Thank you
Josh Engelhardt
906 N 35th st
Seattle WA 98103

From: Daniel Feldman
To: Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abemathy
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 3:20 PM
Subject: Ownership rules

I wish to comment as a long time radio advertiser on the effects of relaxing ownership rules in media. Since the rules were relaxed in 1996, advertising prices have more than tripled. Creativity and diversity have all but been eliminated as the major stations have become homogenous shadows of their former selves. Whether it is Clear Channel stations, Infinity, Jefferson Pilot or Entercom (the 4 major players in Denver), the result has been the same across the board...far higher prices for a far worse product. New artists are not found on radio, but on the Internet and on cable TV where there is competition, not consolidation. Where does it make sense to allow a giant media corporation to own the concert venues the artists MUST play in (or lose valuable airplay? Where is any of this a benefit to the public good?

Even more disturbing is the corporate stamp and philosophy broadcast by every station regardless of audience composition. Most obvious is the overwhelming pro war stance of Clear Channel Communications on every one of their stations here. KTCL (93.3), who never runs a regular news program, is now running Gulf War news on an hourly basis with a Clear Channel promotion tag that is blatantly pro war. The Clear Channel Classic Rock station KRFX (103.5 FM), traditionally filled with frat humor revolving around sex and Harley's held a Support our Troops rally that was nothing more than a kick Saddam's butt promotion, though it was advertised as a rally for both pro war and pro peace people to come together to support the brave fighting men and women who do indeed put their lives on the line for our country. All this to bow to the politics of Clear Channel ownership instead of the public they serve.

For the record, I am not taking a stance one way or another on the war in this regard, however the same reports and promotional tag is carbon copied on every Clear Channel Station. There are even rumors in the trade here that Clear Channel put pressure on air personalities not to speak out against the war. This is not diversity. This does not bode well for public interest that these stations are supposed to be serving.

If you allow ownership consolidation to progress even further free speech on the public airwaves will all but disappear. If you allow big corporations to buy more market share, and even more stations, more advertisers will be priced out of the marketplace by ever increasing rates to pay for overpriced signals. The ownership rules should be tightened, not relaxed. There is way too much consolidation of the ownership of the radio airwaves today and in my opinion, it would be foolish to allow this trend to become an even bigger joke. The government has spent millions trying to break up IBM, Microsoft, AT&T and more, claiming too much power resided in one company. The mistake you are striving to take today will in future years have to be undone by future taxpayers.

Daniel Feldman
Denver, CO

CC: john-mccain@mccain.senate.gov

From: Murphy, Richard
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 4:19 PM
Subject: station ownership

Dear Commissioner,

I understand the FCC is considering relaxing the cap on the number of radio stations a company can own.

I feel this is a wrong course for Radio. We are seeing the making of a monopoly in Radio broadcasting. At least with the advent of cable and satellite TV, viewers have choice. If one company owns a majority of the radio signals in a market, choice and variety is no longer an option to the radio listener. As a 20 year radio professional I have seen the industry consolidate and the quality and variety of product available to the community dwindle. Relaxing of these rules creates ~~two~~ major problems. 1. Small broadcast companies offering a different product and 2. unemployment.

1. Companies like Clear Channel eliminate any new competition to come to the market. I could open a hardware store today to compete with the one down the street, but because there are no new radio signals signing on. You have to buy what's available. In Denver to buy a decent signal you're looking at 80-120 million dollars, with the idea that Clear Channel owns a majority of Denver radio. Fair competition requires a level playing field. That currently does not exist in sales, and programming. Sales has to compete with Clear Channel saying to an advertiser buy station 1 and we will bonus your commercials on stations 2, 3, and 4. Programming wise Clear Channel says to an artist play a show for one of our competitors and we will pull your music off all Clear Channel stations. Play concert for Clear Channel concerts or we will do the same. Relaxing the rules only makes a playing field favor large companies like Clear Channel even more. Where the mom and pop stations have no opportunity to offer any type of value or quality radio to the listener because of the big bully on the block. These companies realize they won't generate the advertising dollars of a Clear Channel but at least they should have a chance to come into the market and compete.

2. From an internal employment point of view relaxing the ownership rules will allow companies like Clear Channel to implement their programming philosophy of an Announcer voice tracking multiple markets from one location. I know for a fact that one disc jockey will voice as many as 13 markets a day. 13 communities, cities, stations, without local broadcasters being able to communicate to their audience. This practice is not only a disservice to the listener but also is contributing to the unemployment of Americans. 12 Announcers out of work and that one announcer that is working is not making the salary of 13 Disc jockeys. They are told to do it or lose your job to some who will.

We are on the verge of Radio being controlled by a couple of companies in top 250 markets in the United States. Fair market competition and the employment of broadcast professionals like my self are on the verge of being a casualty of your decision. They days of 20 years ago where 30 stations in Denver owned by 10-15 owners a thing of the past. tomorrow it could be 30 stations owned by 3 broadcast companies.

Diversity in the number of broadcasters in a market offers variety and

quality programming. The winner is the communities and the listeners served by those stations.

Thank for your time and consideration

Richard Werry
4268 South Argonne Street
Aurora, CO
80013

From: ozen batum
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 4:54 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

The above subject sale should not be allowed. FCC, over the years, have let the big media companies forming by merger or acquisition of smaller or other media firms. They are so big now that all they are concerned with is the bottom line. There is no longer any interest stated in their vision of serving the communities, small or large, or provide different points of views in the interest of better informing the public. This threatens the basic fiber of our democracy and our freedom of expression. Watching various debates on CSPAN and PBS (you will no longer find any trustful information on any other major media stations) I believe we should reverse the trend and breakup these media giants and NOT make them any bigger. Particular concern is the News Corp and its CEO Rupert Murdoch. Time and time again it has been demonstrated that Mr. Murdoch has no interest of serving America let alone the small communities who depend on news coverage by major media companies. If you don't believe it, watch FOX network sometimes. We the public is fed up with receiving biased information all the time.

I hope FCC will not allow this purchase to go through.

Sincerely,
O. Batum
231 Star Trek Dr.
Pelham, AL 35124

From: Ben C.
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 5:52 PM
Subject: FCC Deregulation

Dear Commissioner Copps.

Please let this letter **serve** as my formal complaint and objection to any pending FCC rulings which may lift restriction's on mergers between TV broadcast networks and the number of local TV or radio stations owned by one company. Such deregulation threatens to further stifle the diversity of programming for consumers, advertisers and producers. One of the main charges of the FCC is to promote diversity, which doesn't just refer to people of color, it refers to many different types of programming. I applaud you Commissioner Copps for attempting to draw attention to

this problem. I would like to go on record as being opposed to increased or further media deregulation and

wish for you to act on my behalf and STOP further media deregulation.

Respectfully yours,
Ben Clayton

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Tax Center - File online, calculators, forms, and more
<http://tax.yahoo.com>