

Sandralyn Bailey

02-277

From: David P Glass [daveglass@findlayoh.com]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2006 1:26 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

David P Glass (daveglass@findlayoh.com) writes:

IAN - 9 2007

December 15, 2006
E-mail

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

To: FCC
Re: Small Market Radio Support

Please consider that the nearly 500 Clear Channel stations being sold are in markets where, in several instances, a small [LOCALLY OWNED] newspaper would have interest in investing.

Clearly, all agree that LOCAL ownership enhances and increases "the amount of local news."

In a recent letter to Chairman Martin, Senator Dorgan (D-ND) let it be known that he hasn't forgotten about media issues as the 109th Congress lame duck session winds to a close. He states "The rules governing media ownership have a significant impact on the diversity of voices and ownership in our communities. When local stations are controlled by big corporations outside their communities, it weakens their ability to provide wide coverage of local issues." Source: Inside Radio

I could not agree more!

In your attempt to make sure BIG CORPORATE doesn't get any BIGGER, the small - independent - LOCALLY OWNED media firm is stifled.

Look no further than the "Working Paper - Do Local Owners Deliver More Localism" report. That is the report that Chairman Martin referenced when he addressed Senator Boxer on September 18, 2006.

Please note one passage from that report:

"Therefore, we then hypothesize that joint ownership of a television and radio station by a local owner would increase the amount of local news aired on the radio station."
[Page #16]

Though the comment is focused on TV and RADIO, the same would be true with respect to local newspaper and RADIO. Local ownership makes the difference.

The Media Landscape of today is being carved by a speeding glacier and the "ban" against Newspaper / Broadcast is no longer needed.

...in 2002 the FCC's Biennial Review proposed NEW cross-media limits.

"The FCC found that because broadcast stations and newspapers did not compete in the same economic market, elimination of the ban was in order."

They also found that "efficiencies resulting from newspaper and TV common ownership could actually increase competition."

The NEW limits were challenged to the US Court of Appeals / Third Circuit in Philadelphia, which agreed with the FCC that a flat ban on the newspaper / broadcast combinations was not necessary any longer.

The Court said that "reasoned analysis supports the Commission's determination that the blanket ban on newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership was no longer in the public interest." It also upheld the FCC's determination that the ban did not promote diversity.

No. of pages to be listed
List ABCDE 0

Finally, it upheld FCC's determination that eliminating the ban was necessary to promote competition and localism, and that FCC could continue to regulate cross-ownership as it had decided to do.

However, the Court remanded the issue of the specific numerical limits, (specifically the formula for deriving those limits) back to the FCC for further consideration.

The Philly decision was supportive of the NEW cross-media limits.

What is at issue is the numerical limits - specifically - the number of TV stations to determine market limits.

I am seeking your leadership to separate RADIO from TV, with respect to this issue and provide a pathway for LOCAL investment again!

Please make the Newspaper - RADIO Cross Ownership go away sooner-than-later.

Respectfully,

Dave

David P Glass, CRMC
VP / Director of Broadcast
The Findlay Publishing Company
701 West Sandusky Street
Findlay, Ohio 45840-0609
419.427.8085 - Office
419.422.9337 - Fax
daveglass@findlayoh.com

Radio
WRBI-FM, Batesville, Indiana
WFIN-AM / WKXA-FM, Findlay, Ohio
WCSI-AM / WKKG-FM / WWWY-FM / WINN-FM, Columbus, Indiana

Newspapers
The Courier, Findlay, Ohio
The Fostoria Review Times, Fostoria, Ohio

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.133.226.67
Remote IP address: 70.133.226.67

Sandralyn Bailey

02-277

From: Carol M. Lewis [carol@adforcenc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2006 2:18 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

IANI - 9 2007

Carol M. Lewis (carol@adforcenc.com) writes:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chairman Martin,

Station ownership consolidation not only hurts consumers and performers by limiting access to music (as was testified to in your hearing). It has an even larger impact on the American public. This is because advertising costs go up dramatically as a result of reduced competition. Higher advertising costs are a primary cause of the high cost of running for elected office. This is something that everyone who contemplates public service has to consider; it prevents many fine people from serving; and it causes people who are elected to have to spend a high percentage of their time and energy devoted to fundraising rather than serving the people. This is a concern of Republicans and Democrats alike.

Thanks for your service on the FCC.

Regards,

Carol M. Lewis
Partner/Media Director
AdForce Inc.
2530 Meridian Parkway Suite 2075
Durham, NC 27713
919-806-4685

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.38.10.17
Remote IP address: 12.38.10.17

JAN - 9 2007

02-277

SandraLyn BaileyFederal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Brian Yarbrough [briankyarb@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2006 7:00 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, MB Docket No. 05-311

We unite with Alliance for Community Media members in calling for competition without destruction of local, community controlled media.

- 1) The proposed rule eliminates incentive for providers to negotiate in good faith. If the city and the provider do not come to agreement within 90 days, the provider can proceed without an agreement. They can then make billions of dollars using our public land without considering local needs. This framework would be unreasonable.
- 2) The proposed rule lacks a remedy for geographic discrimination. Public, Education and Government Access, or PEG, are tools to engage our local communities in democracy. Democratic participation should be for all, not based on a company business rule. The public-right-of-way is owned by all in our community, not just those in an area lucky enough to be served. We believe that inevitable market imbalances must be anticipated by the FCC, as they were by Congress, and that any rule-making must provide these three elements:
 - A) A standard for identifying imbalances in service.
 - B) A party responsible for identifying the imbalance—logically, the municipality.
 - C) A means for prevention or remedy of the imbalance.
- 3) The proposed rule reduces the support for PEG or other community media services from what is allowed by current Federal law. We believe this is an arbitrary reduction which will hurt our communities. It is in direct contradiction to language authored by telephone companies and already passed in key states such as California and Texas. This reduction would eliminate a valued community resource with no demonstrated effect on either subscriber price or level of competition.
- 4) The changes being proposed to the law are dramatic. We believe that such changes to the law should be made by Congress, not the FCC. These changes will slow competition by confusing the legal framework. Such changes should be decided by law-makers, not the courts. The FCC should not usurp Congressional authority.

We look forward to working with the FCC to establish a process which supports both competition and community fairness. Please contact us if you have questions or comments.

Do you Yahoo!?
Everyone is raving about the all-new Yahoo! Mail beta.
<http://new.mail.yahoo.com>

02-277

Sandra Lyn Bailey

From: Bart Walker [bart.walker@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2006 11:29 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

.IAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Bart Walker (bart.walker@comcast.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Martin:

Thank you for holding your second Federal Communications Commission public hearing on Media Ownership in Nashville. You are to be commended for seeking public opinion on how the public's airwaves can best serve the public.

In the two-minutes allocated at that hearing in Nashville, I brought-up that in most communities, the AM radio station was the first to offer local programming. Especially in the small and medium size markets, the AM radio station is often the only source of local programming. These AM radio stations have the mayor, sheriff and other local leaders on the air. In many cases, the public has the opportunity to phone the local AM radio station to talk with these community leaders about issues of concern.

Yet over the years, man-made interference has eroded the audience of AM radio stations. I have been in broadcasting for 48-years, and in the past ten-years, the amount of interference has escalated to the point that it is difficult to get a listenable signal in many parts of a community. This is even within a mile of the station's tower.

I ask that the Commission move forward and approve the use of FM translators to fill-in signal problems within the AM station's city grade signal (2mV/m daytime contour). The FCC first presented this to the public this past summer through a petition filed by the National Association of Broadcasters (RM-11338). This would be an immediate cure and would benefit the health and welfare of the public in those areas. FM signals are less prone to get manmade interference. The issue of digital in-band AM has interference problems. As a result, the FCC is not allowing digital AM at night. Therefore, it appears that the use of FM translators for AM broadcasters would be the only way to best serve the public in an immediate manner.

This is a plea for the Commission to allow AM broadcasters to use FM translators. I fear that if this is not done, AM stations will continue to get more and more interference and eventually will not have a large enough audience to continue in business.

I know your time is valuable, but this needs to be brought to your attention. Engineers on your staff will agree that AM is being harmed by manmade interference.

1. Buried traffic signal sensors are creating hums that eliminate local strength AM signals. For example, at different times, the intersection at Broad and Memorial in Murfreesboro, Tennessee (reported to be the busiest intersection in the state) the WGNS (AM 1450) signal gets a buzz that would cause most motorists to change stations. Our tower is 1-mile away, so we have ample signal. At the same site, the 50KW signal of WSM (AM 650) is totally covered. This old clear-channel signal is 25-miles away.
2. The installation of metal utility poles in most cities is creating signal nulls and hums to AM signals. This is especially true within 2-miles of a station's tower. These metal utility poles are re-radiating the signal and creating a null and hum on the signal. WGNS (AM 1450) even has this problem as close as 1,500-feet from our tower on Broad at South Church Street in Murfreesboro. This problem is evident in many parts of our city of license. This is the same principal as detuning cellular towers that are located near AM towers, however there is not law requiring utility poles to have de-tuning circuits.
3. What is either leakage of RF from cable TV or electrical interference from the power lines, annoying hums that cover local strength AM signals are increasing in number in all parts of our city? Mr. Roy Stewart with the FCC notes that these are problems facing AM broadcasters in all parts of our nation. Electric lines and cable TV coax are both hung on the same utility poles. The interference is only when you are near these lines, which run alongside all roads. The area where this problem wipes out local AM signals is increasing dramatically. The utilities say it is not their fault, and Mr. Stewart says

the Commission cannot stop this problem.

4. Another problem for many AM broadcasters is that their city of license has dramatically grown beyond the signal of the local AM station.

5. No matter whether an AM station remains non-directional at the same power at night, reduces power or goes directional and reduces power...the usable AM signal at night is most often dramatically reduced. Skip is a fact of the physics of the medium-wave band. Sky wave interference begins two hours before sunset and increases with darkness. It continues to be a problem until two-hours after sunrise.

Unfortunately, in many of these communities the local AM broadcaster is the only source of local news, play-by-play coverage of local sports, stopping regular programming and going to full storm coverage during hazardous weather.

We are out of the Daylight Savings Time period at this time. The dark hours are longer this time of year. AM signals are at their worst this time of year. The public's ability to receive local AM programming is most vulnerable this time of the year.

As you are aware, the Middle Tennessee area is victim to many deadly tornadoes. It is winter and ice storms and cold weather create problems. The local AM signal is most vulnerable at this time of year. In reality, AM signals are destroyed by many forms of interference during all times of the year and at all times of the day.

It is a fact that escalating levels of interference to AM signals is causing listeners to switch to other forms of communication. The use of FM translators to fill-in the AM broadcaster's city grade signal as described in RM-11338 would not only enable the public to more clearly receive this much needed local programming.

This is a plea for the Commission to grant AM broadcasters the right to use FM translators to fill-in signal problems within the AM's city grade signal (2mV/m daytime contour). Granting of this request would benefit the health and welfare of the public.

Respectfully submitted,
Bart Walker, Chief Operator
WGNS (AM 1450)
306 South Church Street
Murfreesboro, TN 37130
Phone: 615-893-5373
e-mail: bart.walker@comcast.net

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.52.82.170
Remote IP address: 68.52.82.170

Sandralyn Bailey



From: william h tishler [wtishler@wisc.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2006 10:37 PM
To: dtayloratateweb
Subject: Media Reform

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Ms. Tate,

I am deeply concerned about the growing loss of localism in the media. Local control of the media is essential in our democracy. A case in point is the fight here in Madison, WI about the loss of our local Air America affiliate because of conglomerate Clear Channel's recent decision to replace progressive talk radio with more boring sports programming.

I hope you will do everything in your power to initiate media reforms that can halt the dangerous trend toward media consolidation and its corresponding loss of localism in broadcasting.

Thank you, William H. Tishler
3925 Regent St.
Madison, WI 53705
(608) 233-0180

Sandralyn Bailey

02-277

From: rob Heaney [robh2@innercite.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2006 12:59 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Please Consider Carefully
Attachments: rob Heaney.vcf

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Please deliberately consider the future media landscape you are molding!
consolidation without further negotiations with A.T.&T!

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Your Constituent,

Robert Heaney

SandraLyn Bailey

02-277

From: Lachel, Diane [DLACHEL@ci.tacoma.wa.us]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2006 7:20 PM
To: Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Click! Network comments on media ownership
Attachments: FCC field visit.doc; talking points12.06.doc; review10.06.doc

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Commissioners Copps and Adelstein;

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Thank you for the opportunity to be part of the recent FCC field visit in Seattle on 11/30/06. I was an invited guest and have attached my comments for the record.

If you find yourself in the Northwest again, and have time for a tour of one of the nation's largest municipal telecommunications network's, please let me know. I would be honored to show you what Tacoma Power's investment means in the cities of Tacoma, Fircrest, University Place, Lakewood and Fife. In addition to providing critical telecommunications connectivity between power substations and a central Energy Control Center for monitoring the health of the electric network, residents also have wire line choices for cable TV and Internet services, where rates are 15 - 25% lower than areas where wire line telecommunications choices don't exist.

Click! Network staff is proud of what we've accomplished in 10 years time.

Thank you for serving the public in your role as Commissioner.

Diane R. Lachel
Government and Community Relations Manager
Click! Network / Tacoma Power
3628 South 35th Street
Tacoma, WA 98409-3192
253.502.8537 office
253.732.6696 mobile
dlachel@click-network.com

Sandra Lyn Bailey

02-277

From: Jsir57@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2006 3:24 PM
To: KJMWEB; dtaylor@at&t.com; Robert McDowell
Subject: merger

Please approve the at&t and BLS merger.
Jorge Schmidt

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sandralyn Bailey

02-277

From: Jack & Carol Morrison [morriscj@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2006 12:33 AM
To: Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Media mergers

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioners Copps and Adelstein,

It seems that everyone is spending all their time fighting over little odds and ends (that are very important) but missing the biggest problem.

The monopolies should be broken up, not merged. This would create competition and diversity.

We need a new well researched Federal Communications Act. A midnight special bill sneaked thru when everyone is out on vacation won't

solve the problems.

Respectfully your,

Jack Morrison
275 Prindton Drive
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

714 540 7576

Sandralyn Bailey

02-277

From: John & Kris [jaakaa@mtaonline.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2006 12:14 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Multi Media Ownership

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Please **FINALLY PUT TO REST** attempts this disengenuous and dangerous consideration to change the rules which set limits on the expansion of big media companies — how many TV channels, radio stations and newspapers a single company can own in a single city or nationwide. These rules are designed to maintain a healthy democracy through media outlets which are diverse, information-rich and accountable to their local communities.

DO NOT RELAX RULES ON MULTI MEDIA OWNERSHIP!

Respectfully submitted,

Kristine A. Abshire
1602 W. Jaime Marie
Wasilla, AK 99687

SandraLyn Bailey

02-27-07

From: alan burgin [alanburgin@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2006 7:38 PM
To: KJMWEB
Cc: alanburgin
Subject: Conglomerate ownership

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

My name is Alan Burgin and I spent 25 years working in local radio in the Statesville NC area. That was about 20 years ago. In that span of time I have watched the massive changes that have taken away any meaningful local radio in most communities. Any FM station of any size has been swallowed up and moved to the nearest major market in small town after small town all across the country. This has left a major hole in these communities. In our hometown in particular we lost a 100,000 watt FM station that had been a fixture in our lives for several generations. No one was asked, no one was considered and no one cared if we liked it or not. Our 50 year old country station was changed to an Urban Format and moved in a matter of hours after final approval. Radio has become the professional sports of broadcasting. If you don't like the money you make in one town you pack up and move to another. This is done with the blessing of the FCC. No move can be made without approval. These approvals are made without consideration to the public good. I remember the FCC license requirements that were in place many years ago that required public input and discernment of the communities needs. It appears no such requirements exist today. If they do there is little true concern about the public need. Business decisions are made based on dollars alone. That is not the way the public airwaves should be governed.
Alan Burgin

Sandralyn Bailey

02-277

From: JARABT@aol.com
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2006 12:39 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Stop Big Media

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

STOP big media from getting any bigger

Jeanette in Illinois

Sandralyn Bailey

02-277

From: Bernie Kotler [direct@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2006 2:29 PM
To: Robert McDowell
Subject: Media Consolidation and Democracy

FILED/ACCEPTED

IANI - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Robert McDowell:

I am writing to express my strong disapproval of former FCC Chairman Michael Powell's efforts to bury studies that found media consolidation to be harmful to local news reporting. No decision should be made on ownership until a full and independent investigation of this cover-up is completed.

The FCC can't simply hide data from the public and push through new rules that unleash further consolidation of local news outlets. Localism and diversity are the cornerstones of a democratic media system; we cannot afford to compromise them in any way. The FCC should allow no relaxation or elimination of the public interest limits on media ownership without first weighing all of the evidence and hearing out widespread public concern about the problems of consolidation.

Limits on media consolidation have been a bulwark against the concentration of economic power in the marketplace of ideas -- a critical part of balancing the public service mission of the media with their private profit motive. Our democracy requires the free flow of local information from a broad range of diverse voices.

Media consolidation has already led to declines in local and minority ownership as well as the homogenization of content in radio and television. Allowing further concentration of local media markets, will only worsen the problems we already have.

The FCC should stand firm with the public against further concentration of media ownership in the hands of the few. A vote against media consolidation is a vote for democracy.

Bernard Kotler
5401 Greenside Drive
San Jose, CA 95127

SandraLyn Bailey

02-277

From: bobg@kerhonksonsynagogue.org

Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2006 10:16 AM

To: KJMWEB

Cc: Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylorataweb; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am against further media consolidation. I honestly believe our democracy requires a broad, diverse, open, and free media. To allow a few to control the vast majority of the media does not allow the diversity needed.

Robert Greenough
98 Luarel Hollow
Kerhonkson, NY 12446

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Gerard Charles [gcharles@balletmet.org]

Sent: Monday, December 18, 2006 2:45 PM

To: Jonathan Adelstein

02-277

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

I am greatly concerned by the homogenization of the American media, the lack of regional diversity and the exclusion of local issues. It is now easier than ever for centrally located entities to control what we see and hear and to quell alternative opinions.

Rather than a creating short sighted increases in profits by being more omnipresent I suggest that broadcasters would do better to add more local content to create a more invested listening audience and to develop their medium for the years to come.

I also believe that as these are public airwaves a broader access of the local public is only possible with more community based service providers. Let us celebrate our strengths and diversity.

I therefore, most decidedly, oppose proposals to relax the media ownership restrictions.

Sincerely
Gerard Charles

SandraLyn Bailey

02 277

From: dklein@ic.sunysb.edu on behalf of dklein [dklein@ic.sunysb.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 08, 2006 3:28 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: Broadcast Monopoly

There is no polite way to begin this message, although I spent a while trying to think of one. I am not one for small talk when big decisions must be made. I contact you now because I have retained some of my childhood naivete and still believe that if I ask nicely, something can be fixed. I am concerned, dismayed, and outraged at the state of the media today. Specifically, I find it completely unethical for the kind of media monopoly that you all know exists to be tolerated. How can so much effort, on the part of the FCC, be focused on ensuring decency and morality in broadcast, when no apparent considerations have been made for ensuring that free speech is not suppressed by corporate domination? I beg you, please reform the FCC regulations to severely limit the kinds of monopolies now held by people like Rupert Murdoch, and corporations like Clear Channel. I hope to see news of these changes soon.

Hopefully,

Deb Klein, concerned citizen

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

SandraLyn Bailey

07-277

From: Elizabeth Willoughby [missusliz@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, December 22, 2006 8:57 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Elizabeth Willoughby (missusliz@yahoo.com) writes:

What is being done by the FCC to stop the monopoly of our airwaves (aka Rupert Murdoch) at the expense of our public necessity for a democratized press? If you are not sure what I refer to, please refer to our Constitution and maybe read a book or two by Ben Franklin. Remember him?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

FILED/ACCEPTED

IAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

SandraLyn Bailey

02-277

From: gayle noble [windy_1@skyhighway.com]
Sent: Friday, December 01, 2006 1:50 AM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Please limit the number of stations under one owner back to the 1970s rules

Please limit the number of stations under one owner back to the 1970s rules. Clear Channel and other scum passing as broadcasters are requiring pay for play and calling it research. Back in the 70s this was called payola and was prosecuted. Now it is called good business.

Please help clean up our air waves so once again we hear what we the listeners want not want has been paid for. The only station in this area that really plays what its listeners want is KPIG. I may not like everything I hear but I know someone does or it won't be being played. That is how radio use to be. Please return it to that former glory.

thank you
gayle noble
14890 big basin way
boulder creek, ca 95006

FILED/ACCEPTED

DEC - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

SandraLyn Bailey

02-277

From: J. K. Frazier [moon4kat@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2006 2:42 PM
To: dtayloratateweb
Subject: ownership diversity

Dear Commissioner Tate,

The FCC does a severe disservice to the American public when it allows corporate giants to control the majority of the broadcast licenses and monopolize most of the audience those licenses reach.

I strongly oppose any further consolidation of broadcast ownership.

Instead, the FCC should be creating more diversity so that we, the public owners of the airwaves, can receive a wide variety of viewpoints on issues that are important to us and our government.

Sincerely,

J.K. Frazier
1035 Laurel Branch Trail
Sewanee, TN 37375

FILED/ACCEPTED

.IAN - 9 2007

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

SandraLyn Bailey

02-297

From: Harry Hoyler [harry@kkay1590.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2006 8:34 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Harry Hoyler (harry@kkay1590.com) writes:

Chairman Martin,

I want to commend your office on the ownership hearings. I continue to ask the question about when is big big enough. I am as strong a capitalist as you'll ever see and think it is wonderful when a business thrives and in the case of us "little guys", survives.

I have two really simple questions:

1) is it possible the issue allowing AM stations to operate FM translators be expedited or for that matter; how about 10 to 30 watts at 60 feet? Do you know this would cover our entire little town and not interfere with any other station? It would be a simple process, Send a letter to the F.C.C., indicate the frequency, sign an affidavit that this would be 100% simulcast and attach a \$750.00 check. The frequency can be obtained through the Commission frequency search.

2) how about allowing those of us reducing power from 1KW to less than 100 watts stay at 1KW? This once again is simple. It may be a problem with border stations but for those of us outside of those areas it would be a tremendous help.

We need some help. I do appreciate you taking the time to read this and the offer for a cup of coffee and chat on Railroad Avenue in Donaldsonville still stands.

Sincerely,
Harry Hoyler

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

Sandralyn Bailey

02-277

From: Gregory Vouros [gcvsea@eskimo.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 26, 2006 3:28 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylor@tateweb; Robert McDowell; Greg Vouros
Subject: Limits on Media Ownership - Public Comment

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to express my strong disapproval of any relaxation or elimination of the public interest limits on media ownership. The last time this issue was raised, there was public outcry from both sides of the political spectrum.

Diversity of media ownership is a very critical factor in enabling the public to get somewhat unbiased news. Allowing multiple venues to be owned by single entities threatens our democracy.

We live in a time when Clear Channel refused to play the music of musical groups who openly (and justifiably) criticized the competency of President Bush, and when Fox media knowingly and erroneously reported that Tom Foley was a Democrat (and not a Republican) because of the potential impact on the November elections. These are small examples of the abuse by media monopolies.

Eliminating the public interest limits on media ownership will lead to even more abuse and dissemination of false and misleading information.

Sincerely,

Gregory Vouros
2120 - 8th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119

FILED/ACCEPTED

NOV - 9 2007

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

Sandralyn Bailey

02 277

From: Jane Kelsberg [jlkelsberg@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2006 8:31 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Jane Kelsberg (jlkelsberg@yahoo.com) writes:

Dear Chairman Martin,
In a free and democratic society, we cannot allow the media to be owned by large corporations. News must be reported objectively, and without bias to the financial interests of the corporation. Please keep our media free and do not allow the merger of large corporate interests. Thank you.
Sincerely, Jane Kelsberg

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 192.104.54.5
Remote IP address: 192.104.54.5

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

SandraLyn Bailey

02-277

From: Joe Haussmann [haussmannj@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Friday, December 08, 2006 11:34 PM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylorataweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: RE: Docket 06-121, Media Ownership Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

RE: Docket 06-121, Media Ownership Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making

I strongly oppose any action by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to relax or eliminate media ownership limits.

Media consolidation is to blame for the decline in the quality and quantity of local news, the dearth of minority ownership in broadcasting, the homogenization of programming on TV and radio and the decline in revenues for media related industries. Allowing big media companies to own even more media outlets in our local communities will only exacerbate those problems and further stifle innovation and progress in these areas.

Information -- from diverse, competitive and independent sources -- is vitally important to the health of our democracy. I urge you to hold the line against any further consolidation of our media, and to listen to the voices of the people -- not the media corporations -- on this critical issue.

I would propose that you restrict things even further, limiting media ownership to 1 AM & 1 FM radio station and one broadcast and one cable television outlet per (parent) corporation.

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sandralyn Bailey

02-277

From: Judith Binder [bjudy@unm.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2006 1:12 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: America is slipping

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FROM: Judith Binder 1201 Columbia Dr., NE Albuquerque, NM
87106-2603

(505) 265-4336

Dear Chairman Martin

I am opposed to media consolidation and urge the FCC to return to the policy of limited media ownership within a demographic area. Media includes newspapers, radio, television, cable, broadband, telephone, etc.

Today, we don't get the news. The channels are full of violence, game shows based mostly on luck rather than on information. There is celebrity gossip and talking heads promoting the views of the network's owners and the sponsors.

Before the election in November, there were less than five minutes an hour of local TV newscasts devoted to political issues. Radio was no better.

Media can't be only about profit. Management must understand its place in society and become more socially conscious. When the media does not perform its public duty to inform the public of important issues, our country is intellectually and economically diminished and all profits will come to a halt.

Chairman, you stated recently that:

Broadband adoption grew by almost 70 percent among middle-income households (those with incomes between \$40,000 and \$50,000 per year).

Our income is less than \$30,00!

Broadband adoption grew by 120 percent among African Americans.

Broadband adoption grew by 70 percent among those with less than a high school education.

Broadband adoption grew by more than 60 percent among senior citizens.

Broadband growth in rural areas was also brisk (39 percent), although overall penetration rates in rural areas still lag behind those in urban areas.

BUT, The United States is years behind China and India, where rural districts—along with cosmopolitan areas—have gone wireless for several years. Communications. Yes.

Sincerely yours,
Judith Binder

NO MORE MEDIA CONSOLIDATION - FREE WIRELESS COMMUNICATION

SandraLyn Bailey

02-277

From: KATHARINE H ODELL [khodell@wisc.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2006 10:26 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: media monopolies

I am one of many who oppose media consolidation and the corresponding loss of localism in the news. I urge you and the FCC to promote media reform to augment the development of multiple and varied media enterprises. As citizens, we need many voices and opinions to help us make wise decisions - locally and nationally.

Katharine H. Odell, Ph.D., CCC-SLP

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN -9 2007

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

SandraLyn Bailey

02-277

From: Michelle Brockway [mbrockway@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2006 7:41 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Radio takeovers

Dear Sir,

I agree with Porter Wagoner. Consolidation of radio stations stifles talent AND deprives the citizens--owners of the airwaves--from a variety of ideas and entertainment. It scares me that a few pinheads were able to shut down the Dixie Chicks' career. If their fans had said, "No, we're not listening to you anymore," that's their right. But the fact is even after "the comment," their fans were packing stadiums. And then a few creepy men flipped the switch. That disgusts me.

Believe in Democracy? Then this consolidation has got to stop.

Michelle Brockway
Houston, TX

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

SandraLyn Bailey

02-277

From: RC [rcooley@spamcop.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2006 9:56 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb; Robert McDowell
Subject: IPTV concerns

I am concerned about the future of telecommunications. The direction the rule-making process is headed, is giving more and more monopoly power to telephone companies, artificially preventing competition.

With the roll-outs of fiber optic lines to homes, telephone companies are repeatedly abusing their right-of-way privlidges, by using it to allow them to monopolise unrelated services, without any sort of oversight. If they want to provide IPTV services without getting special privlidges from local municipalities (as cable companies are required to do), they should decouple the IPTV service from the physical lines, making it a normal information service, seperated from the physical lines. That, of course, would inherently require them to allow 3rd parties fair access to compete for customers on the public lines they manage, rather than granting them the monopoly on IPTV service they want.

Despite claims to the contrary, this duopoly of local television service is not competition of any kind. They have no motivation to compete. This became overtly clear when cable companies began offering VoIP services. While many localities now have two options for wired phone service, both just are mimicing the other's rates, with no attempts to add more features, better service, or lower prices. They are merely trying to be no worse than the other guy, and awaiting disgruntled customers to exodus from the entrenched service.

By denying them the option of abusing their monopoly status, and right-of-way privlidges, you can force them to negotiate a more transparent and benefital plan with local municipalities, that will better serve the public.

Fears of them deciding not to roll-out such services, if they do not recieve everything they want, are unfounded. There is too much money to be made, for them to ignore the market. What has stalled them for so long is their own attempts to encourage such fears, in an attempt to get more favorable legislation for themselves. Granting them what they want, will only lead to more delays, as they try to get more of the same.

SandraLyn Bailey

02 277

From: Richard F. Wilhelm [richgolf@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2006 10:34 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Richard F. Wilhelm (richgolf@comcast.net) writes:

Please don't give the big boys any leeway to own more stations in a local market. I worked my way up in TV at local WDCA-TV for 6 yrs, then was acquired by Fox..their creativity just about scuttled the station. I moved on to Clear Channel's WTEM Sports Talk 980....their revolving door of management gave me a new manager every 90 days or so until asked to leave by someone who I just met. Enough is enough. We need more local. Local EVERYTHING. NEWS. Sports. WEather. Radio. TV....less Fox. less Clearchannel. What an awful company.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.251.246.1
Remote IP address: 69.251.246.1

FILED/ACCEPTED

.IAN - 9 2007

**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

SandraLyn Bailey

02-277

From: Robert Samboy [chiefcuttingbull@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2006 10:46 PM
To: Robert McDowell
Subject: media ownership

I am writing to express my strong disapproval of any relaxation or elimination of the public interest limits on media ownership. Localism and diversity are the cornerstones of a democratic media system, and we cannot afford to compromise them in any way.

Limits on media consolidation have been a bulwark against the concentration of economic power in the marketplace of ideas -- a critical part of balancing the public service mission of the media with their private profit motive. Our democracy requires the free flow of information from a broad range of diverse voices.

Any public policy seeking to protect diversity in the media must recognize the simple fact that ownership matters.

Media consolidation has already led to declines in local and minority ownership as well as the homogenization of content in radio and television.

Permitting cross-ownership of newspapers and broadcast stations, or allowing further concentration in local television markets, will only worsen the problems we already have.

When the FCC attempted to weaken and remove media ownership limits in 2003, millions of Americans rose up in protest.

Congress and the courts ultimately intervened to turn back that misguided regulatory process.

Now that these same rules are being reconsidered, the FCC should stand firm with the public against further concentration of media ownership in the hands of the few. A vote against media consolidation is a vote for democracy.

Yahoo! Music Unlimited
Access over 1 million songs.
<http://music.yahoo.com/unlimited>

FILED/ACCEPTED
JAN - 9 2007
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sandra Lyn Bailey

02-277

From: Sandra Raymond [skraymon@umich.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2006 3:10 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

IAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Sandra Raymond (skraymon@umich.edu) writes:

Dear Chairman Martin-

I am writing to express my concern about consolidation of media sources in the U.S. It is troubling to me that there are fewer and fewer diverse sources for news. A free press is the cornerstone of a free society, and consolidation of news sources lends itself to manipulation and suppression of information that is crucial to the ability of citizens to know and understanding what is happening within the U.S. and the world. Please protect democracy by restricting media consolidation and monopolization.

Thank you for your attention--
Sandra Raymond

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 141.214.17.5
Remote IP address: 141.214.17.5

SandraLyn Bailey

02277

From: Stacy Harris [stacy_harris@juno.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2006 12:19 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Stacy Harris (stacy_harris@juno.com) writes:

I am trying to submit a public comment, but no one at the FCC nor Congressman Jim Cooper's office has a clue about FCC media ownership rules, but no one has a clue about proceeding and document-type information, etc.

All I'm trying to convey is that I am totally against media consolidation. In Nashville alone, you have independently-owned newspapers and TV stations establishing news division "partnerships," that I feel are very dangerous to the news-gathering process and to the public interest.

Please also look into WSMV-TV, which is not acting in the public interest. It has some sort of contract to run paid religious programming in midmorning. Twice this week alone, when other Nashville network affiliates interrupted scheduled programming to carry the live network feed of presidential news conferences, as should always be the case, WSMV-Channel 4, the NBC affiliate, kept right on broadcasting Pat Robertson's evangelism.

This is not programming in the public interest.

ECFS - Email Filing
<PROCEEDING>
<DATE> 12/07/2006
<NAME> Stacy Harris
<ADDRESS1> 4215 Harding Road
<ADDRESS2>
<CITY> Nashville
<STATE> TN
<ZIP> 37205
<LAW-FIRM>
<ATTORNEY>
<FILE-NUMBER>
<DOCUMENT-TYPE>
<PHONE-NUMBER>
<DESCRIPTION> Email Comment
<CONTACT-EMAIL> stacy_harris@juno.com
<TEXT> Dear FCC;

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.1.199.128
Remote IP address: 65.1.199.128

Sandralyn Bailey

02277

From: Tekla Lewin [ttl@wideopenwest.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2006 12:16 AM
To: Robert McDowell
Subject: Urge prevent concentration of media ownership

Dear Commissioner McDowell:

I urge you to reverse the trend toward concentration of media ownership. Please take steps to insure that media ownership will be more diverse and that there is substantial minority ownership of media.

The public needs independent media.

Tekla Lewin
5100 Kingshill Drive
Columbus, OH 43229

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN - 9 2007

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary