

From: Potholeontheroad@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Mar 27, 2003 9:40 PM
Subject: No to deregulation of the FCC

Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that the FCC is attempting to press ahead with deregulating the FCC. I am strongly opposed because independent newspapers across the United States are in danger of being bought out by multinational corporations. A free press is one of the rights guaranteed by our Bill of Rights. Please oppose this tyranny that seeks to squash free speech

Sincerely,
William Patterson
Miami, Florida

From: Alex Soave
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, Mar 27, 2003 10:37 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Mr. Copps:

I support your position that the media monopoly should not be allowed to expand its clout

Sincerely,

Alex F. Soave
Fellsmere, FL

From: P. Dirschka
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Mar 27, 2003 10:45 PM
Subject: Consolidation of station ownership

Dear Chairman Michael K. Powell,

I am concerned that consolidation of ownership of broadcast TV and radio will be a detriment to our nation. An example of the problem involves Clear Channel.

Clear Channel in the Pensacola, Florida area broadcasts on WEARTV channel 3 and on WFGX via cable. Today's Pensacola News Journal (March 27, 2003) has an Associated Press article that notes Clear Channel is organizing and funding rallies to support the war. A quote in the article regarding this activity by Bob Steele, director of journalism ethics at Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, FL states: "When a media Company takes an advocacy position on a significant public policy issue, it can certainly undermine the credibility of that media company's journalists". Mark Hyman, a representative of Clear Channel, broadcasts corporate opinions on various subjects. (For a sample visit <http://www.newscentral.tv/thepointthepoint.shtml>.) The point is, Clear Channel has an agenda and is not bashful about presenting it. With little TV competition to present local news, Clear Channel can promote whatever slant it chooses without the concerns of competitive journalism.

WEARTV news is the sole Florida TV source for news about Pensacola and the surrounding communities. You would expect that they would take the responsibility of reporting the news in a balanced fashion that presented both sides of community issues. In some cases they do this, but all too often they do not. Examples of the lack of balance have been seen regarding a proposed dam near Baker and reporting on the state organization of superintendents position on the school class size issue. Evidently they have had complaints and perhaps in response, have an excellent program "Extra" that allows viewers to express opinions about issues. However this does not un-do a failure to present local issues in a balanced manner.

The lack of balance in the WEARTV news reports is egregious on its own. But, to allow a corporation, contemptuous of public debate and discussion as I perceive Clear Channel, overwhelming dominance in a small market is not a path of wisdom for our community anymore than it is for our nation. The control of information, inherent in consolidation of broadcast ownership, is a breach of the trust the public has placed with the FCC for regulation of the resource of the public frequencies. I urge you to continue to regulate station ownership within markets, thereby promoting competition, minimizing corporate influence on news content and providing differing perspectives on the issues facing our world.

Respectfully,

Paul A. Dirschka

2949 Laurel Drive
Gulf Breeze, FL 32563
850.932.1888

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

From: P.Dirschka
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Mar 27, 2003 10:45 PM
Subject: Consolidation of station ownership.

Dear Chairman Michael K. Powell,

I am concerned that consolidation of ownership of broadcast TV and radio will be a detriment to our nation. An example of the problem involves Clear Channel.

Clear Channel in the Pensacola, Florida area broadcasts on WEARTV channel 3 and on WFGX via cable. Today's Pensacola News Journal (March 27, 2003) has an Associated Press article that notes Clear Channel is organizing and funding rallies to support the war. A quote in the article regarding this activity by Bob Steele, director of journalism ethics at Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, FL states: "When a media Company takes an advocacy position on a significant public policy issue, it can certainly undermine the credibility of that media company's journalists". Mark Hyman, a representative of Clear Channel, broadcasts corporate opinions on various subjects. (For a sample visit <http://www.newscentral.tv/thepoint/thepoint.shtml>.) The point is, Clear Channel has an agenda and is not bashful about presenting it. With little TV competition to present local news, Clear Channel can promote whatever slant it chooses without the concerns of competitive journalism.

WEARTV news is the sole Florida TV source for news about Pensacola and the surrounding communities. You would expect that they would take the responsibility of reporting the news in a balanced fashion that presented both sides of community issues. In some cases they do this, but all too often they do not. Examples of the lack of balance have been seen regarding a proposed dam near Baker and reporting on the state organization of superintendents position on the school class size issue. Evidently they have had complaints and perhaps in response, have an excellent program "Extra" that allows viewers to express opinions about issues. However this does not un-do a failure to present local issues in a balanced manner.

The lack of balance in the WEARTV news reports is egregious on its own. But, to allow a corporation, contemptuous of public debate and discussion as I perceive Clear Channel, overwhelming dominance in a small market is not a path of wisdom for our community anymore than it is for our nation. The control of information, inherent in consolidation of broadcast ownership, is a breach of the trust the public has placed with the FCC for regulation of the resource of the public frequencies. I urge you to continue to regulate station ownership within markets, thereby promoting competition, minimizing corporate influence on news content and providing differing perspectives on the issues facing our world.

Respectfully,

Paul A. Dirschka

2949 Laurel Drive
Gulf Breeze, FL 32563
850.932.1888

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, **KM** KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: P.Dirschka
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Mar 27, 2003 10:45 PM
Subject: Consolidation of station ownership...

Dear Chairman Michael K. Powell,

I am concerned that consolidation of ownership of broadcast TV and radio will be a detriment to our nation. An example of the problem involves Clear Channel.

Clear Channel in the Pensacola, Florida area broadcasts on WEARTV channel 3 and on WFGX via cable. Today's Pensacola News Journal (March 27, 2003) has an Associated Press article that notes Clear Channel is organizing and funding rallies to support the war. A quote in the article regarding this activity by Bob Steele, director of journalism ethics at Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, FL states: "When a media Company takes an advocacy position on a significant public policy issue, it can certainly undermine the credibility of that media company's journalists". Mark Hyman, a representative of Clear Channel, broadcasts corporate opinions on various subjects. (For a sample visit <http://www.newscentral.tv/thepoint/thepoint.shtml>.) The point is, Clear Channel has an agenda and is not bashful about presenting it. With little TV competition to present local news, Clear Channel can promote whatever slant it chooses without the concerns of competitive journalism.

WEARTV news is the sole Florida TV source for news about Pensacola and the surrounding communities. You would expect that they would take the responsibility of reporting the news in a balanced fashion that presented both sides of community issues. In some cases they do this, but all too often they do not. Examples of the lack of balance have been seen regarding a proposed dam near Baker and reporting on the state organization of superintendents position on the school class size issue. Evidently they have had complaints and perhaps in response, have an excellent program "Extra" that allows viewers to express opinions about issues. However this does not un-do a failure to present local issues in a balanced manner.

The lack of balance in the WEARTV news reports is egregious on its own. But, to allow a corporation, contemptuous of public debate and discussion as I perceive Clear Channel, overwhelming dominance in a small market is not a path of wisdom for our community anymore than it is for our nation. The control of information, inherent in consolidation of broadcast ownership, is a breach of the trust the public has placed with the FCC for regulation of the resource of the public frequencies. I urge you to continue to regulate station ownership within markets, thereby promoting competition, minimizing corporate influence on news content and providing differing perspectives on the issues facing our world.

Respectfully,

Paul A. Dirschka

2949 Laurel Drive
Gulf Breeze, FL 32563
850.932.1888

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: tupacdebbie2@yahoo.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri. Mar 28, 2003 1:42 AM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan **S.** Adelstein,

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

debbie friar
1100 9th street
booneville, Mississippi 38829

cc:
Senator Thad Cochran
Senator Trent Lott
Representative Roger Wicker

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 1:42 AM
Subject: Fwd: Protect Children's Television!

From: tupacdebbie2@yahoo.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 1:42 AM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

debbie friar
1100 9th street
booneville, Mississippi 38829

cc:
Senator Thad Cochran
Senator Trent Lott
Representative Roger Wicker

From: Potholeontheroad@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri. Mar 28, 2003 4:53 AM
Subject: No to deregulation of FCC

Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that the FCC is attempting to press ahead with deregulating the FCC. I am strongly opposed because independent newspapers across the United States are in danger of being bought out by multinational corporations. A free press is one of the rights guaranteed by our Bill of Rights. Please oppose this tyranny that seeks to squash free speech.

Sincerely,
William Patterson
Miami, Florida

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 4:54 AM
Subject: Fwd: No to deregulation of FCC

From: Potholeontheroad@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 4:54 AM
Subject: No to deregulation of FCC

Dear Madam,

It has come to my attention that the FCC is attempting to press ahead with deregulating the FCC. I am strongly opposed because independent newspapers across the United States are in danger of being bought out by multinational corporations. A free press is one of the rights guaranteed by our Bill of Rights. Please oppose this tyranny that seeks to squash free speech.

Sincerely,
William Patterson
Miami, Florida

From: Kevin Cramer
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 8:38 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Kevin Cramer (maitrikaruna@yahoo.com) writes:

I Am writing because of my deep concerns about lack of diversity in media outlets. The last telecom act, while good intentioned, has allowed the consolidation of media assets (radio stations in particular) to an extreme level.

This has given control of the mindshare of Americans to just a handful of people, which has allowed those controlling parties to put forth their own interests, many of which are sharply divisive political issues.

Now you are proposing further eroding the controls by allowing these parties to control multiple delivery channels in one geographic locale. This is unthinkable to me.

Is the US going to move towards what amounts to a corporation controlling our every news source? **Is** this not the same as the communist controlled media on other countries?

The argument that I can get news from **so** many other sources does not wash with me. First, not all media sources are created equally. When I'm in my car, i have to listen to the radio for news. I can't **surf** the net there, or watch **tv**, of read **a** newspaper. Many people rely on one source of info for their news. This is often radio, where the effects of the last telecom act are **so** apparent because only one side of the political spectrum can **be** heard predominantly.

I hope you rethink your position. The strength of this great country lies in its diversity of opinions and healthy debates on all important issues. **Let's** not give one political interest group or corporation control of the eyes and minds of Americans. **Let's** not make that your legacy Sir.

Regards,
Kevin Cramer

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 64.78.65.155
Remote IP address: 64.78.65.155

From: L. Lynn LeSueur, Ph.D.
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 8:50 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

L. Lynn LeSueur, Ph.D. (LLynnL@mac.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

The commission's push to deregulate media ownership *is* clearly in accordance with Mr. Powell's "religious" marketing agenda. Just as clearly, he shows no grasp of what the First Amendment **is** about: a Free Press **is** insured in order to protect the citizens from a centralized media. One look at the way this war is being 'covered' (and **I use** that term both facetiously and with double-entendre, as in 'covered up'), not to mention the glaring way in which the media itself has NOT covered this ownership issue, reveals the importance of regulating ownership even further.

Please, for the sake of our democracy, establish public hearings throughout the country over the next year, WITH COPIOUS MEDIA COVERAGE, to show respect for the WILL **OF** THE PEOPLE, not the elite and powerful few.

Thank you,
L. Lynn LeSueur, Ph.D

Server protocol: HTTPII.1
Remote host: 24.147.57.46
Remote IP address: 24.147.57.46

From: Susan S. Balding
To: Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 9:21 AM
Subject: Fw: Media Ownership-Radio Industry

Dear Commissioners: PLEASE READ the following letter and don't be forced into a premature vote on expanding the broadcast regulations. Your debates need to continue into the heartland of our country for a true temperature reading on how all broadcasters feel about another "relaxation" of the rules--it will completely wipe out the small companies that truly serve communities. PLEASE DON'T vote with Mr. Powell.

----- Original Message -----

From: Susan S. Balding
To: RussellFeingold@ feingold.senate.gov
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2003 12:01 PM
Subject: Fw: Media Ownership-Radio Industry

----- Original Message -----

From: Susan S. Balding
To: john-mccain@mccain.senate.gov
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2003 11:59 AM
Subject: Media Ownership-Radio Industry

Dear Senators: HELP!!!!

My husband and I are broadcasters from Champaign-Urbana, Il. and have served our communities for over 22 years. In our recent 5 month long search to locate and purchase a broadcast facility in small to midsize markets in the Northwest, primarily Montana, we have encountered Clear Channel, Fisher Communications and New Northwest. Clear Channel and Fisher DOMINATE the state of Montana. They have bought up every station in communities that they legally can, then buy any or all signals from surrounding communities (50-60 miles) that can be altered (boosted), changed, or moved and buy them, sign SMAs, LMAs (management and sales agreements) with ownership agreements. Stations in Bozeman (also listed under the towns of Livingston and Belgrade), Missoula (also see Hamilton and Superior) and Billings are prime examples. (If you need further proof of ownership, our research is directly from the F.C.C., and contacting the owners in recent visits). These large broadcast companies cannot possibly serve the interests of the communities. My husband and I have spent untold hours monitoring these broadcast stations on-air, visiting the communities, researching the FCC Banks, conferred with leading engineers and local engineers, talking to Brokers and banks, and traveled to the communities. All we have wanted was to own our own station, but find there is no room for single operators like us who want to own our own facilities in a town that we would reside and serve. The Federal Government in its rulings has gifted the large media companies with all the radio waves. Senator Dorgan must be aware of this as North Dakota has become a playground for Clear Channel, also.

Sincerely,
Susan Strack Balding
217-351-1992, ssbaldingl @insightbb.com
1201 Waverly Dr.
Champaign, Il. 61821
Fax: 217-353-7489

New Northwest owns 6 radio stations in the small town of Astoria, Or-- KAST
F.M., KASTA.M., KCRX, KVAS, KKEE, KSWB.

From: Susan S. Balding
To: Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 9:21 AM
Subject: Fw: Media Ownership-Radio Industry

Dear Commissioners: PLEASE READ the following letter and don't be forced into a premature vote on expanding the broadcast regulations. Your debates need to continue into the heartland of our country for a true temperature reading on how all broadcasters feel about another "relaxation" of the rules--it will completely wipe out the small companies that truly serve communities. PLEASE DON'T vote with Mr. Powell.

----- Original Message -----

From: Susan S. Balding
To: RussellFeingold@ feingold.senate.gov
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2003 12:01 PM
Subject: Fw: Media Ownership-Radio Industry

----- Original Message -----

From: Susan S. Balding
To: john-mccain@mccain.senate.gov
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2003 11:59 AM
Subject: Media Ownership-Radio Industry

Dear Senators: HELP!!!!

My husband and I are broadcasters from Champaign-Urbana, IL and have served our communities for over 22 years. In our recent 5 month long search to locate and purchase a broadcast facility in small to midsize markets in the Northwest, primarily Montana, we have encountered Clear Channel, Fisher Communications and New Northwest. Clear Channel and Fisher DOMINATE the state of Montana. They have bought up every station in communities that they legally can, then buy any or all signals from surrounding communities (50-60 miles) that can be altered (boosted), changed, or moved and buy them, sign SMAs, LMAs (management and sales agreements) with ownership agreements. Stations in Bozeman (also listed under the towns of Livingston and Belgrade), Missoula (also see Hamilton and Superior) and Billings are prime examples. (If you need further proof of ownership, our research is directly from the F.C.C. and contacting the owners in recent visits). These large broadcast companies cannot possibly serve the interests of the communities. My husband and I have spent untold hours monitoring these broadcast stations on-air, visiting the communities, researching the FCC Banks, conferred with leading engineers and local engineers, talking to Brokers and banks, and traveled to the communities. All we have wanted was to own our own station, but find there is no room for single operators like **us** who want to own our own facilities in a town that we would reside and serve. The Federal Government in its rulings has gifted the large media companies with all the radio waves. Senator Dorgan must be aware of this as North Dakota has become a playground for Clear Channel, also.

Sincerely,
Susan Strack Balding
217-351-1992, ssbaldingl @insightbb.com
1201 Waverly Dr.
Champaign, IL 61821
Fax: 217-353-7489

New Northwest owns 6 radio stations in the small town of Astoria, Or-- KAST
F.M., KASTA.M., KCRX, KVAS, KKEE, KSWB.

From: Susan S. Balding
To: Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein. Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 9:21 AM
Subject: Fw: Media Ownership-Radio Industry

Dear Commissioners: PLEASE READ the following letter and don't be forced into a premature vote on expanding the broadcast regulations. Your debates need to continue into the heartland of our country for a true temperature reading on how all broadcasters feel about another "relaxation" of the rules—it will completely wipe out the small companies that truly serve communities. PLEASE DON'T vote with Mr. Powell.

----- Original Message -----

From: Susan S. Balding
To: RussellFeingold@ feingold.senate.gov
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2003 12:01 PM
Subject: Fw: Media Ownership-Radio Industry

----- Original Message -----

From: Susan S. Balding
To: john-mccain@mccain.senate.gov
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2003 11:59 AM
Subject: Media Ownership-Radio Industry

Dear Senators: HELP!!!!

My husband and I are broadcasters from Champaign-Urbana, IL, and have served our communities for over 22 years. In our recent 5 month long search to locate and purchase a broadcast facility in small to midsize markets in the Northwest, primarily Montana, we have encountered Clear Channel, Fisher Communications and New Northwest. Clear Channel and Fisher DOMINATE the state of Montana. They have bought up every station in communities that they legally can, then buy any or all signals from surrounding communities (50-60 miles) that can be altered (boosted), changed, or moved and buy them, sign SMA's, LMA's (management and sales agreements) with ownership agreements. Stations in Bozeman (also listed under the towns of Livingston and Belgrade), Missoula (also see Hamilton and Superior) and Billings are prime examples. (If you need further proof of ownership, our research is directly from the F.C.C. and contacting the owners in recent visits). These large broadcast companies cannot possibly serve the interests of the communities. My husband and I have spent untold hours monitoring these broadcast stations on-air, visiting the communities, researching the FCC Banks, conferred with leading engineers and local engineers, talking to Brokers and banks, and traveled to the communities. All we have wanted was to own our own station, but find there is no room for single operators like us who want to own our own facilities in a town that we would reside and serve. The Federal Government in its rulings has gifted the large media companies with all the radio waves. Senator Dorgan must be aware of this as North Dakota has become a playground for Clear Channel, also.

Sincerely,
Susan Strack Balding
217-351-1992, ssbaldingl @insightbb.com
1201 Waverly Dr.
Champaign, IL 61821
Fax: 217-353-7489

New Northwest owns 6 radio stations in the small town of Astoria, Or-- KAST
F.M., KASTA.M., KCRX, KVAS, KKEE, KSWB.

From: logannilsson
To: FCC FCCINFO, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 9:22 AM
Subject: broadcast decency

I am offended that are children are being exposed to sex and violence on television because you are not willing to take a stand for decency. No wonder our nation has serious problems with the youth. You are responsible! You get paid to protect our children and instead you allow them to be exposed to filth and violence everyday on prime-time TV.

What kind of a person are you? Do you have children of your own? Do you have a conscience?

Janine Nilsson

From: Patrice Titterington
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri. Mar 28,2003 10:38 AM
Subject: FCC promote media diversity

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,

Patrice Titterington
1223 Selby Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

From: Robin DeGrassi
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 11:10 AM
Subject: Ownership rules

Dear Mr. Powell,

I just read an article in which you were quoted as saying "It's hard to see how a complete ban on newspapers owning TV stations serves the public interest." I urge you to reconsider this viewpoint! Besides the ominous implications of one or two companies controlling the flow of information to the majority of Americans, I hope that you will realize that a homogeneous media will suffocate the diversity of opinions in this country -diversity of which we should all be proud. Please do not make it easier for companies like Clear Channel to monopolize the airwaves -Americans deserve to have choices!

Respectfully,
Robin DeGrassi
Lakewood, Colorado

From: shelly
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 11:29 AM
Subject: Upcoming June 2 Vote on Media Regulations

Dear Commissioner Powell:

As an old (now-retired) salesman of media advertising, one point I would make about allowing companies to own more than one media outlet in a market is that, contrary to them wanting to "monopolize" and constrict the number of news outlets they have in that situation, it behooves them to create as many different outlets for news as possible, because that gives them the opportunity to sell more advertising, and that's really how it pays off for them. And more advertising (which we always thought of as news, too) is also good for consumers.

I think that is why the FCC study you cited shows that media companies produce more local news under such circumstances, not less.

Thanks for giving me the opportunity to express my opinion!

Sheldon Greenberger

CC: Len Greenberger

From: Neal Plotnik
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 1:14 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Neal Plotnik (nealmari@earthlink.net) writes:

As a concerned citizen, I wanted to write to you to support your stand against mistakenly relaxing our current ownership regulations and allowing megacorporations to swallow up more of our media outlets. I support your efforts in this 100%

Sincerely
Neal Plotnik
Round Lake Beach IL

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 63.72.182.34
Remote IP address: 63.72.182.34

From: nloveladyallen@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 2:52 PM
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 Congress and 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,

Beth Allen
1429 Corcoran St Nw
Washington, District of Columbia 20009

From: nloveladyallen@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 2:52 PM
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 Congress and 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,

Beth Allen
1429 Corcoran St Nw
Washington, District of Columbia 20009

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 2:52 PM
Subject: Fwd: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

From: nloveladyallen@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 2:52 PM
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 Congress and 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,

Beth Allen
1429 Corcoran St **Nw**
Washington, District of Columbia 20009

From: Kathleen Abernathy
To: KAQUINN
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 3:17 PM
Subject: Fwd: Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

From: seal943@aol.com
To: KathleenAbernathy
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 3:17 PM
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 Congress and 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,

Beth Allen
7800 Carroll Ave.
Takoma Park, Maryland 20912

From: seal943apatriot.net
To: Michael Copps
Date: Fri, Mar 28, 2003 3:30 PM
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 Congress and 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,

Steph Lovelady
7800 Carroll Ave.
Takoma Park, Maryland 20912