ORIGINAL

ex parte written presentations

D 02-277

to Chairman and Commissioners

1,500 Documents

RECEIVED
JAN 30 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: lmadorkl2345@cs.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jan 26, 2003 11:26 AM
Subject: Media Ownership Rules changes

ORIGINAL
02-277

Michael K. Powell

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 11, 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 it's 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,

Micah Uetricht

1206 Whitehall Road

Muskegon, Michigan 49445

02-277

From: scantrell@ranger.cc.tx.us
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Jan 24. 2003 9:49 AM
Subject: oppose media concentration

02-277

Chairman Michael K. Powell:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277. (rel. Sept. 23. 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. **02-277.** the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant companies and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCCs plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Sincerely,

Sandra ***S.*** Cantrell

02-277

3502 Highway 112
Eastland, TX, **76448**

From: Ken Winston
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Jan *23,2003* 2:05 PM
Subject: No cross ownership

02-277

Sir.

The last thing this country needs now or ever is to weaken the rules prohibiting cross ownership of newspapers and TV stations in the same market. Too much control in the hands of the few has never been in the best interest of a Democracy. We must have media diversity. *Do* the right thing.

Ken Winston

RECEIVED

JAN 30 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: nat k
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Jan 24, 2003 11:26 AM
Subject: Opposed to Media Ownership Rules

02-277

STOP MORE SPAM with the new MSN 8 and get 2 months FREE'

From: brian Dipippa
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Jan 24, 2003 3:48 PM
Subject: Opposistion to the current Media Ownership Rules

02-277

Michael K. Powell
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am sending this E-mail 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 11, 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 countrys 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 didnt 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,
Brian DiPippa

1306 Mississippi ave

PGH. **PA** 15216

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

From: Mari Pillar
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jan26, 2003 11:16 AM
Subject: Preserve Diversity and Openness in the Media and on the Internet

02-277

Mari Pillar
5107 CR 30
Angleton. TX 77515-9440

January 26.2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Chair Powell:

The Federal Communications Commission is responsible for ensuring that the media serve the public interest. I am concerned that the FCC is acting on behalf of big business rather than the people.

It is clear that the FCC has stepped up its efforts to de-regulate the media and telecommunications industries. You must act now to halt further media consolidation and to preserve the openness and diversity of the Internet.

As a supporter of women's rights, I am concerned that the current media merger free-for-all threatens to rob us all of the independent voices, views and ideas that nourish a pluralistic, democratic society. Ownership consolidation is squeezing out what little diversity remains in the marketplace.

The media are more than just a business; they bring information to people that affects their lives. We cannot have a healthy democracy, and women cannot pursue equal rights, if we are uninformed on the issues. The media have a responsibility to serve the public interest and ensure that all voices are heard. It is your job to promote this.

Please remember U.S. consumers and citizens when you review any further regulations. The media giants already control far too much of our precious information resources.

Sincerely,

Mari Pillar

02-277

From: Mari Pillar
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jan 26,2003 11:16 AM
Subject: Preserve Diversity and Openness in the Media and on the Internet

Mari Pillar
5107 CR 30
Angleton, TX 77515-9440

January 26, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Chair Powell:

The Federal Communications Commission is responsible for ensuring that the media serve the public interest. I am concerned that the FCC is acting on behalf of big business rather than the people.

It is clear that the FCC has stepped up its efforts to de-regulate the media and telecommunications industries. You must act now to halt further media consolidation and to preserve the openness and diversity of the Internet.

As a supporter of women's rights, I am concerned that the current media merger free-for-all threatens to rob us all of the independent voices, views and ideas that nourish a pluralistic, democratic society. Ownership consolidation is squeezing out what little diversity remains in the marketplace.

The media are more than just a business; they bring information to people that affects their lives. We cannot have a healthy democracy, and women cannot pursue equal rights, if we are uninformed on the issues. The media have a responsibility to serve the public interest and ensure that all voices are heard. It is your job to promote this.

Please remember U.S. consumers and citizens when you review any further regulations. The media giants already control far too much of our precious information resources.

Sincerely,

Mari Pillar

02-277

From: Charles Alvarez
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Jan 26, 2003 1:38 PM
Subject: Preserve Diversity and Openness in the Media and on the Internet

Charles Alvarez
85-50 Forest Pkwy Apt 2M
Woodhaven, NY 11421-1141

January 26, 2003

Federal Communications Commission Chair Michael K. Powell
445 12th St SW
Rm 8-A204
Washington, DC 20554

Chair Powell:

The Federal Communications Commission is responsible for ensuring that the media serve the public interest. I am concerned that the FCC is acting on behalf of big business rather than the people.

It is clear that the FCC has stepped up its efforts to de-regulate the media and telecommunications industries. You must act now to halt further media consolidation and to preserve the openness and diversity of the Internet.

As a supporter of women's rights, I am concerned that the current media merger free-for-all threatens to rob **us** all of the independent voices, views and ideas that nourish a pluralistic, democratic society. Ownership consolidation is squeezing out what little diversity remains in the marketplace.

The media are more than just a business; they bring information to people that affects their lives. We cannot have a healthy democracy, and women cannot pursue equal rights, if we are uninformed on the issues. The media have a responsibility to serve the public interest and ensure that all voices are heard. It is your job to promote this.

Please remember U.S. consumers and citizens when you review any further regulations. The media giants already control far too much of our precious information resources.

Sincerely

Charles Alvarez

02-277

From: Jim Matus
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Jan 22,2003 5:38 PM
Subject: Do Not further deregulate Media consolidation

Mr. Powell,

Do Not further deregulate Media consolidation

-Jim Matus, Hartford CT

02-271

From: K.Denzer/H.Field
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jan 27, 2003 12:14 AM
Subject: don't eliminate ownership rules

A democracy is only free when citizens have access to many diverse sources of information. Large media conglomerates should NOT be allowed to own and operate multiple outlets in the same city.

-- Kiko Denzer
POB 576
Blodgett, OR 97326
541-438-4300
handiko@cmug.com

02-277

From: Megan Meter
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jan 27,2003 7:01 AM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

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,

Megan L. Van Meter
115 Troy Ave.
Lubbock, TX 79416-3117

02-277

From: Jodi Uyl
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon. Jan 27, 2003 7:01 AM
Subject: FCC don't allow media monopolies

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,

Jodi Den Uyl
3321 Earle SW
Grandville, MI 49418

02-277

From: Heidi Carter
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Jan 27, 2003 6:58 AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

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,

Heidi Carter

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

From: Kwame Warfield
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/24/03 4:01AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

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

Sincerely

Kwame Warfield
9409 N.E. Gertz Ct.
Portland, OR 97211

From: Nicole A Roux
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/24/03 4:01AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

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

Sincerely,

Nicole A Roux

From: Debra McKnight Higgins
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/24/03 4:01AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

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

Sincerely

Debra McKnight Higgins

From: John Thomas
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 1/24/03 4:01AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

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

Sincerely,

John Thomas

From: Elizabeth Popp
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/24/03 4:01AM
Subject: FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

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

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Popp

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: 1/23/03 1:09PM
Subject: Fwd: Consider The Needs Of Children!

From: RobSculpt1@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/23/03 1:09PM
Subject: Consider The Needs Of Children!

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

I urge the FCC to consider the distinct 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 the development of children.

The relaxation of media ownership rules will result in significantly less original programming for children Relaxation also will reduce competition, potentially stifling innovation and increasing commercialism in children's programming.

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

Sincerely,

Robert Wilkinson
870 Parrott Dr
San Mateo. California 94402

cc:
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Tom Lantos

From: Candace–wooden@aici.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: 1/23/03 2:27PM
Subject: Consider The Needs Of Children!

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps.

I urge the FCC to consider the distinct 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 the development of children.

The relaxation of media ownership rules will result in significantly less original programming for children Relaxation also will reduce competition, potentially stifling innovation and increasing commercialism in children's programming.

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

Sincerely,

Candace Wooden
220 Virginia
Indianapolis, Indiana 46207-7101

cc:
Senator Richard Lugar
Senator Evan Bayh
Representative Julia Carson

From: Glen Updike
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy. Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Jan 22,2003 12:13 PM
Subject: Federal Communications Commission Concern

02-277

Dear Mr.Powell and other members of the F.C.C.:

My name is Glen Updike and I am writing in concern about the proposal of abandoning many of the regulations concerning media ownership in the United States. The question that you must be thinking is why would a normal person like me be concerned with this proposal? Well, the truth is this proposal will give the media into corporate hands. They will be picking what is newsworthy and what is not. This proposal will also eliminate a lot of people's voices. Especially, the youth of America which has not always been cared for. Having these corporations running the media, they will choose what is to be heard. A lot of the news that will be critical to the corporations will not be heard for obvious reasons. What is my proof for all this? Look at the Seattle WTO protesters. The media portrayed them as rowdy youths breaking stuff for no reason. These people were saying something, but the media ignored all of that just to get a better story. Things like this will happen all the time if these corporations run the media. Not just protest coverage, but other news will be left out too. Such as the problem over at Iraq and problems like corporate scandals etc. This proposal is reducing our cultural diversity and our rights of the first amendment. I am only one out of thousands of concerned youths and adults in this country. The main deal here is the media should be a democracy and not a money hungry corporation

Sincerely,
Glen Updike
1006 Hinman Avenue
Boscobel, USA 53805

The new MSN 8: smart spam protection and 2 months FREE'
http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail

From: leila ryterski
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Jan 23, 2003 4:51 PM
Subject: free media

63-4-77

Dear Mr. Powell

By allowing corporations to own the media, you can never expect the people to get unbiased news!!! So America is now being fed propoganda. like any third-world country, only we think we're getting the truth. I've stopped listening and reading. The facts, when we can get them, speak for themselves.

I believe that by enlarge, the Republicans and the Democrats are not allowing a third party into the arena. The Republicans and Democrats are both being fed by the same corporations. It would so wonderful to have a free country again, or get closer to being one. The media needs to be free, first. You're our backbone. We're depending on you not to sell **us** down the drain. It's unfair, unjust, and cruel not to allow another candidate, chosen by the people, to debate. We don't have free elections. America, the land of the what??

The rich and the powerful are not only putting down the masses, they're putting themselves down, too, because clean air and water and beautiful places are being put down, too. We're all in this together.

Sincerely,
Lilly, Ryterski
Fairbanks, AK

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Mail Plus - Powerful. Affordable. Sign up now
http://mailplus.yahoo.com

From: Nadia Rodnova
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon. Jan 27,2003 7:00 AM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

03-277

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,

Nadia Rodnova
115 Apart.,, 11 Bldg., Snaiperskaya Street
111395 Moscow. Russia

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

03-277

From: SUBLIMEsb96@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Jan 25, 2003 3:22 PM
Subject: Concerned with the proposed changes by your agencyy 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 it's 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

Steve Burik
215 Church Dr.
Coraopolis, PA 15108

02-277

From: Rohna@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu. Jan 23, 2003 1:06 PM
Subject: consolidation of media power

I find it very disturbing that the FCC is allowing further consolidation of media outlets. Available access to many different points of view is vital in a democracy. This will not happen if the media is concentrated in a few large corporations.

Rohna Shoul
9 Exmoor Rd.
Newton, MA 02459

From: Susan Walker
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Jan 23,2003 9:20 PM
Subject: Diversity

02-277

Dear Mr. Powell:

To preserve our democracy we need a diverse media. Please do not weaken rules about separate ownership of TV and newspapers. Thank you. Sue Walker

02-277

From: blakeqiu@charter.net
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jan 26,2003 11:09 AM
Subject: I oppose media concentration!

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -
Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules
and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202
of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking,
MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCCs broadcast media ownership rules. In promoting its supposed goals of fair competition, diversity and local voice in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of the huge, dominant companies and players in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate, or even attempt to demonstrate, the negative effects that media deregulation and consolidation have had on the diversity of our media. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented has been severely limited.

The right to conduct an informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was renewed in the marketplace of diverse ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge and consolidate further, our ability to have an open, informed discussion from a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

I urge the FCC to preserve the public interest by keeping the media ownership rules in question intact.

Also, I support the FCCs plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February of 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy. it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

Blake Nicholson

02-277

419 West 9th Street
Crescent City, CA, 95531

02-277

From: Thomas Heiman
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Jan 22, 2003 6:46 PM
Subject: DO NOT change FCC rules

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am writing IN OPPOSITION to any changes that you are contemplating in the FCC rules. I ask that you (not just one of your staffers) read this, and hear me out. Such changes will only serve to allow what little diversity of media "control" and management that now exists, to be completely smothered. Trashing any chance for regaining diverse expression in the media. There is little or no chance for real wide-ranging "information" options in radio or TV, which are presently captive to large corporate advertisers and their agencies. News programming has become laughable, if it was not so pathetic.

I live in a radio-TV market area of western Wisconsin, where there is little opportunity for a variety of news programming ..... and where citizen grass roots issues can be effectively shut-out, when large corporate affiliated managements control all outlets…... providing only pre-programmed music..... with little if any choice left to the community.

FOR EXAMPLE: In a recent long-term (and still ongoing) citizens issue ---concerning a radical "big corporation" proposal to turn significant, populated areas of towns and countryside in Wisconsin into industrial, polluted regions..... toxic fuel (ethanol) refineries, namely .....AND . because there are NO radio stations in the entire area of western Wisconsin that would deal with the subject even for a few moments much less a discussion.....we, concerned citizens of **ALL** political parties, were effectively SHUT OUT of getting our issue to the public. The small "public radio station" (PBS…WHWC 88.3 FM) here is usually excellent, but it is listened to by only a small fraction of the population. And they only gave limited air coverage for local issues.

I know whereof I speak, for I actively pursued every possible radio and TV station reaching the listening area of our counties: essentially Dunn, Eau Claire, and Chippewa counties, in Western Wisconsin. Nothing. Nichts. Nada! It was like talking to a blank wall. The program producers just said "we have no time for that", "it's not our format" "we have national talk shows", "what's wrong .... don't you like ol' Rush?'

It is devastating to citizens who really care about their communities, to know that the FCC has essentially sold their common property --- the air waves of communication --- out from under them. We are talking about hundreds of citizens, people who have signed petitions in protest, working and advocating, and obeying the **laws** of the land. And all the local stations can say is "Sorry, that's not our format".

Another example: one or two TV stations may come to interview you for one hour..... then actually edit the tape to oblivion, and finally air only about 7 to 10 seconds of sound bite ……which are well sandwiched between the *98* % of the program, given to sports, the endless trivia of weather data, rehashed national news, advertising, and empty chatter. That's not coverage. That's a token of disdain for legitimate citizen concerns.

The local newspapers and TV are very limited in their coverage..... and are governed by large corporate interests, linked directly with those who would turn our area into a series of industrial zones. These are crucial issues. They are not trivial . They are not funny. But talk show formats have no coverage of local issues ..... they are all the national blow-hards, who couldn't care less about our backyard. That, Mr. Powell, represents a betrayal and a true breakdown in regulations of the FCC mandates. It is reprehensible.

This point is crucial: when those stations say THEIR surveys show they are giving the public what it wants..... I sharply challenge the validity or honesty of such surveys. Those very stations have literally 'chased-away' thousands of other former listeners, who do not want what they have turned their stations into..... thus, when they sample their listenership..... they are completely ignoring a massive number of people, deserving of responsive and responsible news, who have turned off their radios.

02-277

We now know that the managements have no desire to inform.... but only to carve out a chunk of population.....who are pliable, susceptable to sound bites, ... they are choosing to entertain the "lowest common denominator". It wasn't always this way. There was a time when local talk shows were allowed to exist and even flourish.

Our democracy cannot survive on canned junk food... whether that be for the eyes, the ears, or the mind.....or the tummy..... We are fast becoming a parody of our former culture: obese bodies and fat heads.

Your commission is that of "communication". That is a sacred trust. Those are OUR AIR WAVES. They are for FULL communication of, for, and by all sectors of our society. DO NOT SOFTEN THE FCC RULES.

The body and mind of our country is dying on the vine. We expect you to enforce and protect ALL the people's interests, not those of the big boys, with marketing strategies for quick bucks. We expect you to do your job and set high standards so that citizen groups, community issues get the attention and depth that are deserved. Right now it is a wasteland..... of hyped national talk-show hosts and full of invective. All heat and no light.

Also, if you decide to answer this e-mail, I refuse to accept a stock, faceless, mass mailing letter. I expect a personal reply to the specific issues addressed. Citizens who care about this country expect action and protection. We live to build and strengthen the FACT of democracy, not the empty fantasies, slogans and outright lies of demagogues and ruthless corporations.

My wife, Lenore, my family, friends and concerned citizens join me in asking you to bring back the airwaves to serve the people and their true need for communication.

Sincerely,

Thomas H. Heiman. M.S.. CRC, CVE
Rehabilitation Consultant
E6227 819th Ave.
Colfax, WI 54730
Phone: (715) 235-6552
Fax: (715)235-6638
e-mail: tomlen52@charter.net

copies: Senator Russ Feingold, Senator Herb Kohl, Representative Ron Kind,
Assembly Representative Joe Plouff.

cc: Ed Garvey, Alice Clausing, Joe Plouff, Senator Kohl, Russell Feingold

From: David Sagaser
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Jan 25, 2003 5:38 PM
Subject: Media

02-277

Michael K. Powell

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 countrys 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 didnt 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,

03-277

David Sagaser

4633 East Karen Drive

Phoenix, Arizona 85032

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Mail Plus - Powerful. Affordable. Sign up now
http://mailplus.yahoo.com

From: bodners@erols.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Jan 7,2003 1:40 PM
Subject: NYTimes.com Article: All News Media Inc.

02-277

This article from NYTimes.com
has been sent to you by bodners@erols.com.

Mr. Powell:

I am sending you the attached NY Times op-ed piece because it ex[resses better than I can my concerns about the proposed relaxation of FCC regulations.

The proposed changes are really an assault on the democratic process. The Internet is simply not an adequate vehicle for the average American, many of whom do not have access to it, to receive comprehensive news coverage.

The major media outlets will consider the changes a boon--they can become more powerful and influential than ever they were. This, I think, explains why we have seen so little coverage of this subject.

Holding a comment hearing in Richmond is a laugh. For so fundamental change in our access to what Government does, nothing short of public hearings in Washington will do.

I urge you to reconsider so sweeping a change in the regulations governing public access to the news

Sheila Bodner
Arlington, VA

bodners@erols.com

All News Media Inc

January 7, 2003
By BILL KOVACH and TOM ROSENSTIEL

WASHINGTON
Without much notice, the federal government is moving toward the most sweeping change ever in the rules that govern ownership of the American news media.

This shift could reduce the independence of the news media and the ability of Americans to take part in public debate. Yet because of meager press coverage and steps taken by the Federal Communications Commission in its policy-making process, most people probably have no idea that it is taking place.

Having seen how totalitarian regimes moved the world to war through domination of their news media, the government

during the 1940s put restrictions on how many news media outlets one company could own, both nationally and in a single city.

02-277

Though those rules have been relaxed in the last 20 years, companies are still blocked from buying a newspaper and television station in the same city or from owning more than one TV station in the same market.

Three weeks after it proposed eliminating those rules, the F.C.C. released a series of reports about the current media marketplace. But the reports focused almost entirely on the economic impact of relaxing the ownership rules. They largely ignore the public's interest in a diverse and independent press.

The F.C.C. argues that technologies like the Internet offer Americans access to more information than ever and thus worries about monopolies are unfounded. But studies also show that most Americans receive their news from a handful of outlets. Beyond this, much of what appears on the Internet is repackaged from those outlets. The number of operations that gather original news is small and now may become smaller.

The question of concentration is most acute at the local level. In most communities, even those with television and radio stations, the vast range of activities are covered by only one institution, the local newspaper.

What will happen to communities if the ownership rules are eliminated? Among the possibilities is that one or two companies in each town would have an effective monopoly on reaching consumers by being allowed to control the newspaper, radio, TV, billboards and more - with costly consequences for businesses that need those outlets for advertising. Such a monopoly on information would also reduce the diversity of cultural and political discourse in a community.

The precedent in radio is telling. Since the rules on ownership of radio were last relaxed in 1996, the two biggest companies went from owning 130 stations to more than 1,400.

The F.C.C.chairman, Michael K. Powell, has scheduled only one public hearing, in Richmond, Va., on the proposal, and the public comment period will close at the end of this month. It is a small and brief opportunity, but one that the public should seize if it cherishes an independent press.

Bill Kovach is chairman of the Committee of Concerned Journalists. Tom Rosenstiel is director of the Project for Excellence in Journalism.

http://w.nytimes.com/2003/01/07/opinion/07KOVA.html?ex=1042962900&ei=1&en=0e593b71454e88f6

02-277

HOW TO ADVERTISE

For information on advertising in e-mail newsletters or other creative advertising opportunities with The New York Times on the Web, please contact onlinesales@nytimes.com or visit our online media kit at http://w.nytimes.com/adinfo

For general information about NYTimes.com, write to help@nytimes.com.

Copyright 2002 The New York Times Company

From: Shane !
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Jan 22,2003 9:45 PM
Subject: Federal Communications Commission

02-277

Michael K. Powell

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 countrys 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 didnt 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,

02-277

Shane Angell

Murietta CA.

--

Sign-up for your own FREE Personalized E-mail at Mail.com
http://www.mail.com/?sr=signup

Meet Singles
http://corp.mail.com/lavalife