

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JAN - 2 2003

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)	MB Docket No. 02-277
)	
)	
Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers)	MM Docket No. 01-235
)	
)	
Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets)	MM Docket No. 01-317
)	
)	
Definition of Radio Markets)	MM Docket No. 00-244

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

COMMENTS OF MEDIA GENERAL, INC.

(Volume 1: Comments and Appendices 1-8)

John R. Feore, Jr.
Michael D. Hays
M. Anne Swanson
Kevin P. Latek

Dow, Lohnes & Albertson, PLLC
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-6802
(202) 776-2534

Its Attorneys

January 2, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY.....	iv
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Media General’s Experience and a Review of the History of the FCC’s Regulation of Media Ownership and the Current Media Marketplace Show That Repeal of the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule in All Markets Is Long Overdue	6
A. Media General Has Pioneered Convergence in Medium and Small Markets	6
B. The Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule Is the Only Media Ownership Rule That Has Gone Unmodified for Almost Three Decades, and the Record Already Before the Commission on the Rule Is More Than Sufficient To Support Complete Repeal.....	8
C. Changes in the Media Marketplace in the Last Twelve Months Make the Need for Repeal Even More Compelling.....	13
1. Media General's Converged Facilities Continue To Bring Better, Faster, and Deeper Local News and Other Civic Improvements to Their Communities, Proving That Common Ownership Yields Tangible Public Interest Benefits.....	13
2. Media General's Convergence Markets Continue To Benefit From a Wide Variety of Media Outlets and Owners.....	21
III. Recent Court Decisions Further Compel Repeal of the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule	25
A. Section 202(h) Calls for Regulatory Reform and Establishes a More Exacting Standard for Retention Than For Promulgation of the Commission’s Rules, a Standard That Requires Repeal of the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule.....	26
B. Under Both <i>Fox</i> and <i>Sinclair</i> , Any Action Short of Repeal Would Not Only Violate Section 202(h) But Would Be Arbitrary and Capricious in Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act	30
C. <i>Fox</i> and <i>Sinclair</i> Allow, and Indeed Implicitly Invite, the FCC To Find That Spectrum Scarcity No Longer Exists.....	34
D. With the Demise of the Spectrum Scarcity Rationale, the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule Must Be Judged Under More Restrictive First Amendment Standards.....	36
IV. The FCC’s Own Recently Released Media Ownership Studies Also Compel Repeal of the Rule.....	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

V.	Diversity of Ownership Never Did and Now Clearly Does Not Bear a Credible Link to Diversity of Viewpoint, and the Commission’s Responsibility To Foster Competition, Localism, and Innovation Requires Repeal of the Rule	56
A.	Given That Diversity of Ownership Is, at Best, an “Aspirational” Proxy for Diversity of Viewpoint, the FCC Cannot Reasonably Determine That the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule Is Necessary in the Public Interest	56
B.	Repealing the Archaic Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Ban Would Not Harm Competition in Local Markets, and <i>Fox</i> Makes Clear That the FCC Must Consider Competition from New Media Services in Evaluating Whether the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule Is Necessary in the Public Interest	61
C.	Repeal of the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule Would Advance the Communications Act’s Requirement That FCC Actions Promote Localism	65
D.	Innovation, Another Policy Goal in the Communications Act, Requires Repeal of the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule.....	69
VI.	Repeal of the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule Is Required for All Markets, Regardless of Size.....	71
VII.	Conclusion	75

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

- Appendix 1 Television Stations Owned by Media General, Inc.
- Appendix 2 Daily Newspapers Owned by Media General, Inc.
- Appendix 3 James K. Gentry, Ph.D., *Statement*, December, 2002.
- Appendix 4 Awards Given to Media General, Inc.'s Broadcast, Internet and Newspaper Properties in the Tampa, Florida DMA.
- Appendix 5 David Pritchard, Chair, Department of Journalism and Mass Communications, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, *The Expansion of Diversity: A Longitudinal Study of Local Media Outlets in Five American Communities*, March, 2002.
- Appendix 6 Temporal Comparison of Television Stations and Cable Penetration (1975 to 2001).
- Appendix 7A Temporal Comparison of Radio Stations and Cable Penetration (1975 to 2001).
- Appendix 7B Temporal Comparison of Radio Stations and Cable Penetration (1994 to 2000).
- Appendix 8 Percent of Households with Computers and Internet Access, by State, 2002.

Volume 2

- Appendix 9 Availability of Media Outlets in the Tampa/St. Petersburg, Florida, DMA.
- Appendix 10 Availability of Media Outlets in the Roanoke-Lynchburg, Virginia, DMA.
- Appendix 11 Availability of Media Outlets in the Tri-Cities, Tennessee/Virginia, DMA.
- Appendix 12 Availability of Media Outlets in the Florence-Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, DMA.
- Appendix 13 Availability of Media Outlets in the Columbus, Georgia, DMA.
- Appendix 14 Availability of Media Outlets in the Panama City, Florida, DMA.

DOCUMENT AVAILABLE
IN THE LEAD
DOCKET/RULEMAKING

SEE DOCKET NO. *02-277* FOR THE DOCUMENT.