

September 25, 2007

Marlene H. Dortch  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary  
455 12th Street SW  
Washington DC 20554

Re: *2006 Quadrennial Regulatory Review – Review of the Commission’s Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; 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; Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers; Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets; Definition of Radio Markets, MB Docket Nos. 06-121, et al.*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

The National Association of Broadcasters (“NAB”) hereby submits this filing in order to respond to several of the arguments raised in the comments of Consumers’ Union et al. (“CU”) and Prometheus Radio Project (“Prometheus”) regarding the analysis of the financial condition of television stations in medium and small markets that NAB has submitted in this proceeding.<sup>1</sup> As shown below, the attacks mounted by CU and Prometheus on NAB’s empirical evidence are without merit.

As NAB explained previously, its *TV Financial Reports* demonstrate that television stations, particularly the lowest-rated stations in medium and small markets, are experiencing severe economic stress.<sup>2</sup> Reformation of the television duopoly rule is necessary to preserve the ability of these stations to continue to offer high quality programming and other services to

---

<sup>1</sup> See NAB, *The Declining Financial Position of Television Stations in Medium and Small Markets* (Aug. 2006) (“*August 2006 TV Financial Report*”) (Attachment J to Comments of NAB). The initial study included data through 2003. With its reply comments, NAB provided data through 2005, which had not been available at the time of its prior filing. See NAB, *The Declining Financial Position of Television Stations in Medium and Small Markets* (Dec. 2006) (“*December 2006 TV Financial Report*”) (Attachment to Reply Comments of NAB). The only material substantive difference between the two reports is that the latter report was updated to provide 2005 data. NAB will focus on the *August 2006 TV Financial Report* for purposes of discussion herein because that is the document at which Prometheus and CU directed their criticisms, and will provide parallel citations, where appropriate, to the *December 2006 TV Financial Report*. The two will be referred to collectively as the “*TV Financial Reports*.”

<sup>2</sup> Comments of NAB, at 87-110 (Oct. 23, 2006); Reply Comments of NAB, at 59-80 (Jan. 16, 2007).

viewers, including local news.<sup>3</sup> Although CU and Prometheus employ dramatic rhetoric in their attempt to undercut NAB's showing, it is clear, for the reasons that follow, that NAB's television financial analysis is sound and fully supports NAB's position.

### **Excluding Even-Numbered Years Was Necessary to Avoid Distortion**

As an initial matter, CU and Prometheus object to the omission of even-numbered years from the *TV Financial Reports* as "fraudulent," "bogus," and "absurd."<sup>4</sup> However, NAB clearly explained in its comments the reasons for including only odd-numbered years – "none of these years involved a national election or the Summer Olympics" and therefore their use would "avoid the sometimes inconsistent impact of advertising associated with these events."<sup>5</sup> Contrary to the assertion of CU and Prometheus, that was an entirely reasonable approach. While CU is correct that "[n]ational elections are not random events,"<sup>6</sup> that observation is overly simplistic and in any event does not end the matter.

In fact, the actual revenues earned by stations in election years vary dramatically depending on a number of interrelated factors, and are not consistent from election year to election year for a particular station, or even stations in a given market or state. These factors include, among other things: whether there is a hotly contested congressional race in the state (or district(s)) where a station is located; whether a station is in a battleground state for presidential elections in the year in question; the degree to which candidates in particular states are well-financed; and how many candidates are running for office in a given state. Below, we provide and discuss examples of the ways in which these variables can result in widely divergent levels of advertising in Senate, Presidential, and House of Representatives election campaigns.

- *Arizona* – In 2000, Senator Jon Kyl's seat was regarded as safe,<sup>7</sup> and he won by a margin of 71%.<sup>8</sup> In 2004, Senator John McCain easily won re-election, receiving 77% of the vote and winning by a 56% margin.<sup>9</sup> In 2006, however, Kyl was

---

<sup>3</sup> Comments of NAB, at 87-110; Reply Comments of NAB, at 59-80.

<sup>4</sup> Reply Comments of CU, 27-28 (Jan. 16, 2007); Mark Cooper, *Out of Focus: The NAB's Fraudulent Financial Analysis* (Study 5 Attached to CU Reply Comments) ("*CU Reply Study 5*"); see Reply Comments of Prometheus, at 32-33 (Jan. 16, 2007); Gregory Rose, *Report of Doctor Gregory Rose on Economic Studies Submitted by the National Association of Broadcasters in 2006 Quadrennial Review MB Docket No. 06-121*, at 13 (Attachment A to Reply Comments of Prometheus) ("*Rose Report*").

<sup>5</sup> Comments of NAB, at 93 n.217.

<sup>6</sup> *CU Reply Study 5*, at 72.

<sup>7</sup> See Michael Barone, *THE ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS* (2000) ("2000 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS"), Sen. Jon Kyl (R), available at <http://nationaljournal.com/pubs/almanac/2000/people/az/azs2.htm> (subscription required; on file with NAB).

<sup>8</sup> See Michael Barone, *THE ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS* 99 (2006) ("2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS") (reporting that Kyl won 79% of the vote, with the next most successful candidate receiving 8%).

<sup>9</sup> See *id.* at 94 (reporting that McCain won 77% of the vote, with the next most successful candidate receiving 21%).

challenged by Jim Pederson, and only won the election by 9%.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, total Senate campaign expenditures – of which advertising expenditures are themselves a differing percentage from year to year – varied dramatically between 1994 and 2004 in Arizona, and steadily *decreased* over that period.<sup>11</sup> In 1994, expenditures by Senate candidates in Arizona were approximately \$5.7 million.<sup>12</sup> The 1998 and 2000 elections, however, saw Senate candidates spending only about half of that on their campaigns, with expenditures in those years totaling only \$2.8 million and \$2.5 million, respectively.<sup>13</sup> And in 2004, candidates spent only \$2.15 million total on their campaigns.<sup>14</sup> Arizona had no Senate elections in 1996 or 2002. The following chart shows the variation in campaign expenditures in Arizona over the 1994-2004 period.

---


<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Wikipedia, *United States Senate elections, 2006*, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_States\\_Senate\\_elections,\\_2006](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Senate_elections,_2006) (last visited Sept. 4, 2007); Washingtonpost.com, *Election 2006: Key Senate Races*, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/interactives/campaign06/key\\_senate.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/interactives/campaign06/key_senate.html) (last visited Sept. 4, 2007) (reporting that Kyl won 53% of the vote and that Pederson won 44%).

<sup>11</sup> See 2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS 99, 94. The 2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS states that campaign expenditure figures reported therein “are derived from candidates’ campaign finance reports and party reports available from the Federal Election Commission.” *Id.* at 16. For each state for which campaign finance information is provided in this filing, information from all years for which the information is included in the 2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS is included. The 2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS lists total expenditures, and does not contain separate information related to expenditures on advertising in particular. It is necessarily the case, however, that advertising expenditures must be lower in years in which total expenditures are lower, and vice-versa.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 99 (reporting that for the 1994 general election, Kyl spent \$4,138,203 and Coppersmith spent \$1,577,556, for a total of \$5,715,759).

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 94 (reporting that, in the 1998 general election, McCain spent \$2,461,900 and Ranger spent \$371,439, for a total of \$2,833,339), 99 (reporting that, in the 2000 general election, Kyl spent \$2,503,674 and Toel spent \$21,491, for a total of \$2,525,165).

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 94 (reporting that for the 2000 general election, McCain spent \$2,140,807 and Starkey spent \$12,716, for a total of \$2,153,523).



- *Maryland* – In 2000, Senator Paul Sarbanes’ seat was regarded as safe,<sup>15</sup> and he in fact won by a margin of 26%, receiving 63% of the vote.<sup>16</sup> In 2004, Senator Barbara Mikulski easily won re-election by a margin of 31%, receiving 65% of the vote.<sup>17</sup> However, in 2006 Sarbanes chose not to run for re-election, and the election for his seat was hotly contested from the primaries through the end.<sup>18</sup> In the end, Democratic Senator Benjamin Cardin won by a margin of just 10%.<sup>19</sup> Expenditures on Senate campaigns in Maryland between 1994 and 2004 also varied in roller-coaster

<sup>15</sup> See 2000 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS, Sen. Paul S. Sarbanes (D), available at <http://nationaljournal.com/pubs/almanac/2000/people/md/mds1.htm> (subscription required; on file with NAB) (listing Sarbanes’ seat as “probably safe”).


<sup>16</sup> See 2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS 777 (reporting that Sarbanes won 63% of the vote with the next most successful candidate receiving 37%).

<sup>17</sup> See *id.* at 780 (reporting that Mikulski won 65% of the vote with the next most successful candidate receiving 34%).

<sup>18</sup> See, e.g., Wikipedia, *United States Senate elections, 2006*, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_States\\_Senate\\_elections,\\_2006](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Senate_elections,_2006) (last visited Sept. 10, 2007); Washingtonpost.com, *Election 2006: Key Senate Races*, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/interactives/campaign06/key\\_senate.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/interactives/campaign06/key_senate.html) (last visited Sept. 4, 2007) (listing Maryland among 2006’s key Senate races).

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., Wikipedia, *United States Senate elections, 2006*, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_States\\_Senate\\_elections,\\_2006](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Senate_elections,_2006) (last visited Sept. 10, 2007); Washingtonpost.com, *Election 2006: Key Senate Races*, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/interactives/campaign06/key\\_senate.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/interactives/campaign06/key_senate.html) (last visited Sept. 10, 2007).

fashion.<sup>20</sup> In 1994, the candidates spent a total of approximately \$5.9 million.<sup>21</sup> In 1998, that figure dropped to \$3.3 million, just over half of what had been spent in the previous election year in which there was a senate race in the state.<sup>22</sup> It dropped again in 2000 to \$1.9 million, but increased in 2004 to \$8.2 million.<sup>23</sup> Maryland did not have any Senate elections in 1996 or 2002. The chart below shows the variation in campaign expenditures in Maryland over the 1994-2004 period.



<sup>20</sup> See 2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS 777, 780.

<sup>21</sup> See *id.* at 777 (reporting that in the 1994 general election, Sarbanes spent \$2,767,187 and Brock spent \$3,201,650, for a total of \$5,968,837).

<sup>22</sup> See *id.* at 780 (reporting that in the 1998 general election, Mikulski spent \$3,014,312 and Pierpoint spent \$297,768, for a total of \$3,312,080).

<sup>23</sup> See *id.* at 777 (reporting that, in the 2000 general election, Sarbanes spent \$1,837,286 and Rappaport spent \$146,866, for a total of \$1,984,152), 780 (reporting that, in the 2004 general election, Mikulski spent \$5,997,093 and Pipkin spent \$2,300,354, for a total of \$8,297,447).

- *Tennessee* – In 2000, Senator Bill Frist’s seat was viewed as secure,<sup>24</sup> and he ultimately won by a margin of 33%, receiving 65% of the vote.<sup>25</sup> In 2006, however, Frist did not run for reelection, and the 2006 election was a battle between Harold Ford, Jr., then a member of the House of Representatives, and Bob Corker, former mayor of Chattanooga, with the candidates exchanging leads in the polls.<sup>26</sup> In the end, Corker won the election by a margin of just 3%.<sup>27</sup> In Tennessee, too, total expenditures on Senate campaigns differed widely between 1994 and 2004, and again, decreased over time.<sup>28</sup> In 1994, candidates spent approximately \$12 million, but in 1996 and 2000 they spent just \$4.3 million and \$4.8 million, respectively.<sup>29</sup> In 2002, Senate candidates spent a total of \$6.5 million, which, while an increase over the previous two years in which Senate elections occurred, was only just over half of what they had spent eight years earlier in 1994, when Frist defeated incumbent Jim Sasser.<sup>30</sup> Tennessee had no Senate elections in 1998 or 2004. The chart below shows the variation in Tennessee campaign expenditures over the 1994-2004 period.

---

<sup>24</sup> See 2000 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS, Sen. Bill Frist (R), available at <http://nationaljournal.com/pubs/almanac/2000/people/tn/tns2.htm> (subscription required; on file with NAB).

<sup>25</sup> See 2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS 1540 (reporting that in the 2000 general election, Frist won 65% of the vote with the next most successful candidate receiving 32%).


<sup>26</sup> See Wikipedia, *United States Senate elections, 2006*, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_States\\_Senate\\_elections,\\_2006](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Senate_elections,_2006) (last visited Sept. 10, 2007).

<sup>27</sup> See *id.*

<sup>28</sup> See 2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS 1540, 1544.

<sup>29</sup> See *id.* at 1540 (reporting that in 1994 general election, Frist spent \$7,017,424 and Sasser spent \$5,020,515, for a total of \$12,037,939, and that in the 2000 general election, Frist spent \$4,664,737 and Clark spent \$173,406, for a total of \$4,838,143), 1544 (reporting that in the 1996 general election, Thompson spent \$3,469,369 and Gordon spent \$795,969, for a total of \$4,265,338).

<sup>30</sup> See *id.* at 1544 (reporting that in the 2002 general election Alexander spent \$3,761,804 and Clement spent \$2,832,990, for a total of \$6,594,794).



- *Virginia* – Senator John Warner, who has been in office for five terms and who would likely have easily been re-elected for a sixth, recently announced his plans not to seek re-election in 2008.<sup>31</sup> Many are now predicting that the race for his seat will be highly competitive. Virginia also has seen greatly varying expenditures on Senate campaigns over time.<sup>32</sup> The 1994 race between Oliver North and Charles Robb involved total expenditures of \$26.1 million.<sup>33</sup> In 1996, Mark Warner and John Warner spent a combined total of \$17.4 million on their campaigns.<sup>34</sup> In 2000, the race between George Allen and Charles Robb resulted in total expenditures of \$16.6 million.<sup>35</sup> But in 2002, total expenditures by John Warner and his two independent opponents were \$1.8 million – just over 10% of what they had been in 2000, and a mere 6.9% of what they had been in 1994.<sup>36</sup> Virginia had no Senate elections in 1998

<sup>31</sup> See Bill Turque, *Sen. Warner to 'Quietly Step Aside'*, Wash. Post, Sept. 2, 2007, A1, available at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/08/31/AR2007083100986.html>.

<sup>32</sup> See 2006 ALMANAC OF AMERICAN POLITICS 1712, 1714.


<sup>33</sup> See *id.* at 1714 (reporting that in the 1994 general election Robb spent \$5,501,697 and North spent \$20,607,367, for a total of \$26,109,064).

<sup>34</sup> See *id.* at 1712 (reporting that in the 1996 general election John Warner spent \$5,819,157 and Mark Warner spent \$11,600,424, for a total of \$17,419,581).

<sup>35</sup> See *id.* at 1714 (reporting that in the 2000 general election Allen spent \$9,995,980 and Robb spent \$6,610,252, for a total of \$16,606,232).

<sup>36</sup> See *id.* at 1712 (reporting that in the 2002 general election John Warner spent \$1,709,202, Spannaus spent \$61,984, and Hornberger spent \$66,480, for a total of \$1,837,666).

or 2004. The chart below shows the variation in campaign expenditures in Virginia races over the 1994-2004 period.



An examination of the dramatic differences between how much candidates spend in a particular election year from state to state also makes clear that amounts will vary widely among similar-sized DMAs. As shown in the chart below, in 2004, for example, Senate candidates spent a total of \$22.6 million in California,<sup>37</sup> \$4.5 million in Indiana,<sup>38</sup> and just over \$1 million in Idaho.<sup>39</sup> Further, Michigan, among other states, had no Senate election in 2004.<sup>40</sup>


---

<sup>37</sup> See *id.* at 164 (reporting that in the 2004 general election, Boxer spent \$14,886,426 and Jones spent \$7,802,657, for a total of \$22,689,083).

<sup>38</sup> See *id.* at 621 (reporting that in the 2004 general election, Bayh spent \$2,250,428 and Scott spent \$2,242,526, for a total of \$4,492,954).

<sup>39</sup> See *id.* at 539 (reporting that in the 2004 general election, Crapo, who was unopposed, spent \$1,031,912).

<sup>40</sup> See *id.* at 851, 854.



Each of these states included (and still includes) DMAs ranked between 101 and 125 – California includes the 121st- and 124th-ranked DMAs of Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-San Luis Obispo and Monterey-Salinas; Indiana includes the 104th-ranked Fort Wayne; Idaho is home to the 122nd-ranked Boise; and Michigan includes the 110th-ranked Lansing and the 112th-ranked Traverse City-Cadillac.<sup>41</sup> Obviously, however, stations in each of the DMAs that had Senate elections in 2004 necessarily would have earned dramatically different amounts from Senate advertising in that year, due to the variance in total Senate campaign expenditures among the states in which the DMAs are located, and the stations in the DMAs that had no such elections would have earned literally zero. An “average” that considered stations in all of these states would therefore have no relation whatsoever to the total expenditures in any given state, let alone the advertising revenues of a particular station.

These observations are borne out by the *Buying Time* series of studies completed by the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law. The *Buying Time 2000* study found that “the Senate races that analysts expected to be competitive attracted most of the spending on television advertising,” with candidates spending “on average four times more on

<sup>41</sup> See Television & Cable Factbook 2005, C-40 (listing Nielsen market rankings based on 2004 estimates). The DMA rankings have changed slightly since 2004, although those changes do not affect this analysis. Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-San Luis Obispo is now ranked 122; Monterey-Salinas is now ranked 124; Fort Wayne is now ranked 106; Boise is now ranked 118; Lansing is now ranked 112; and Traverse City-Cadillac is now ranked 113. See Nielsen Media Research, Inside TV Ratings, 2006-2007 DMA List, available at <http://www.nielsenmedia.com/nc/portal/site/Public/menuitem.3437240b94cacebc3a81e810d8a062a0/?vgnnextoid=130547f8b5264010VgnVCM100000880a260aRCRD> (click on link for “2006-2007 DMA List”) (last visited Sept. 10, 2007).

advertising in competitive than in non-competitive Senate elections.”<sup>42</sup> In 2000, those races occurred in Delaware, Florida, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Virginia, and Washington.<sup>43</sup> Even among those states, a disproportionate amount was spent in New Jersey; during the *primary* season alone, the study found that 47% – or *almost half* – of the total spent on television advertising by all Senate candidates was spent in New Jersey.<sup>44</sup> The 2000 New Jersey Senate election was not only hotly contested, but one of the candidates was “Wall Street multimillionaire Jim Corzine, who spent a record \$35 million of his own money” on the election, representing the extent to which personal financing can impact political spending.<sup>45</sup>

The *Buying Time 1998* study contains similar showings, and also allows for a comparison of political advertising on a DMA-by-DMA basis.<sup>46</sup> Specifically, it analyzes twelve 1998 Senate races that involved a minimum of 1000 campaign-related commercials, and provides data regarding total spending on political advertising, as well as the percentage of that total spent in the five largest media markets in which the commercials aired.<sup>47</sup> Many of these markets are similarly ranked, but an examination of the data, reflected in the chart below, shows that the advertising expenditures in the 1998 Senate race varied widely between them.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> The Brennan Center for Justice, *Buying Time 2000: Television Advertising in the 2000 Federal Election* 48 (2001) (“*Buying Time 2000*”), available at [http://www.brennancenter.org/dynamic/subpages/download\\_file\\_10670.pdf](http://www.brennancenter.org/dynamic/subpages/download_file_10670.pdf) (last visited Sept. 10, 2007).

<sup>43</sup> *Id.* at 48 n.7.

<sup>44</sup> *Id.* at 48.

<sup>45</sup> *Id.*

<sup>46</sup> Jonathan S. Krasno & Daniel E. Seltz, *Buying Time: Television Advertising in the 1998 Congressional Elections* (2000) (“*Buying Time 1998*”). Due to the study’s apparently limited availability, NAB is attaching hereto copies of the portions of the study discussed in this filing. See Attachment A.

<sup>47</sup> *Id.* at 141; see generally *id.* at 143-154 (analyzing spending on Senate campaigns in California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin).

<sup>48</sup> See *id.* at 143 (California), 145 (Georgia), 147 (Kentucky), 149 (New York), 151 (Ohio), 153 (Washington), and 154 (Wisconsin). Amounts in the “Total State Spending on Political Advertising” column were calculated by adding the amounts listed as “total spending” under the “political broadcasting” heading for each race. The “% for DMA” column includes the percentage for the relevant media market listed in the “media markets covered” chart for each race. The “Amt. for DMA” column was calculated by multiplying the “Total State Spending” by the “% for DMA” to arrive at the total dollar spent in each DMA. DMA rankings are from the 1999 Television & Cable Factbook. See Television & Cable Factbook 1999, at A-1 - A-4 (listing Nielsen market rankings based on 1997-1998 estimates). The DMA rankings have changed slightly since 1998, although those changes do not substantively affect this analysis. Jacksonville is now ranked 50, Albany-Schenectady-Troy is now ranked 56, Dayton is now ranked 58, Fresno-Visalia remains ranked 55, Knoxville is now ranked 60, Toledo is now ranked 71, Lexington is now ranked 63, Green Bay-Appleton is now ranked 69, Spokane is now ranked 77, Syracuse is now ranked 79, Rochester is now ranked 78, and Greenwood-Greenville is now ranked 180. See Nielsen Media Research, Inside TV Ratings, 2006-2007 DMA List, available at <http://www.nielsenmedia.com/nc/portal/site/Public/menuitem.3437240b94cacebc3a81e810d8a062a0/?vgnextoid=13>

Rank	DMA	State of Race	Total State Spending on Political Advertising	% For DMA	Amt For DMA
52	Jacksonville FL	GA	\$ 3,959,595.00	2%	\$ 79,191.90
53	Albany-Schenectady-Troy NY	NY	\$ 28,821,820.00	7%	\$ 2,017,527.40
54	Dayton OH	OH	\$ 3,605,726.00	12%	\$ 432,687.12
55	Fresno-Visalia CA	CA	\$ 14,022,746.00	4%	\$ 560,909.84
63	Knoxville TN	KY	\$ 3,630,106.00	2%	\$ 72,602.12
66	Toledo OH	OH	\$ 3,605,726.00	9%	\$ 324,515.34
67	Lexington KY	KY	\$ 3,630,106.00	27%	\$ 980,128.62
69	Green Bay-Appleton WI	WI	\$ 2,564,697.00	19%	\$ 487,292.43
72	Spokane WA	WA	\$ 4,602,180.00	12%	\$ 552,261.60
74	Syracuse NY	NY	\$ 28,821,820.00	6%	\$ 1,729,309.20
77	Rochester NY	NY	\$ 28,821,820.00	5%	\$ 1,441,091.00
181	Greenwood-Greenville MS	GA	\$ 3,959,595.00	2%	\$ 79,191.90

The disparities among similarly-ranked markets are dramatic. For example, in the 54th-ranked Jacksonville, only just over \$79,000 was spent by Senate candidates, while the 52nd-ranked Albany market saw over \$2 million in advertising expenditures on the Senate race. And if one were to average the expenditures listed above for the markets between 51 and 75, the result would be \$788,865.14. That amount, however, is almost or more than ten times the amount actually spent in Jacksonville, Knoxville and Greenwood-Greenville, and overstates the amounts spent in Dayton, Fresno, Toledo, Green Bay-Appleton, and Spokane by more than \$200,000.

With respect to the presidential elections, there is also substantial variance from election to election regarding which states are significant. Colorado, Florida, and Minnesota, for example, were considered battleground states in the 2000 presidential election but not in 2004.<sup>49</sup> And Delaware, Illinois, Louisiana, and Tennessee, for example, were considered battleground states in the 2004 presidential election, but not in 2000.<sup>50</sup> As the *2000 Buying Time* study explains, “[i]n any presidential election, the outcome largely depends on a handful of hotly contested states.”<sup>51</sup> Indeed, “[m]ost Americans reside in states that are already assumed to be casting their electoral votes for one candidate or another, and thus these states are not the focus

---

0547f8b5264010VgnVCM100000880a260aRCRD (click on link for “2006-2007 DMA List”) (last visited Sept. 10, 2007).

<sup>49</sup> See, e.g., Mitch Frank, *Election 2004: The Battleground States*, Time.com, <http://www.time.com/time/election2004/battleground> (last visited Sept. 10, 2007); *Election 2002 Battleground States*, CNN.com, <http://www.cnn.com/interactive/allpolitics/0010/battleground.states/battlegroundstates.html> (last visited Sept. 10, 2007).

<sup>50</sup> See, e.g., Mitch Frank, *Election 2004: The Battleground States*, Time.com, <http://www.time.com/time/election2004/battleground> (last visited Sept. 10, 2007); *Election 2002 Battleground States*, CNN.com, <http://www.cnn.com/interactive/allpolitics/0010/battleground.states/battlegroundstates.html> (last visited Sept. 10, 2007).

<sup>51</sup> *Buying Time 2000* at 42.

of advertising campaigns by the candidates of either major party.”<sup>52</sup> Thus, for example, during the 2000 primary elections a substantial 83% of Democratic presidential candidates’ expenditures on television advertising were concentrated in just three states – New Jersey, California, and Massachusetts – while 87% of Republican presidential candidates’ expenditures on television advertising were spent in Arizona, California, Massachusetts, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia, and Washington.<sup>53</sup> During the general election, “the air war” took place in only ten out of the nation’s fifty states – Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin.<sup>54</sup> In 2004, according to one report released 25 days before the election, 59.8% of the total spending on presidential television advertising was spent in just five states.<sup>55</sup>

House races, as the 2000 *Buying Time* study confirms, often do not involve substantial amounts of television advertising at all, in large part because “compact districts often make television advertising inefficient.”<sup>56</sup> Indeed, in 2000, only 39% of House races used television.<sup>57</sup> Nevertheless, television buying patterns track those of the presidential and Senate elections, with disproportionate amounts being spent on hotly contested races. The 2000 *Buying Time* study found that, in fact, “[m]ore than 74% of television advertisements aired” in relation to the mere “10% of house races [that] were considered competitive by election analysts.”<sup>58</sup> The 1998

---

<sup>52</sup> *Id.*

<sup>53</sup> *Id.* at 43.

<sup>54</sup> *Id.* at 45.

<sup>55</sup> See TNS Media Intelligence/CMAG, *Findings Memo: Election '04 Edition, “Issues in Political Advertising,”* at 4, available at [http://www.tnsmi-cmag.com/Publications/1004\\_election\\_findings.pdf](http://www.tnsmi-cmag.com/Publications/1004_election_findings.pdf) (last visited Sept. 10, 2007) (“*Issues in Political Advertising*”). Expenditures in these five states were as follows: Ohio: \$59.7M; Florida: \$57.1M; Pennsylvania: \$41.1M; Michigan: \$22.2M; and Wisconsin: \$19.4M, for an aggregate total spending of \$199.5M. *Id.* The 59.8% figure was derived by dividing the aggregate total from the five states just listed into the total spending on Presidential TV advertising of \$333.4M.

<sup>56</sup> *Buying Time 2000* at 49.

<sup>57</sup> *Id.*

<sup>58</sup> *Id.* at 49. A variety of other factors also may affect the extent to which individual stations earn revenues in a given election year. Some stations, for example, reach viewers in more than one state and, of particular relevance to House races, more than one Congressional district. Thus, a station in the 48th-ranked Louisville, Kentucky DMA, which likely reaches viewers in multiple states and multiple districts could well earn much higher revenues from political advertising than a station in a comparably-sized market located in eastern Virginia, such as the 42nd-ranked Norfolk-Portsmouth-Newport News DMA. Even within a given state or market, individual station revenues are extremely unpredictable, because spending from election year to election year may vary based on, for example, the extent to which a candidate might choose one station over another based on the demographics of its audience and the station’s ratings at the time. And, in addition to variances in spending on national elections, spending on local elections differs widely from year-to-year and from market-to-market. As of 25 days before the 2004 election, for example, one source reported that 59.2% of the total amount that had been spent on television advertising for state elections at that time had been spent on gubernatorial elections in just five states. Expenditures were as follows: Missouri: \$13M; Indiana: \$8.6M; North Carolina: \$3.5M; Washington: \$2.5M; and New Hampshire: \$1.6M, for aggregate gubernatorial spending of \$29.2M. The 59.2% figure was derived by dividing the aggregate total from the five states just listed into the total reported state spending of \$49.3M. See *Issues in Political Advertising* at 3.

*Buying Time* study's profile of thirty-eight House races in which more than 1,000 commercials were aired shows, further, that where House candidates do spend money on advertising, the total amounts spent are not at all consistent across different states, and most often a large portion of the money is spent in a very small portion of the state.<sup>59</sup> This is not surprising, of course, because of the nature of congressional district boundaries. But it does mean that, depending on the dynamics of a particular election, revenue from political advertising on House races will vary widely between similarly-ranked markets.

As with respect to national elections, the question whether the Summer Olympics occur in a given year is not a factor that affects all stations equally. Any positive effects of Olympic coverage obviously flow exclusively to stations affiliated with the network with coverage rights, and NBC has long had the rights to coverage of the Olympics and will cover both the 2008 and 2012 summer games.<sup>60</sup> Stations affiliated with the other networks experience no advertising revenue gains in years in which the Summer Olympics occur, and most likely experience substantial losses. The generalization that stations earn higher advertising revenues across the board in years when the summer games are played is simply not true.

Thus, while the mere *fact* that elections and the Summer Olympics may occur in even-numbered years is not "random," the actual benefit that a given station earns in any particular such year is very much dependent on external, unpredictable factors. It is therefore not the case, as CU and Prometheus suggest, that television stations exist within a predictable cycle of advertising revenue in which losses in an odd-numbered year will necessarily be counterbalanced by gains in the next even-numbered year. In fact, a particular station could experience losses for ten years straight, notwithstanding the fact that other similarly ranked stations in either the same market or in markets of the same size earn higher revenues in one or more years during the same period.

Simply put, the effects of national elections and the Summer Olympics on a given station vary greatly depending on a number of variables. Accordingly, including the years in which these events occur in a financial analysis that includes a large number of stations would distort the "average" revenues of stations within a given market range. It would thereby paint a picture that all of them are doing better than they are and that they can all expect to experience spikes in ad revenue in each year marked by a national election or the summer games. That picture, however, would have no relation to reality.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> See *Buying Time 1998* at 141; see generally *id.* at 155-192.

<sup>60</sup> \$2.201 Billion Bid Beats Competitors, Associated Press, June 6, 2003, <http://espn.go.com/oly/news/2003/0606/1564473.html> (last visited Sept. 10, 2007).

<sup>61</sup> NAB's analysis also measured the percentage change for all relevant revenue and expense factors between the earliest and latest years; those figures are reflected in the bottom column of the tables for each market range. See *August 2006 TV Financial Report*, Tables 2-4; *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, Tables 2-4. To the extent that NAB's financial analysis was intended to measure a trend over a period of time by showing the percentage change in revenues in earlier and more recent years, it made perfect sense to use odd numbered years at both of the end points. Such trends are best measured by comparing like years to like years. Because of the distorting factors that are present in even-numbered years, including an odd-numbered year at one end and an even-numbered year at the other would have skewed the results.

## The Exclusion of 1999 Was Reasonable

Prometheus next questions NAB's motive in omitting 1999 from its analysis.<sup>62</sup> The omission, however, is easily explained. NAB had conducted an analysis similar to that contained in its *TV Financial Reports* in a study submitted in the FCC's 2002 biennial review proceeding.<sup>63</sup> That study examined revenue and expense trends using four year intervals, based on data for 1993, 1997, and 2001.<sup>64</sup> In connection with its opening comments in this proceeding, NAB wished to provide the Commission with updated information. As noted in those comments, however, data for 2005 – the next data point using a four-year interval – was not available at the time.<sup>65</sup> Out of a desire to refresh the record to the extent possible, NAB supplied data for 2003, but in doing so simply updated the prior study to include that information, rather than recreating it entirely. Subsequently, with its reply comments, NAB submitted a further updated version of the study, which included 2005 data, but again did not recreate the analysis of the earlier years.

In any case, to dispel any further concerns, NAB submits a revised version of the study, including 1999 data.<sup>66</sup> As can be seen by the revised study, the inclusion of 1999 makes no significant difference in the analysis. The low-rated stations not only generally showed *declining* profitability from 1997 to 2005, but, as of 2001, the average low-rated station in a number of markets ranked 51-175 have experienced *negative* profitability.<sup>67</sup> The low-rated stations in markets 126-150 and markets ranked 151-175 have seen their profits decline by 1,136% and 117%, respectively, since 1997, and, not surprisingly, have suffered actual losses in 2001, 2003, and 2005.<sup>68</sup> And in markets ranked 51-75, the average low-rated stations saw their profits decline by 126% between 1997 and 2005.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, to the extent that low-rated stations in some markets may appear, based on raw numbers, to be earning increasing profits, it is clear that, when inflation is taken into account their profit levels are actually stagnant at best. In markets 101-125, for example, the study indicates that low-rated stations saw their pre-tax profits increase modestly by 18.2% between 1997 and 2005.<sup>70</sup> Over the same period, however, the

---

<sup>62</sup> Prometheus Reply Comments, at 33; *Rose Report*, at 13.

<sup>63</sup> *September 2007 TV Financial Report*, at 2; see NAB, *The Declining Financial Position of Television Stations in Medium and Small Markets* (Dec. 2002) (“*December 2002 TV Financial Report*”) (Attachment C to NAB Comments in MB Docket No. 02-277 (filed Jan. 2, 2003)).

<sup>64</sup> *December 2002 TV Financial Report*, at 2.

<sup>65</sup> NAB Comments, at 93 n.217.

<sup>66</sup> NAB, *The Declining Financial Position of Television Stations in Medium and Small Markets* (Sept. 2007) (“*September 2007 TV Financial Report*”) (Attachment B hereto).

<sup>67</sup> See *September 2007 TV Financial Report*, at 5-9.

<sup>68</sup> *Id.* at 9, 10.

<sup>69</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>70</sup> *Id.* at 8.

annual average Consumer Price Index increased from 160.5 to 195.3, or by 21.7%.<sup>71</sup> An 18.2% increase in pre-tax profits over a period when prices in general rose by 21.7% is not an increase at all.

The updated report also confirms the financial differences that exist between the average high-rated and low-rated network affiliates in these mid-sized and small markets. For example, in markets 151-175, while the average low-rated station saw their profits decrease by 117%, the average high-rated station experienced an increase of 41.7%.<sup>72</sup> And in markets 126-150, the average high-rated affiliate saw its cash flow decrease by 121.2%, while the average high-rated station saw its cash flow increase by 44.2%.<sup>73</sup> At the same time, in markets 126-150, the average low-rated affiliate suffered actual losses of over \$2.5 million, while the average high-rated station experienced positive pre-tax profits of nearly that same amount.<sup>74</sup>

### **The TV Financial Reports Are Based on a Comprehensive and Neutrally-Selected Data Set**

CU and Prometheus also allege that NAB has “cherry-picked” data in order to manipulate the results of its analysis.<sup>75</sup> These claims, too, are false, and reflect either a misreading of the description of methodology contained in the analysis itself, or a failure to address that part all together. For example, the data upon which NAB’s analysis is based was not, contrary to CU’s assertion, obtained from an NAB survey of “its members.”<sup>76</sup> As the *August 2006 TV Financial Report* explained on page 2:

This data was compiled from the NAB/BCFM Television Financial survey for the data years 1997, 2001 and 2003. This survey, conducted annually by the National Association of Broadcasters in conjunction with the accounting firm Hungerford, Aldrin, Nichols & Carter P.C., requests revenue and expense information from *all commercial television stations*.<sup>77</sup>

While NAB’s members include many of the country’s commercial television stations, *all* such stations are not, of course, members of NAB. Thus, a survey of “all commercial television

---

<sup>71</sup> U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index, *available at* <ftp://ftp.bls.gov/pub/special.requests/cpi/cpi.txt> (last visited Sept. 4, 2007).

<sup>72</sup> See *September 2007 TV Financial Report*, at 10.

<sup>73</sup> *Id.* at 9.

<sup>74</sup> *Id.*

<sup>75</sup> Prometheus Reply Comments at 33; *Rose Report*, at 14; *CU Reply Study 5*, at 73.

<sup>76</sup> *CU Reply Study 5*, at 73.

<sup>77</sup> *August 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 2 (emphasis added); see *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 2; see also *September 2007 TV Financial Report*, at 2.

stations” would include a large number that are *not* NAB members.<sup>78</sup> As a general matter, NAB has no control whatsoever over which commercial television stations respond to the survey; whether the stations are NAB members or not, participation in the survey is purely voluntary. Furthermore, this annual survey is not in any way related to the FCC’s ownership proceedings. Rather, it has been done for decades as a general survey regarding the financial performance of the television industry as a whole. Both the collection of data from non-NAB members and the voluntary nature of participation are, moreover, *legally required*. When NAB first began collecting and publishing television station revenue and expense data, it sought guidance from the Department of Justice as to the legality of doing so under the antitrust laws. The Department of Justice indicated that it would not take enforcement action against NAB based, in part, on the fact that “participation in the survey is voluntary and is not limited to NAB members.”<sup>79</sup>

Furthermore, contrary to Prometheus’ suggestion,<sup>80</sup> NAB’s analysis of cash flow and pre-tax profits, as the *August 2006 TV Financial Report* plainly states, included data from *all* of the highest- and lowest-rated affiliated stations for *all* of the markets between 51 and 175 where both categories of stations responded to the survey.<sup>81</sup> As explained in the *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, this was done “in order to directly compare the financial position of these stations.”<sup>82</sup> In addition, as the study explains, NAB limited its data set to ABC, CBS, FOX, and NBC affiliates “because, particularly in smaller markets, stations not affiliated with the four leading networks are much less likely to provide regular local news programs.”<sup>83</sup> Thus, if anything, the data is skewed toward the most profitable stations, because stations affiliated with the four major networks are usually the financially strongest stations.

While Prometheus launches a further attack on NAB’s substantive decision to exclude markets in which both the highest- and lowest-rated stations did not respond to the study,<sup>84</sup> the

---

<sup>78</sup> NAB has 1,153 television station members, out of a total number of 1,762 full power television stations in the United States.

<sup>79</sup> Letter from William F. Baxter, Assistant Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice Antitrust Division, to Edward P. Henneberry, Howrey & Simon, Counsel to NAB, at 1 (Aug. 8, 1983) (“*DOJ Letter Ruling*”) (Attachment C hereto).

<sup>80</sup> *Rose Report*, at 14 (suggesting that “the highest revenue-producers among the highest-rated stations were systematically excluded to depress the mean and fit the data to a desired trend line”).

<sup>81</sup> *August 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 3 (“[D]ata were used for markets only where both the highest and lowest rated affiliated stations participated in the survey.”); *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 4 (same). For news expense and network compensation, NAB considered data from *all* of the affiliated stations that responded to the survey in *all* markets between 51 and 175. *August 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 3; *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 4. Declines in network compensation affect all network-affiliated stations, regardless of their ratings, and increases in the cost of news operations affect all stations with local news. Accordingly, the *TV Financial Reports* include data from all network affiliated stations that responded for these categories.

<sup>82</sup> *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 4.

<sup>83</sup> *August 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 3 n.1; *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 3 n.2.

<sup>84</sup> *Rose Report*, at 15.

reason for doing so is plain. Most fundamentally, the *primary purpose* of the study was to show the dramatic differences between high-rated and low-rated stations, particularly in mid-sized and small markets.<sup>85</sup> Simply put, NAB's decision to include only markets where it had data for the highest- and lowest-rated affiliated stations was required by the study's essential purpose and was necessary to ensure the accuracy of the results.

### **Variations in Sample and Market Size Were Dictated by External Factors**

Prometheus' claim that NAB's analysis is flawed because the sample and market size vary by year, rendering it "impossible to determine how many of the same stations are being observed longitudinally," fares no better.<sup>86</sup> As noted above, for revenue and pre-tax profit line items, NAB considered data from *all* of the highest- and lowest-rated affiliated stations for *all* of the markets between 51 and 175 where both categories of stations responded to the survey. As also already explained, NAB has no control whatsoever over how many stations respond each year. Variation in the sample and market size was therefore not an affirmative choice made by NAB, but was dictated by the rate of response to the survey from which the data was obtained, a factor over which NAB has no control.

At bottom, this critique also seems to be simply a variation on Prometheus' argument that the study is flawed because it failed to include individual station data,<sup>87</sup> apparently both so that Prometheus could check NAB's math, and so that it could have determined for itself whether some or all of the stations had responded in each year studied. This criticism is invalid, however, in that it ignores the legal and practical sensitivities that would arise from disclosure of individual station financial data. Here again, NAB's position is supported by the Department of Justice's letter ruling, which based its decision on the lawfulness of NAB's plans to collect and report television station revenue and expense data in part on the fact that "individual station data reported to the NAB will not be made available to anyone other than those persons in the NAB responsible for publishing the survey and that the NAB has established internal procedures to protect the confidentiality of the individual station data."<sup>88</sup> In fact, the procedures that NAB has

---

<sup>85</sup> See, e.g., *August 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 4 ("A review of television station profitability in smaller markets reveals that profit margins are already at risk today, *especially for the lower rated affiliated stations.*") (emphasis added); *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 5 (same); see also, e.g., NAB Comments, at 93 (explaining that the study "compared the cash flow and pre-tax profits of the average high-rated affiliated station in these markets to the cash flow and profits of the average low-rated affiliate"); *id.* (noting that the study "unequivocally demonstrates the *financial differences* between the average high-rated and low-rated network affiliates in these mid-sized and small markets") (emphasis added); NAB Reply Comments, at 65 (citing the *December 2006 TV Financial Report* for the proposition that "[i]n particular, lower-rated network affiliated stations in the smallest markets (126+) have experienced actual losses in 2001, 2003, and 2005"); see also NAB Comments, at 97 ("Smaller market television broadcasters (*especially those who are not the ratings leader in their markets*) are experiencing serious financial distress. . . . These financial problems are sufficiently severe to threaten the long-term viability for lower-rated stations.") (emphasis added).

<sup>86</sup> *Rose Report*, at 14.

<sup>87</sup> *Id.* at 15.

<sup>88</sup> *DOJ Letter Ruling*, at 1.

adopted in order to maintain confidentiality involve submission of the data directly to the outside accounting firm of Hungerford, Aldrin, Nichols & Carter, P.C., and NAB represents to stations asked to participate in the study that “no one at NAB or BCFM will ever see your completed survey or figures.”<sup>89</sup> Under this process, *NAB itself* does not have access to data on an individual station basis, due to potential antitrust concerns. Even apart from legal considerations, it is obvious that as a practical matter stations would not respond to the survey, which seeks detailed data regarding revenues and expenses, if they were not ensured confidentiality. Financial information is, of course, among the most highly proprietary information that a company possesses.

### **The Relation Between the Variables Studied and Station Profitability Is Obvious**

Prometheus next criticizes NAB’s analysis for failing to “explain the specific relationship of each variable [that the study measured] to overall station profitability” or “to include a measure of station profitability itself.”<sup>90</sup> This too is misplaced. Simply put, it is obvious that decreases in cash flow combined with increases in expenses, both of which the study measured, result in lower station profitability. The study clearly shows that the trend is towards decreasing cash flow and pre-tax profits, while network compensation is decreasing and news expenses are rising. These factors plainly evidence that station profitability is declining.

### **DTV Costs Do Not “Artificially Depress” Station Profitability Calculations**

Prometheus’ claim that the study fails to take into account the effect of “one-time DTV transition costs”<sup>91</sup> reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the impact of the DTV transition on broadcasters. As NAB has explained, stations have reported spending tremendous amounts on the DTV transition.<sup>92</sup> Indeed, for stations with annual revenues below \$2 million (which tend to be in the 100 smallest DMAs), transition expenses average a staggering 242% of annual revenue, as compared to a still substantial 11% of annual revenue for stations in larger markets.<sup>93</sup> The suggestion that a station can recover from a “one-time” expenditure that approaches 250% of its annual revenue – or even 11% of its annual revenue – within a short period of time, such that the effect of the expense should be discounted, defies logic and is inconsistent with reality. These expenses, whether they recur or not, do not “artificially depress” station revenue trends as Prometheus summarily contends.<sup>94</sup> Rather, they are costs that, based solely on their magnitude, will impact stations for many years to come. This is all the more true because, as NAB has

---

<sup>89</sup> See Letter from Teresa J. Ottina, Sr. Director, R&A, NAB, to General Managers (Feb. 26, 2007) (Attachment D hereto).

<sup>90</sup> *Rose Report*, at 14.

<sup>91</sup> *Id.* at 15.

<sup>92</sup> See NAB Reply Comments, at 65-69.

<sup>93</sup> *Id.* at 67 & n.247 (citing General Accounting Office, Report No. 02-466, *Telecommunications: Many Broadcasters Will Not Meet May 2002 Digital Television Deadline* 18 (Apr. 2002)).

<sup>94</sup> *Rose Report*, at 15.

explained and as shown by the table below, stations are not earning any measurable revenues from their DTV operations, and the extent to which they ever will remains uncertain.<sup>95</sup>

Digital Broadcast Operations Revenue<sup>96</sup>  
*Includes affiliated stations: ABC, CBS, FOX, NBC*

Market Size	2005 Average Dollar Amount	% of Net Revenue <sup>97</sup>
All Affiliate Stations	<b>\$6,455</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
1-25	<b>\$2,891</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
26-50	<b>\$8,982</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
51-75	<b>\$13,265</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
76-100	<b>\$869</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
101-125	<b>\$13,675</b>	<b>0.2%</b>
126-150	<b>\$3,171</b>	<b>0.1%</b>
151-175	<b>\$1,158</b>	<b>0.0%</b>

Moreover, while the construction and purchase of new transmission facilities may be a “one-time” cost, the costs of operating a DTV station, some of which are higher than those of operating an analog station, are recurring costs or, at least, costs that are incurred over time. Apart from new transmitters and towers, broadcasters have “incur[red] the costs of running two stations [*i.e.*, an analog and a digital] during the transition period.”<sup>98</sup> Individual stations have also spent significant sums to acquire digital programming, as well as high-definition cameras, field units, editing suites, and infrastructure.<sup>99</sup> Indeed, recent reports confirm that “[t]elevision

<sup>95</sup> NAB Reply Comments, at 67-69.

<sup>96</sup> Data derived from the 2006 NAB/BCFM Television Financial Survey database. Digital Broadcast Operations Revenue is defined as any revenue derived from digital broadcast operations. Any multicast advertising revenues are included.

<sup>97</sup> Net Revenues is defined as a total of gross advertising revenues, plus network compensation, plus trade-outs and barter, plus digital broadcast operations revenue, plus other broadcast related revenues minus agency and rep commissions.

<sup>98</sup> *Id.* at 66 n.246 (quoting *GAO Digital Report* at 9).

<sup>99</sup> *Id.* at 66 & nn.244, 246.

stations and production companies are spending millions of dollars to upgrade equipment – cameras, lenses, software, editing boards and broadcasting infrastructure – to meet demand spurred by” the DTV transition.<sup>100</sup> These costs are significant, and broadcasters have indicated that “[i]t’s not unheard of for a total conversion to HD digital news broadcast to top out at \$10 million.”<sup>101</sup> Stations are “investing a ton of money into digital and HDTV infrastructure,” far beyond the costs of transmission facilities.<sup>102</sup> In many cases, there are also higher power costs associated with running a digital operation on a day-to-day basis. These costs are not actually “one-time” costs at all, but are completely ignored by Prometheus.

### **The TV Financial Reports Fully Support NAB’s Request for Duopoly Relief**

Finally, Prometheus’ assertion that NAB’s television financial analysis does not evidence a basis for regulatory relief from the top-four rule because it shows that “most of the stations studied remained profitable”<sup>103</sup> completely misses the mark. The study was not intended to – nor did it purport to – show that *all* television stations are struggling. Rather, as discussed above, its primary purpose was to demonstrate that stations in smaller markets are facing significant financial challenges, that there is a large disparity between the profitability of lower-rated stations and higher rated-stations, that this disparity is even more substantial in mid-sized and small markets, and that low-rated stations in smaller markets are facing particularly perilous financial situations.<sup>104</sup> Thus, for each market range studied, the *TV Financial Reports* compare the cash flow and pre-tax profit of the average highest rated station and the average lowest rated station.<sup>105</sup> They conclude that “financial pressures are particularly acute for smaller market stations that are not the top-rated station in their respective market.”<sup>106</sup> Clearly, there would have been no reason to conduct this comparative analysis or reach these conclusions if the point were to show that *all* stations were experiencing financial difficulties.<sup>107</sup>

Furthermore, while the NAB’s *TV Financial Reports* have focused on markets 1-175, recent industry data shows that the situation faced by television broadcasters in the very smallest

---

<sup>100</sup> Bill Shea, *High-def TV Brings Costs*, Crain’s Detroit Business, Aug. 20, 2007, available at <http://www.craindetroit.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20070820/SUB/708200341>.

<sup>101</sup> *Id.* (quoting Steve Wasserman, vice president and general manager of television station WDIV, Detroit, MI).

<sup>102</sup> *Id.* (quoting same).

<sup>103</sup> Prometheus Reply Comments at 33.

<sup>104</sup> *See supra* p. 17 & n.85.

<sup>105</sup> *See August 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 5-9 & Tables 2-6; *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 6-9 & Tables 2-6.

<sup>106</sup> *August 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 10; *December 2006 TV Financial Report*, at 11.

<sup>107</sup> In addition, other studies in the record, including several attached to NAB’s filing, support relief from the duopoly rule. *See* NAB, *Local Television Market Revenue Statistics* (Aug. 18, 2006) (Attachment F to NAB Comments); Mark R. Fratrik, Ph.D, BIA, *Economic Viability of Local Television Stations in Duopolies* (Oct. 23, 2006) (Attachment H to NAB Comments).

markets (those ranked above 176) is even more grim, and confirm NAB's prior showings with respect to the mid-sized and small markets included in its prior analyses. In 2005, with respect to markets ranked above 176, 25% of stations reported actual *losses* in excess of \$557,251, and 50% reported actual *losses* in excess of \$98,798.<sup>108</sup> And, in all but one group of markets ranked between 71-175, more than 25% of stations reported actual losses,<sup>109</sup> with 25% of stations in markets 121-130, for example, reporting actual *losses* of more than \$986,834.<sup>110</sup> These data are taken from the most recent *Television Financial Report*, which includes 2005 data for all commercial stations affiliated with the ABC, CBS, and NBC networks that responded to the NAB/BCFM annual survey.<sup>111</sup> Consideration of this more comprehensive data set yields results that are fully consistent with the findings of NAB's previous *TV Financial Reports*, and adds to the already fulsome record evidence regarding the exceedingly tenuous financial position of the lowest-rated stations in mid-size and small markets.

Similarly, an analysis of data gleaned from the NAB/BCFM annual survey over time provides still further confirmation that the lowest-rated stations in mid-sized and small markets are struggling financially. Attachment E hereto<sup>112</sup> shows that, when all affiliates responding to the survey in each relevant year are considered, in all but two sets of markets ranked 51 and higher the percentage change from 1997 to 2005 shows a decrease in profitability among the lower 25% of stations.<sup>113</sup> Indeed, in six of the eleven market groupings within that range, the percentage change from 1997 to 2005 shows an increase in *actual losses* among the lower 25% of stations, with the percentage change ranging from an overwhelming 3878.9% in markets ranked 151-175 to a still substantial 87.6% in markets ranked 81-90.

Comparable results are found when the data set is limited to all ABC, CBS, and NBC affiliates responding to the survey in each relevant year, as shown in Attachment F hereto. Specifically, in all but two sets of markets ranked 51 and higher the percentage change from 1997 to 2005 shows a decrease profitability from 1997 to 2005 among the lower 25% of stations.<sup>114</sup> In four of the eleven market groupings within that range, the percentage change from

---

<sup>108</sup> NAB, BCFM TELEVISION FINANCIAL REPORT 69 (2006 Ed.).

<sup>109</sup> *Id.* at 53-69.

<sup>110</sup> *Id.* at 63.

<sup>111</sup> The overall response rate for that annual survey was 63.1%.

<sup>112</sup> Data for this attachment, and Attachment F, were obtained from the annual NAB, BCFM TELEVISION FINANCIAL REPORTS for the years covered by the analyses.

<sup>113</sup> Even where the percentage change from 1997 to 2005 shows an increase in profits or a decrease in losses, which might suggest an improvement of financial situation, an examination of the data reveals that stations are still struggling. In markets ranked 111-120, more than 25% of the stations showed losses each year, although the losses may have decreased in severity over time. In markets ranked 101-110, the percentage change shows an increase in profits among the lower 25% of stations, but only after several successive years of substantial losses.


<sup>114</sup> Here, too, where the percentage change from 1997 to 2005 shows an increase in profits or a decrease in losses, which might suggest an improvement of financial situation, an examination of the data reveals that stations are in dire financial condition. In markets ranked 111-120, more than 25% of the stations consistently showed losses,

1997 to 2005 shows an increase in actual losses among the lower 25% of stations, with the percentage change ranging from 248.5% in markets ranked 121-130 to 3.5% in markets ranked 131-150.

The simple fact is that commercial television stations in mid-sized and small markets are at risk, and that the lower-rated stations in those markets are at even more substantial risk. The current duopoly rule, which through its “eight voices” standard effectively prohibits duopolies in the vast majority of medium and small markets, is a major impediment to these stations’ ability to remain viable. The “top-four” restriction only makes matters worse, by severely restricting duopolies in markets with only five or six stations, and prohibiting them entirely in markets with four or fewer stations.<sup>115</sup> NAB’s *TV Financial Reports* focus on stations affiliated with one of the four major networks, and compare the financial situations of the highest- and lowest-ranked stations in markets of different sizes. The analysis conclusively shows that it is the smaller markets where broadcasters – and particularly the *lower ranked* stations among the top-four – are struggling the most. And, supplemental analysis based on more comprehensive data bear this out even further. By perversely placing the greatest restriction on the ability of those very stations to enjoy the efficiencies and synergies associated with common ownership, the duopoly rule, with its top-four restriction, causes the greatest harm to those stations that need the most help. Therefore, despite Prometheus’ attempt to distract the Commission by mischaracterizing NAB’s argument, NAB’s television financial analysis fully supports its request for relaxation of the duopoly rule and elimination of the top-four restriction.

For these reasons, the *TV Financial Reports* properly document the struggling condition of smaller-market broadcasters, particularly lower-rated stations, and fully support NAB’s request for relaxation of the television duopoly rule. The charge of “fraud” is inappropriate and unnecessary.

Respectfully submitted,



Jane E. Mago  
Marsha J. MacBride  
Jerianne Timmerman

---

although the losses may have decreased in severity over time. In markets ranked 101-110, there was little change from 1997 to 2005, but the lower 25% of stations experienced two successive years of substantial losses in the interim.

<sup>115</sup> NAB Comments, at 102-03. The restriction is all the more illogical because, as NAB has shown, in mid-sized and small markets, one or two stations often have a significant ratings lead, and a very substantial audience share drop-off occurs after the first- or second-ranked stations. *Id.* at 103 & n.237.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**Buying Time:  
Television Advertising in the  
1998 Congressional Elections**

by  
**Jonathan S. Krasno and Daniel E. Seltz**

**Funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts**

Copyright © 2000 by the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law. All rights reserved.  
No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted without permission in writing from the publisher,  
Brennan Center for Justice, 161 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10013.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 00-0913

ISBN 0-9654063-3-4

## Chapter Seven—Top Races

While Chapters One through Five presented an overview of television advertising in the 1998 elections, Chapter Seven shifts gears by looking separately at fifty top Senate and House races. What sets apart the 11 Senate and 39 House elections profiled here is that each saw a minimum of 1,000 commercials aired by candidates, parties and interest groups. That degree of campaign activity does not always insure a close contest—Representative Wes Watkins (R), for instance, carried Oklahoma's 3rd district with 62 percent of the vote despite a spirited effort by his opponent—but many of the races examined here are among the tightest in the country. Some of the closest elections in the nation took place in smaller media markets for which we have no data; others that occurred within the largest media markets simply, for a variety of reasons, made less use of television advertising.

Focusing on individual districts gives a sense of the texture of specific campaigns that the aggregate figures cannot provide. Some races fit the general patterns that the earlier chapters establish, but others are clearly exceptional. New York's Senate campaign, for instance, dwarfs other races in the use of television advertising;—Republican Alfonse D'Amato, Democrat Charles Schumer, and their allies together aired nearly 40,000 commercials, thus accounting for more than 1/7th of the data set. And, though candidates usually take the lead in campaigning, that was not the case in Michigan's 12th district where incumbent Debbie Stabenow faced opposing ads

purchased only by the Republican Party and interest groups, or in a number of other states and districts where the involvement of parties and interest groups far exceeded the norm.

Each of the profiles reports the magnitude of advertising activity in the race by candidates, parties and interest groups, along with the main themes of the commercials, the tone of the ads, and the timing of the ad war. We include background information on each race, including vote totals and percentages and each candidate's total reported expenditures—not just the cost of television advertising—to the Federal Election Commission<sup>1</sup>. We also list the five largest media markets that are included in each district or state and the portion of the state or district that each media market covers<sup>2</sup>. Kentucky's 4th District, for example, includes three media markets tracked by CMAG, Cincinnati, Louisville, and Charleston (WV). CMAG tracks ads in each media market, but each market makes up only a portion of that district.

Readers will want to be advised of several special circumstances among the races examined here. New Mexico's 1st district featured two contests, a special election in June and the November general, between Republican Heather Wilson and Democrat Phil Maloof in 1998. Wilson won both and advertising from both races is shown here. In Nevada's Senate race commercials by the Committee for Fairness clearly focused on the election, but favored neither candidate.

<sup>1</sup> Michael Barone and Grant Ujifusa, *Almanac of American Politics* (Washington, D.C.) : CQ Press, 1999).

<sup>2</sup> Campaign Media Analysis Group, *Campaign 1998*. In possession of Brennan Center.

Profiles are divided into Senate and House elections, and ordered alphabetically. They include:

<b>Senate (12):</b>	New York (Schumer)
California (Boxer)	North Carolina (Edwards)
Florida (Graham)	Ohio (Voinovich)
Georgia (Coverdell)	South Carolina (Hollings)
Illinois (Fitzgerald)	Washington (Murray)
Kentucky (Bunning)	Wisconsin (Feingold)
Nevada (Reid)	

---

<b>House (38):</b>	Michigan 10 (Bonior)
Alabama 4 (Bevil)	Michigan 12 (Levin)
Arizona 6 (Hayworth)	Nevada 1 (Berkley)
Arkansas 2 (Snyder)	New Mexico 1 (Wilson)
California 49 (Bilbray)	New Mexico 3 (Udall)
Colorado 2 (Udall)	New York 29 (LaFalce)
Colorado 6 (Tancredo)	North Carolina 2 (Etheridge)
Connecticut 5 (Maloney)	North Carolina 4 (Price)
Connecticut 6 (Johnson)	Ohio 1 (Chabot)
Florida 3 (Brown)	Ohio 6 (Strickland)
Idaho 1 (Chenoweth)	Oklahoma 3 (Watkins)
Indiana 9 (Hill)	Oregon 1 (Wu)
Indiana 10 (Carson)	Pennsylvania 10 (Sherwood)
Iowa 3 (Boswell)	Pennsylvania 13 (Hoeffel)
Kansas 3 (Moore)	Utah 2 (Cook)
Kentucky 3 (Northup)	Washington 1 (Inslee)
Kentucky 4 (Lucas)	Washington 3 (Baird)
Kentucky 6 (Fletcher)	Wisconsin 1 (Ryan)
Maine 1 (Allen)	Wisconsin 8 (Green)
Michigan 8 (Stabenow)	

# California

Incumbent Party: Democrat

Senate


Primary date: June 2, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Barbara Boxer  
 Total FEC spending: \$13,737,548  
 Vote Total: 4,410,056  
 Percentage: 53



Republican: Matt Fong  
 Total FEC spending: \$10,764,892  
 Vote Total: 3,575,078  
 Percentage: 43

## Political Expenditures

Total Spending for Boxer \$9,210,680




Total Spending for Fong \$4,812,066




## Issue Advertisements

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Environment	2,254	35
Gun control	1,956	30
Health care	1,908	29
<b>Republican</b>		
Education	1,625	43
Taxes	912	24
Government spending	898	24

## Advertising by Issue



## Advertising by Time



# Florida

Incumbent Party: Democrat

Senate


Primary date: September 1, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Bob Graham  
 Total FEC spending: \$5,094,581  
 Vote Total: 2,436,407  
 Percentage: 63

Republican: Charlie Crist  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,487,498  
 Vote Total: 1,463,755  
 Percentage: 38


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Graham \$2,455,814




Democrat Total Ads 3,829 Party for (D) Total Ads 0 Groups for (D) Total Ads 0

Total Spending for Crist \$676,628



Republican Total Ads 1,113 Party for (R) Total Ads 0 Groups for (R) Total Ads 0


## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
1 Taxes	2,124	62
2 Education	1,481	44
3 Medicare	1,288	38
<b>Republican</b>		
1 Taxes	800	72
2 Crime	791	71
3 Health care	478	43

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Georgia

Incumbent Party: Republican

Senate


Primary date: July 21, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Michael Coles  
 Total FEC spending: \$5,275,419  
 Vote Total: 791,904  
 Percentage: 45

Republican: Paul Coverdell  
 Total FEC spending: \$6,936,745  
 Vote Total: 918,540  
 Percentage: 52


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Coles \$2,239,481




Democrat Total Ads 2,955  
 Party for (D) Total Ads 252  
 Groups for (D) Total Ads 0

Total Spending for Coverdell \$1,720,114



Republican Total Ads 1,499  
 Party for (R) Total Ads 218  
 Groups for (R) Total Ads 0


## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Health care	2,047	68
Veterans	534	18
Honesty	450	15
<u>Republican</u>		
Education	601	35
Other economic	546	32
Drugs	539	31

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Illinois

Incumbent Party: Democrat

Senate


Primary date: March 17, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Carol Moseley-Braun  
 Total FEC spending: \$7,200,895  
 Vote Total: 1,610,496  
 Percentage: 47


Republican: Peter Fitzgerald  
 Total FEC spending: \$17,678,198  
 Vote Total: 1,709,041  
 Percentage: 50

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Moseley-Braun \$1,725,828



Total Spending for Fitzgerald \$5,341,761




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	403	54
Abortion	396	53
Medicare	204	26
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	1,868	52
Honesty	1,413	39
Other	453	13

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Kentucky

Incumbent Party: Open


Senate  
Primary date: May 26, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Scotty Baesler  
Total FEC spending: \$3,841,950  
Vote Total: 563,051  
Percentage: 49

Republican: Jim Bunning  
Total FEC spending: \$3,746,540  
Vote Total: 569,817  
Percentage: 50


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Baesler \$1,776,182




Democrat Total Ads 3,831  
Party for (D) Total Ads 2,351  
Groups for (D) Total Ads 336

Total Spending for Bunning \$1,853,924



Republican Total Ads 4,047  
Party for (R) Total Ads 2,229  
Groups for (R) Total Ads 0

## Media Markets Covered



## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
------	---------------	---------


Democrat		
Health care	2,048	34
Other	2,044	34
Taxes	2,043	34
Republican		
Social Security	3,534	56
Taxes	2,784	44
Other	1,356	22

## Major Interest Groups Participating


Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Campaign for America	336	\$125,366

Groups		
Education	336	100
Social Security	336	100
Medicare	336	100

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Nevada

Incumbent Party: Democrat

Senate


Primary date: September 1, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Harry Reid  
 Total FEC spending: \$4,939,010  
 Vote Total: 208,650  
 Percentage: 48


Republican: John Ensign  
 Total FEC spending: \$3,490,256  
 Vote Total: 208,222  
 Percentage: 48

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Reid \$2,432,679



Total Spending for Ensign \$2,463,994



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Political record	1,070	29
Environment	1,061	29
Taxes	833	23
<u>Republican</u>		
Taxes	2,954	67
Social Security	1,567	36
Education	993	23
<u>Groups</u>		
Health care	152	54
Political record	131	46
Environment	82	29


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
League of Conservation Voters	131	\$71,666
Committee for Good Common Sense	254	\$165,373

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# New York

Incumbent Party: Republican

Senate


Primary date: September 15, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Charles Schumer  
 Total FEC spending: \$16,671,877  
 Vote Total: 2,551,065  
 Percentage: 55


Republican: Alfonse D'Amato  
 Total FEC spending: \$24,195,287  
 Vote Total: 2,058,988  
 Percentage: 44

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Schumer \$14,877,881



Total Spending for D'Amato \$13,943,939




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Medicare	5,745	34
Education	4,910	29
Crime	4,793	28
<u>Republican</u>		
Other	5,298	28
Education	4,992	26
Taxes	4,947	26

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# North Carolina

Incumbent Party: Republican


Senate  
Primary date: May 5, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: John Edwards  
Total FEC spending: \$8,331,382  
Vote Total: 1,029,237  
Percentage: 51


Republican: Lauch Faircloth  
Total FEC spending: \$9,375,771  
Vote Total: 945,943  
Percentage: 47

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Edwards \$5,163,015



Total Spending for Faircloth \$4,534,411



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	3,641	38
Health care	2,371	25
Special interests	2,058	22
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	5,213	49
Honesty	2,156	20
Welfare	2,080	20
<b>Groups</b>		
Health care	77	76
Environment	25	25


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Am. Association of Health Plans	77	\$53,815
Sierra Club	25	\$17,334

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Ohio

Incumbent Party: Open

Senate

Primary date: May 5, 1998


## Candidates

Democrat: Mary Boyle  
 Total FEC spending: \$2,236,137  
 Vote Total: 1,482,054  
 Percentage: 44


Republican: George Voinovich  
 Total FEC spending: \$6,756,712  
 Vote Total: 1,922,087  
 Percentage: 56

## Political Broadcasting


### Total Spending for Boyle \$848,171



### Total Spending for Voinovich \$2,757,555




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Taxes	1,368	100
Education	1,366	100
Lottery for education	901	66
<b>Republican</b>		
Background	1,020	23
Social Security	1,020	23
Medicare	1,020	23

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# South Carolina

Incumbent Party: Democrat


Senate  
Primary date: June 9, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Ernest Hollings  
Total FEC spending: \$4,968,456  
Vote Total: 562,791  
Percentage: 53

Republican: Bob Inglis  
Total FEC spending: \$2,143,278  
Vote Total: 488,132  
Percentage: 46


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Hollings \$997,069




Democrat Total Ads 1,864    Party for (D) Total Ads 728    Groups for (D) Total Ads 0

Total Spending for Inglis \$482,329



Republican Total Ads 565    Party for (R) Total Ads 814    Groups for (R) Total Ads 80

## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Social Security	829	37
Other	629	28
Health care	546	25
<u>Republican</u>		
Social Security	798	60
Taxes	688	52
Political record	390	29
<u>Groups</u>		
Other	80	100


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Americans for Limited Terms	80	\$31,857

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Washington

Incumbent Party: Democrat

Senate


Primary date: September 15, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Patty Murray  
 Total FEC spending: \$5,600,592  
 Vote Total: 1,103,184  
 Percentage: 58


Republican: Linda Smith  
 Total FEC spending: \$5,159,527  
 Vote Total: 785,377  
 Percentage: 42

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Murray \$2,841,094



Total Spending for Smith \$1,761,086




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Education	2,501	52
Social Security	1,045	22
Other	1,009	21
<u>Republican</u>		
Social Security	1,832	64
Taxes	1,680	59
Defense	795	28

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Wisconsin

Incumbent Party: Democrat

Senate


Primary date: September 8, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Russell Feingold  
 Total FEC spending: \$3,846,089  
 Vote Total: 890,059  
 Percentage: 51


Republican: Mark Neumann  
 Total FEC spending: \$4,373,953  
 Vote Total: 852,272  
 Percentage: 48

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Feingold \$1,108,172



Total Spending for Neumann \$1,456,525



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Social Security	879	33
Special interests	491	19
Education	395	15
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	2,474	47
Social Security	1,573	30
Defense	619	12
<b>Groups</b>		
Political record	71	92
Environment	71	92
Abortion	6	8


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
League of Conservation Voters	71	\$50,216
National Pro-Life Association	6	\$1,761

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Alabama

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 4

Primary date: June 2, 1998


Candidates

Democrat: Donald Bevil  
 Total FEC spending: \$662,224  
 Vote Total: 82,065  
 Percentage: 44


Republican: Robert Aderholt  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,605,092  
 Vote Total: 106,297  
 Percentage: 56

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Bevil \$1,108,172



Total Spending for Aderholt \$1,456,525




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Child-related	197	60
Education	133	40
Social Security	133	40
<u>Republican</u>		
Social Security	1,081	78
Taxes	749	54
Ideology	749	54

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Arizona

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 6


Primary date: June 25, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Steve Owens  
 Total FEC spending: \$836,074  
 Vote Total: 88,001  
 Percentage: 44


Republican: J.D. Hayworth  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,839,460  
 Vote Total: 106,891  
 Percentage: 53

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Owens \$216,252



Total Spending for Hayworth \$1,324,329



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Ideology	203	70
Background	152	52
Taxes	83	29
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	938	62
Defense	515	34
Social Security	499	33
<b>Groups</b>		
Taxes	158	100


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Americans for Fair Taxation	158	\$106,490

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Arkansas

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 2


Primary date: May 19, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Vic Snyder  
 Total FEC spending: \$963,053  
 Vote Total: 100,334  
 Percentage: 58


Republican: Phil Wyrick  
 Total FEC spending: \$607,999  
 Vote Total: 72,737  
 Percentage: 42

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Snyder \$266,851



Total Spending for Wyrick \$337,729




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Health care	466	52
Defense	417	47
Social Security	339	38
<b>Republican</b>		
Drugs	406	42
Political record	363	37
Background	300	31

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# California

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 49

Primary date: June 2, 1998


Candidates

Democrat: Christine Kehoe  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,263,299  
 Vote Total: 86,400  
 Percentage: 47


Republican: Brian Bilbray  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,278,210  
 Vote Total: 90,516  
 Percentage: 49

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Kehoe \$639,378



Total Spending for Bilbray \$814,663




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	629	68
Environment	587	64
Abortion	296	32
<b>Republican</b>		
Defense	399	64
Honesty	265	42
Other child-related-related	265	42

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Colorado

Incumbent Party: Open

District 2

Primary date: August 11, 1998


## Candidates

Democrat: Mark Udall  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,226,580  
 Vote Total: 113,946  
 Percentage: 50


Republican: Bob Greenlee  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,879,887  
 Vote Total: 108,385  
 Percentage: 47

## Political Broadcasting


### Total Spending for Udall \$562,293



### Total Spending for Greenlee \$1,135,002




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	482	74
Health care	482	74
Other	312	48
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	892	74
Social Security	394	33
Background	298	25

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Colorado

Incumbent Party: Open

District 6


Primary date: August 11, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Henry L. Strauss  
 Total FEC spending: \$393,280  
 Vote Total: 82,662  
 Percentage: 42


Republican: Tom Tancredo  
 Total FEC spending: \$527,796  
 Vote Total: 111,374  
 Percentage: 56

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Strauss \$180,306



Total Spending for Tancredo \$207,708



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Ideology	231	100
Abortion	77	33
Education	77	33
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	170	100
Education	170	100
Social Security	170	100
<b>Groups</b>		
Abortion	126	81
Farming	19	19


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Business Roundtable	30	\$22,088
National Right to Life	126	\$45,397

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Connecticut

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 5


Primary date: September 15, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: James H. Maloney  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,377,977  
 Vote Total: 78,394  
 Percentage: 50


Republican: Mark Neilson  
 Total FEC spending: \$939,775  
 Vote Total: 76,051  
 Percentage: 48

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Maloney \$417,610



Total Spending for Neilson \$742,998



## Media Markets Covered



## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name Number of Ads Percent


### Democrat

Political record	202	38
Other law and order	193	37
Taxes	183	35


### Republican

Taxes	455	52
Welfare	277	32
Campaign finance reform	275	32

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Connecticut

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 6


Primary date: September 15, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Charlotte Koskoff  
 Total FEC spending: \$551,881  
 Vote Total: 69,201  
 Percentage: 40


Republican: Nancy Johnson  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,768,957  
 Vote Total: 101,630  
 Percentage: 58

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Koskoff \$397,045



Total Spending for Johnson \$646,131



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Special interests	138	77
Honesty	42	23
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	559	77
Social Security	165	60
Honesty	243	34
<b>Groups</b>		
Health care	139	100


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	139	\$124,936

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Florida

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 3


Primary date: September 1, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Corrine Brown  
 Total FEC spending: \$488,690  
 Vote Total: 66,621  
 Percentage: 55


Republican: Bill Randall  
 Total FEC spending: \$465,865  
 Vote Total: 53,530  
 Percentage: 45

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Brown \$84,887



Total Spending for Randall \$516,417




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Jobs	180	81
Social Security	90	42
Political record	87	39
<b>Republican</b>		
Political record	430	56
Honesty	430	56
Special interests	365	47

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Idaho

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 1


Primary date: May 26, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Dan Williams  
 Total FEC spending: \$876,308  
 Vote Total: 91,653  
 Percentage: 45


Republican: Helen Chenoweth  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,331,487  
 Vote Total: 113,231  
 Percentage: 55

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Williams \$155,045



Total Spending for Chenoweth \$235,580



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Other	402	46
Education	298	34
Environment	268	31
<b>Republican</b>		
Education	313	34
Defense	298	32
Government spending	250	27
<b>Groups</b>		
Health care	87	100


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	87	\$10,631

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Indiana

Incumbent Party: Open

District 9


Primary date: May 5, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Baron Hill  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,009,101  
 Vote Total: 92,973  
 Percentage: 51


Republican: Jean Leising  
 Total FEC spending: \$647,330  
 Vote Total: 87,797  
 Percentage: 48

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Hill \$325,685



Total Spending for Leising \$814,603



## Media Markets Covered



## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
------	---------------	---------


### Democrat

Social Security	505	58
Education	423	48
Medicare	296	34


### Republican

Jobs	1,030	71
Social Security	294	20
Health care	145	10

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Indiana

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 10


Primary date: May 5, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Julia Carson  
 Total FEC spending: \$773,835  
 Vote Total: 69,682  
 Percentage: 58


Republican: Gary Hofmeister  
 Total FEC spending: \$773,589  
 Vote Total: 47,017  
 Percentage: 39

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Carson \$475,278



Total Spending for Hofmeister \$657,089



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Government spending	357	74
Taxes	250	52
Education	199	41
<b>Republican</b>		
Crime	416	46
Personal values	196	22
Drugs	196	22
<b>Groups</b>		
Health care	261	69
Taxes	116	31


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Americans for Fair Taxation	116	\$42,040
AFL-CIO	261	\$148,850

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Iowa

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 3


Primary date: June 2, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Leonard L. Boswell  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,041,955  
 Vote Total: 107,947  
 Percentage: 57

Republican: Larry McKibben  
 Total FEC spending: \$847,794  
 Vote Total: 78,063  
 Percentage: 41


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Boswell \$415,547




Democrat Total Ads 1,184  
 Party for (D) Total Ads 306  
 Groups for (D) Total Ads 129

Total Spending for McKibben \$265,847



Republican Total Ads 378  
 Party for (R) Total Ads 454  
 Groups for (R) Total Ads 0


## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Taxes	596	40
Drugs	563	38
Education	422	28
<b>Republican</b>		
Defense	402	54
Social Security	388	52
Taxes	308	41
<b>Groups</b>		
Education	129	100
Health care	129	100

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Kansas

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 3

Primary date: August 4, 1998


Candidates

Democrat: Dennis Moore  
 Total FEC spending: \$986,688  
 Vote Total: 103,376  
 Percentage: 52


Republican: Vince Snowbarger  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,003,694  
 Vote Total: 93,938  
 Percentage: 48

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Moore \$543,640



Total Spending for Snowbarger \$536,569




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Social Security	597	54
Education	305	28
Health care	295	27
<u>Republican</u>		
Taxes	803	65
Honesty	523	43
Social Security	434	35

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Kentucky

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 3


Primary date: May 26, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Chris Gorman  
 Total FEC spending: \$702,866  
 Vote Total: 92,865  
 Percentage: 48


Republican: Anne Northup  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,772,613  
 Vote Total: 100,690  
 Percentage: 52

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Gorman \$340,760



Total Spending for Northup \$924,082



## Media Markets Covered



## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name Number of Ads Percent

### Democrat

Social Security	558	100
Medicare	259	46
Taxes	259	46

### Republican

Social Security	654	34
Political record	378	20
Education	546	29


### Groups

Taxes	224	35
Defense	224	35
Government spending	224	35


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	224	\$92,567
Americans for Limited Terms	128	\$44,289
Business Roundtable	282	\$97,783

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Kentucky

Incumbent Party: Open


District 4  
Primary date: May 26, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Ken Lucas  
Total FEC spending: \$1,065,956  
Vote Total: 93,485  
Percentage: 53

Republican: Gex Williams  
Total FEC spending: \$1,285,412  
Vote Total: 81,547  
Percentage: 47


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Lucas \$748,556




Democrat Total Ads 1,276  
Party for (D) Total Ads 218  
Groups for (D) Total Ads 951

Total Spending for Williams \$297,874



Republican Total Ads 426  
Party for (R) Total Ads 343  
Groups for (R) Total Ads 0

## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Honesty	650	44
Abortion	626	42
Other child-related	626	42
<b>Republican</b>		
Political record	426	55
Taxes	426	55
Health care	286	37
<b>Groups</b>		
Health Care	517	54
Other	434	46
Government ethics	219	23


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	521	\$171,927
Americans for Limited Terms	430	\$117,772

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time





# Maine

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 1


Primary date: June 9, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Tom Allen  
 Total FEC spending: \$689,694  
 Vote Total: 134,335  
 Percentage: 60


Republican: Ross Connelly  
 Total FEC spending: \$527,330  
 Vote Total: 79,160  
 Percentage: 36

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Allen \$350,486



Total Spending for Connelly \$278,275



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Health care	270	49
Taxes	227	41
Minimum wage	227	41
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	609	85
Social Security	408	57
Background	306	43
<b>Groups</b>		
Health care	451	74
China	159	26


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	451	\$124,503
Business Roundtable	159	\$32,737

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Michigan

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 8


Primary date: August 4, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Debbie Stabenow  
 Total FEC spending: \$996,148  
 Vote Total: 125,169  
 Percentage: 57


Republican: Susan Grimes Munsell  
 Total FEC spending: \$125,971  
 Vote Total: 84,254  
 Percentage: 39

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Stabenow \$88,704



Total Spending for Munsell \$380,824



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Social Security	367	100
Taxes	245	67
Education	245	67
<b>Republican</b>		
Honesty	507	100
<b>Groups</b>		
Taxes	221	100
Crime	123	56
Drugs	98	44


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Business Roundtable	119	\$47,637
Americans for Job Security	123	\$22,573

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Michigan

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 10


Primary date: August 4, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: David E. Bonior  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,477,749  
 Vote Total: 108,770  
 Percentage: 52

Republican: Brian Palmer  
 Total FEC spending: \$734,291  
 Vote Total: 94,027  
 Percentage: 45


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Bonior \$712,334




Democrat Total Ads 433  
 Party for (D) Total Ads 196  
 Groups for (D) Total Ads 0

Total Spending for Palmer \$703,231



Republican Total Ads 213  
 Party for (R) Total Ads 345  
 Groups for (R) Total Ads 108


## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Social Security	267	42
Personal values	170	27
Honesty	115	18
<b>Republican</b>		
Education	295	53
Social Security	295	53
Crime	263	47
<b>Groups</b>		
Crime	108	100

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Michigan

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 12


Primary date: August 4, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Sander Levin  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,638,901  
 Vote Total: 105,824  
 Percentage: 56


Republican: Leslie Tourma  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,188,234  
 Vote Total: 79,619  
 Percentage: 42

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Levin \$642,257



Total Spending for Tourma \$732,750




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	295	45
Social Security	242	37
Personal values	226	35
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	556	83
Background	275	41
Social Security	265	40

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Nevada

Incumbent Party: Open

District 1


Primary date: September 1, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Shelley Berkley  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,295,091  
 Vote Total: 79,315  
 Percentage: 49


Republican: Don Chairez  
 Total FEC spending: \$554,983  
 Vote Total: 73,540  
 Percentage: 46

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Berkley \$1,039,788



Total Spending for Chairez \$837,029



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Education	441	29
Taxes	415	27
Crime	366	24
<u>Republican</u>		
Honesty	748	67
Taxes	307	27
Background	182	16
<u>Groups</u>		
Health care	159	63
Taxes	93	37


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	146	\$89,087
Americans for Fair Taxation	93	\$44,369
Committee for Common Decency	61	\$41,518
American Association of Health Plans	13	\$7,643

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# New Mexico

Incumbent Party: Open


District 1  
Primary date: June 23, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Philip Maloof  
Total FEC spending: \$5,379,249  
Vote Total: 75,040  
Percentage: 42


Republican: Heather A. Wilson  
Total FEC spending: \$1,121,676  
Vote Total: 86,784  
Percentage: 48

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Maloof \$1,338,774



Total Spending for Wilson \$770,504



## Media Markets Covered



## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
------	---------------	---------

### Democrat

Education	1,411	47
Health care	1,097	37
Other	674	23

### Republican

Education	860	47
Taxes	457	25
Social Security	242	13


### Groups

Other	216	100
Government ethics	47	22


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Americans for Limited Terms	216	\$72,963

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# New Mexico

Incumbent Party: Republican


District 3  
Primary date: June 2, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Tom Udall  
Total FEC spending: \$1,591,017  
Vote Total: 91,248  
Percentage: 53


Republican: Bill Redmond  
Total FEC spending: \$1,390,159  
Vote Total: 74,266  
Percentage: 43

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Udall \$847,070



Total Spending for Redmond \$454,950



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	705	57
Social Security	461	38
Political record	406	33
<b>Republican</b>		
Education	618	67
Other	268	29
Jobs	197	22
<b>Groups</b>		
Health care	285	37
Education	281	36
Environment	149	19


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	348	\$113,676
League of Conservation Voters	430	\$179,653

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# New York

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 29


Primary date: September 15, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: John LaFalce  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,026,355  
 Vote Total: 97,235  
 Percentage: 57


Republican: Chris Collins  
 Total FEC spending: \$963,479  
 Vote Total: 69,481  
 Percentage: 41

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for LaFalce \$474,618



Total Spending for Collins \$747,309



## Media Markets Covered



## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
------	---------------	---------

### Democrat

Political record	532	43
Education	484	40
Social Security	280	23

### Republican

Taxes	713	46
Honesty	464	30
Defense	334	22


### Groups

Taxes	175	100
-------	-----	-----


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Americans for Fair Taxation	175	\$59,675

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# North Carolina

Incumbent Party: Democrat


District 2  
Primary date: May 5, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Bob Etheridge  
Total FEC spending: \$1,106,220  
Vote Total: 100,550  
Percentage: 57


Republican: Dan Page  
Total FEC spending: \$349,939  
Vote Total: 72,997  
Percentage: 42

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Etheridge \$427,677



Total Spending for Page \$204,741




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	400	45
Crime	398	44
Other child-related	398	44
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	177	46
Political record	168	44
Honesty	168	44

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# North Carolina

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 4


Primary date: May 5, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: David Price  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,229,519  
 Vote Total: 129,157  
 Percentage: 57


Republican: Tom Roberg  
 Total FEC spending: \$452,724  
 Vote Total: 93,469  
 Percentage: 42

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Price \$454,634



Total Spending for Roberg \$450,725



## Media Markets Covered



## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
------	---------------	---------

### Democrat

Education	325	61
Political record	140	26
Health care	133	25

### Republican

Taxes	592	68
Social Security	288	33
Defense	250	29


### Groups

Health care	126	37
China	114	33
Honesty	104	30


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	126	\$90,441
Business Roundtable	114	\$54,061

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Ohio

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 1


Primary date: May 5, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Roxanne Qualls  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,229,276  
 Vote Total: 82,003  
 Percentage: 47


Republican: Steve Chabot  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,623,706  
 Vote Total: 92,421  
 Percentage: 53

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Qualls \$439,282



Total Spending for Chabot \$869,603




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	313	37
Social Security	261	31
Medicare	176	21
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	996	48
Defense	990	47
Education	815	39

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Ohio

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 6


Primary date: May 5, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Ted Strickland  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,050,157  
 Vote Total: 102,852  
 Percentage: 57


Republican: Nancy P. Hollister  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,008,844  
 Vote Total: 77,711  
 Percentage: 43

## Political Broadcasting


### Total Spending for Strickland \$363,690



### Total Spending for Hollister \$917,373



### Media Markets Covered




### Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Political record	378	38
Jobs	378	38
Other	378	38
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	1,214	54
Education	1,169	53
Political record	750	34
<b>Groups</b>		
Health care	376	76
Taxes	118	24


### Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Americans for Fair Taxation	118	\$36,773
AFL-CIO	376	\$183,333

### Tone of Ads



### Number of Ads Over Time



# Oklahoma

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 3


Primary date: August 25, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Walt Roberts  
 Total FEC spending: \$808,385  
 Vote Total: 55,163  
 Percentage: 38


Republican: Wes Watkins  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,220,356  
 Vote Total: 89,832  
 Percentage: 62

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Roberts \$346,997



Total Spending for Watkins \$340,683




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Social Security	259	30
Taxes	225	26
Political record	191	22
<u>Republican</u>		
Defense	247	33
Social Security	247	33
Other child-related	247	33

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Oregon

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 1


Primary date: May 19, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: David Wu  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,602,063  
 Vote Total: 119,993  
 Percentage: 50

Republican: Molly Bordonaro  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,367,154  
 Vote Total: 112,827  
 Percentage: 47


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Wu \$383,206




Democrat Total Ads 630  
 Party for (D) Total Ads 0  
 Groups for (D) Total Ads 0

Total Spending for Bordonaro \$526,133



Republican Total Ads 891  
 Party for (R) Total Ads 246  
 Groups for (R) Total Ads 89

## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	301	48
Social Security	196	31
Other	133	21
<b>Republican</b>		
Education	669	59
Social Security	289	25
Taxes	270	22
<b>Groups</b>		
Other	89	100


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Americans for Limited Terms	89	\$29,152

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads, Over Time



# Pennsylvania

Incumbent Party: Open


District 10  
Primary date: May 19, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Patrick Casey  
Total FEC spending: \$1,287,027  
Vote Total: 83,760  
Percentage: 48


Republican: Don Sherwood  
Total FEC spending: \$1,921,129  
Vote Total: 84,275  
Percentage: 49

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Casey \$436,936



Total Spending for Sherwood \$543,600




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Background	709	47
Social Security	547	36
Taxes	439	29
<b>Republican</b>		
Social Security	1,084	67
Taxes	965	54
Defense	479	27

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Pennsylvania

Incumbent Party: Republican


District 13  
Primary date: May 19, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Joseph M. Hoeffel  
Total FEC spending: \$1,259,326  
Vote Total: 95,105  
Percentage: 52


Republican: Jon D. Fox  
Total FEC spending: \$1,921,005  
Vote Total: 85,915  
Percentage: 47

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Hoeffel \$1,023,252



Total Spending for Fox \$1,119,790




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<u>Democrat</u>		
Honesty	212	32
Education	177	27
Social Security	168	26
<u>Republican</u>		
Taxes	426	71
Health care	344	58
Government spending	254	43

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Utah

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 2


Primary date: June 23, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Lily Eskelsen  
 Total FEC spending: \$656,985  
 Vote Total: 77,198  
 Percentage: 44


Republican: Merrill Cook  
 Total FEC spending: \$647,249  
 Vote Total: 93,718  
 Percentage: 53

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Eskelsen \$688,165



Total Spending for Cook \$550,178



## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Social Security	429	40
Medicare	429	40
Background	247	23
<b>Republican</b>		
Social Security	431	52
Health care	428	51
Education	254	31
<b>Groups</b>		
Other	177	49
Health care	153	42
Farming	34	9


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	153	\$84,298
Americans for Limited Terms	177	\$95,698
Business Roundtable	34	\$26,154

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Washington

Incumbent Party: Republican

District 1


Primary date: September 15, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Jay Inslee  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,254,460  
 Vote Total: 112,726  
 Percentage: 50


Republican: Rick White  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,655,274  
 Vote Total: 99,910  
 Percentage: 44

## Political Broadcasting


Total Spending for Inslee \$700,590



Total Spending for White \$1,004,946




## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Environment	204	33
Impeachment	166	27
Background	148	24
<b>Republican</b>		
Taxes	858	85
Social Security	472	47
Defense	379	38

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Washington

Incumbent Party: Open

District 3


Primary date: September 15, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Brian Baird  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,602,437  
 Vote Total: 120,364  
 Percentage: 55

Republican: Don Benton  
 Total FEC spending: \$755,022  
 Vote Total: 99,855  
 Percentage: 45


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Baird \$450,462




THOUSANDS  
 Democrat Total Ads 677  
 Party for (D) Total Ads 89  
 Groups for (D) Total Ads 124

Total Spending for Benton \$481,552



THOUSANDS  
 Republican Total Ads 170  
 Party for (R) Total Ads 600  
 Groups for (R) Total Ads 0

## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Crime	421	55
Education	345	45
Attendance record	256	33
<b>Republican</b>		
Education	346	45
Taxes	189	25
Crime	192	25
<b>Groups</b>		
Taxes	124	100
Government spending	124	100
Defense	124	100


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
AFL-CIO	124	\$108,802

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Wisconsin

Incumbent Party: Open

District 1


Primary date: September 8, 1998

Candidates  Democrat: Lydia Spottswood  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,339,361  
 Vote Total: 81,164  
 Percentage: 43

Republican: Paul D. Ryan  
 Total FEC spending: \$1,245,568  
 Vote Total: 108,475  
 Percentage: 57


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Spottswood \$491,647




THOUSANDS  
 Democrat Total Ads 668  
 Party for (D) Total Ads 250  
 Groups for (D) Total Ads 213

Total Spending for Ryan \$615,049



THOUSANDS  
 Republican Total Ads 1,131  
 Party for (R) Total Ads 256  
 Groups for (R) Total Ads 0

## Media Markets Covered




## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
<b>Democrat</b>		
Education	391	43
Social Security	317	35
Health care	224	24
<b>Republican</b>		
Crime	416	46
Personal values	196	22
Drugs	196	22
<b>Groups</b>		
Government ethics	213	100
Other	213	100


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Americans for Limited Terms	213	\$83,224

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



# Wisconsin

Incumbent Party: Democrat

District 8

Primary date: September 8, 1998


Candidates

Democrat: Jay Johnson  
 Total FEC spending: \$850,577  
 Vote Total: 93,441  
 Percentage: 45

Republican: Mark Green  
 Total FEC spending: \$847,692  
 Vote Total: 112,418  
 Percentage: 55


## Political Broadcasting

Total Spending for Johnson \$253,094




Democrat Total Ads 862  
 Party for (D) Total Ads 410  
 Groups for (D) Total Ads 0

Total Spending for Green \$305,288



Republican Total Ads 642  
 Party for (R) Total Ads 390  
 Groups for (R) Total Ads 162

## Media Markets Covered



## Top 3 Themes by Advertiser

Name	Number of Ads	Percent
------	---------------	---------

### Democrat

Health care	552	43
Political record	524	41
Defense	517	41

### Republican

Taxes	558	54
Social Security	501	49
Defense	353	34


### Groups

Honesty	162	100
Gambling	162	100


## Major Interest Groups Participating

Name	Number of Ads	Total Spending
Americans for Job Security	162	\$28,338

## Tone of Ads



## Number of Ads Over Time



## **ATTACHMENT B**

**The Declining Financial Position of  
Television Stations in Medium and Small Markets**

**Prepared by:**

**Theresa J. Ottina**

**Sr. Director, Research & Analysis**

**National Association of Broadcasters**

**Research & Planning Department**

**September 2007**

## **The Declining Financial Position of Television Stations in Medium and Small Markets**

### **Introduction**

The television duopoly rule currently allows common ownership of two television stations in a Designated Market Area (“DMA”) where eight independently owned, full power television stations will remain in the DMA post-merger, and at least one of the stations is not among the top four ranked stations in the market. This “eight voice” standard effectively prevents the formation of even a single duopoly in medium and smaller markets. The Federal Communications Commission in 1999 determined to limit strictly the ability of television licensees to form duopolies to ensure a diversity of voices. But given the current competitive conditions in local media markets, a relaxation of this rule to permit co-ownership of television stations in smaller markets would provide needed financial relief to television broadcasters, and allow television stations to compete more effectively with cable operators and other multichannel video programming distributors.

### **Methodology**

The data contained in this report was compiled from the NAB/BCFM Television Financial Survey, a longstanding industry survey that has been conducted annually for several decades. This annual television financial survey, conducted by the NAB in conjunction with the accounting firm Hungerford, Aldrin, Nichols & Carter P.C., requests revenue and expense information from all commercial television stations. All survey responses are sent directly to the accounting firm of Hungerford, Aldrin, Nichols & Carter P.C. No one at the NAB sees any of the individual stations’ completed survey data.

To illustrate the financial position of stations in medium and small DMAs over time, an examination of the profitability of television stations in markets 51-175 was conducted, based on the NAB/BCFM annual surveys’ response datasets. For the purpose of this

submission examining smaller market stations, a specialized data run was conducted by Hungerford, Aldrin, Nichols & Carter for the data years 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003 and 2005 utilizing the responses of all commercial television stations that responded during those survey periods. The overall response rates for the annual television survey for each of the years examined were as follows: 1997 data: 70.0%; 1999 data: 65.1%; 2001 data: 64.0%; 2003 data: 63.5%; 2005 data: 63.1%.

Please note, to obtain the data for this submission and for NAB's three previous reports on small market television finances,<sup>1</sup> Hungerford, Aldrin, Nichols & Carter P.C. examined the responses from the annual television industry survey to determine the number of markets that contained a response from both the high-rated and low-rated network affiliated stations.<sup>2</sup> Although the overall response rate of 63.1% for the 2005 annual survey is consistent with previous years, the total number of markets reporting data for both high-rated and low-rated stations decreased in comparison to the previous years examined in this report. Therefore caution should be used when interpreting these results, particularly in the two smallest market size groupings.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Attachment C, Comments of NAB in MB Docket No. 02-277 (filed Jan. 2, 2003); Attachment J, Comments of NAB in MB Docket No. 06-121 (filed Oct. 23, 2006); Attachment, Reply Comments of NAB in MB Docket No. 06-121 (filed Jan. 17, 2007).

<sup>2</sup> Includes ABC, CBS, FOX and NBC affiliated stations. We chose to look at affiliated stations because, particularly in smaller markets, stations not affiliated with the four leading networks are much less likely to provide regular local news programs.

For the cash flow and pre-tax profit line items in this submission, data were used for markets only where both the highest rated and the lowest rated affiliated stations participated in the annual survey in order to directly compare and illustrate the differing financial position of these stations on a market basis. Since this cash flow/profit data is drawn from an entirely voluntary submission of data by commercial television stations to a separate annual survey, the number of markets where both the highest rated and lowest rated affiliated stations responded differed in the various survey years. The table below displays the number of markets included in each market-size grouping.

**Table 1**  
**Number of Markets**

<b>Market Size</b>	<b>1997</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2005</b>
51-75	21	25	18	15	12
76-100	16	25	15	16	12
101-125	15	24	13	17	11
126-150	15	22	14	14	5*
151-175	16	20	10	13	3*

For the network compensation and news expense line items, *all* network affiliated stations that participated in the annual television financial survey are included in the analysis. This was done to illustrate the downward trend of network compensation in the smaller markets, as well as demonstrate the increase in news expense incurred in those markets—trends which affect all network affiliated stations, not just the highest or lowest rated affiliates.

---

*\*Due to a small number of markets reporting 2005 data for both the high-rated and low-rated network affiliated stations in the 126-150 and 151-175 market size groupings, caution should be used in interpreting these results.*

## Analysis

A review of television station profitability in smaller markets reveals that profit margins are already at risk today, especially for the lower rated affiliated stations. It is clear that overall these stations show declining profitability in the years examined. Furthermore, those stations located in the smallest of markets are also now at a stage where the average low rated station experienced actual losses. Declining network compensation coupled with increasing news expenses adds to the tenuous financial situation of these small market stations.

To demonstrate this, the following section contains an analysis of the average cash flow,<sup>3</sup> pre-tax profits,<sup>4</sup> network compensation and news expense<sup>5</sup> in market sizes 51-75, 76-100, 101-125, 126-150, and 151-175. Please note, because of the small number of stations in many of the 176+ markets, these markets are excluded from this analysis.

---

<sup>3</sup> Cash flow is defined as net revenues minus total expenses.

<sup>4</sup> A pre-tax profit is defined as cash flow minus depreciation & amortization & interest.

<sup>5</sup> Network compensation and news expense include average numbers for *all* affiliate stations (ABC, CBS, FOX, and NBC) in the market-size grouping. They are not broken out by average high and average low rated stations.

**Markets 51-75: 1997-2005**

While the highest rated stations experienced an 11.0% increase in cash flow between the years 1997-2005, the lowest rated stations saw their cash flow decrease by over one-half. In examining the pre-tax profits, the profitability of the average highest rated stations saw a modest increase of 11.7%; in contrast, the lowest rated affiliate stations experienced a 126.0% decrease in profitability.

Network compensation decreased by 67.4% between 1997-2005. Additionally, news expenses increased by 14.7% for the average affiliate station (see Table 2).

**Table 2**  
**Markets 51-75**

Year	Cash Flow		Pre-Tax Profit		Network Compensation	News Expense
	Average: High-Rated Station	Average: Low-Rated Station	Average: High-Rated Station	Average: Low-Rated Station	Average: All Affiliate Stations	Average: All Affiliate Stations
1997	\$7,446,263	\$3,606,818	\$5,527,154	\$1,275,170	\$741,660	\$2,143,301
1999	\$7,952,140	\$4,112,158	\$5,405,777	\$1,499,147	\$647,981	\$2,172,420
2001	\$6,312,692	\$1,940,512	\$3,340,566	\$(269,865)	\$498,233	\$2,214,057
2003	\$7,655,615	\$1,525,087	\$5,632,695	\$429,900	\$365,413	\$2,485,451
2005	\$8,263,200	\$1,503,312	\$6,173,826	\$(331,409)	\$241,914	\$2,457,376
% Change 1997-2005	11.0%	-58.3%	11.7%	-126.0%	-67.4%	14.7%

**Markets 76-100: 1997-2005**

The cash flow for the highest rated stations remained flat between the years 1997-2005, and the lowest rated stations saw their cash flow decrease by 3.6%. In examining the pre-tax profits, the profitability of the average highest rated affiliate station increased by 94.3%; while the lowest rated affiliate station experienced an increase in profitability of 291.2%. It should be noted, however, that this apparently large increase in profitability for the lowest rated station is actually a return to relatively modest profitability after losses in some previous years. Indeed, the profits earned by the highest rated station are nearly ten times the amount of the lowest rated.

Between 1997-2005 there was a 60.1% decrease in network compensation. Additionally, news expenses increased by 22.5% for the average affiliate station (see Table 3).

**Table 3**  
**Markets 76-100**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Cash Flow</b>		<b>Pre-Tax Profits</b>		<b>Network Compensation</b>	<b>News Expense</b>
	<b>Average: High-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: Low-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: High-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: Low-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: All Affiliate Stations</b>	<b>Average: All Affiliate Stations</b>
1997	\$5,196,269	\$2,002,674	\$1,604,544	(\$177,509)	\$602,945	\$1,318,438
1999	\$4,979,105	\$2,533,439	\$1,690,957	\$655,480	\$545,377	\$1,462,026
2001	\$4,501,747	\$1,837,445	\$349,123	(\$770,915)	\$523,930	\$1,838,865
2003	\$5,395,123	\$1,687,584	\$2,340,758	\$254,353	\$352,424	\$1,675,414
2005	\$5,230,690	\$1,930,295	\$3,117,578	\$339,393	\$240,801	\$1,614,759
<i>% Change 1997-2005</i>	<i>0.7%</i>	<i>-3.6%</i>	<i>94.3%</i>	<i>291.2%</i>	<i>-60.1%</i>	<i>22.5%</i>

*Markets 101-125: 1997-2005*

While cash flow for the highest rated stations remained flat between the years 1997-2005, the lowest rated stations saw their cash flow decrease by 4.6%. In examining the pre-tax profits, the profitability of the average highest rated affiliate station increased by 55.3%; while the lowest rated affiliate station experienced an 18.2% increase.

Network compensation decreased by 60.4% between 1997-2005. Additionally, news expenses increased by 36.8% for the average affiliate station between 1997-2005 (see Table 4).

**Table 4**  
**Markets 101-125**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Cash Flow</b>		<b>Pre-Tax Profits</b>		<b>Network Compensation</b>	<b>News Expense</b>
	<b>Average: High-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: Low-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: High-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: Low-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: All Affiliate Stations</b>	<b>Average: All Affiliate Stations</b>
1997	\$4,282,359	\$1,378,834	\$1,397,684	\$570,936	\$458,650	\$909,901
1999	\$4,156,172	\$1,448,547	\$1,872,362	\$230,581	\$423,810	\$1,061,402
2001	\$3,981,049	\$523,806	\$292,545	(\$254,234)	\$359,843	\$1,120,541
2003	\$3,661,890	\$1,048,977	\$981,939	\$411,943	\$289,869	\$1,138,665
2005	\$4,248,166	\$1,315,394	\$2,170,161	\$674,935	\$181,464	\$1,244,646
<i>% Change 1997-2005</i>	<i>-0.8%</i>	<i>-4.6%</i>	<i>55.3%</i>	<i>18.2%</i>	<i>-60.4%</i>	<i>36.8%</i>

**Markets 126-150: 1997-2005**

The highest rated stations experienced an increase of 44.2% in cash flow between the years 1997-2005 and the lowest rated stations saw a decrease of 121.2%. The highest rated stations experienced nearly twenty times the cash flow of the lowest rated stations in these markets. Additionally, in examining the pre-tax profits, the average highest rated affiliate station experienced a 66.4% increase in profitability; while the lowest rated affiliate station saw its losses escalate by 1,136.0%.

Similar to markets 101-125, markets 126-150 experienced a 58.0% decrease in network compensation from 1997-2005. Additionally, news expenses increased by 20.3% for the average affiliate station between 1997-2005 (see Table 5).

**Table 5**  
**Markets 126-150**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Cash Flow</b>		<b>Pre-Tax Profit</b>		<b>Network</b>	<b>News</b>
	<b>Average: High-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: Low-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: High-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: Low-Rated Station</b>	<b>Compensation Average: All Affiliate Stations</b>	<b>Expense Average: All Affiliate Stations</b>
1997	\$2,350,371	\$800,912	\$1,427,403	\$206,147	\$470,707	\$719,187
1999	\$2,476,972	\$858,943	\$717,799	(\$249,841)	\$457,563	\$753,314
2001	\$2,448,103	\$461,252	\$999,599	(\$1,432,339)	\$374,274	\$824,752
2003	\$2,315,389	\$444,846	\$912,192	(\$1,193,682)	\$275,866	\$812,310
2005	\$3,390,036	\$(170,192)	\$2,374,542	\$(2,547,093)	\$197,905	\$865,344
<i>% Change 1997- 2005</i>	44.2%	-121.2%	66.4%	-1,136%	-58.0%	20.3%

**Markets 151-175: 1997-2005**

While the highest rated stations experienced a 20.9% increase in cash flow between the years 1997-2005, the lowest rated stations saw their cash flow decrease by 70.1%.

Additionally, the average highest rated station experienced nearly nine times the cash flow of the average lowest rated station in these markets.

In examining the pre-tax profits, the profitability of the average highest rated affiliate station increased by 41.7% over the 1997-2005 period, but actually declined from 1999, 2001 and 2003 levels. Conversely, the average lowest rated affiliate station not only experienced a 117.0% decrease in profitability in the years examined, but also incurred actual losses in 2005.

Between 1997-2005 there was a 63.7% decrease in the network compensation revenue source. Additionally, news expenses increased by 31.4% for the average affiliate station between 1997-2005 (see Table 6).

**Table 6  
Markets 151-175**

<i>Cash Flow</i>			<i>Pre-Tax Profits</i>		<i>Network</i>	<i>News</i>
					<i>Compensation</i>	<i>Expense</i>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Average: High-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: Low-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: High-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: Low-Rated Station</b>	<b>Average: All Affiliate Stations</b>	<b>Average: All Affiliate Stations</b>
1997	\$2,134,991	\$976,248	\$519,551	\$554,059	\$404,826	\$628,734
1999	\$2,854,511	\$617,588	\$1,355,356	\$29,508	\$344,844	\$622,281
2001	\$2,741,192	\$403,303	\$1,269,239	(\$92,917)	\$253,636	\$739,290
2003	\$2,488,419	\$3,463	\$1,327,203	(\$265,237)	\$185,482	\$800,618
2005	\$2,582,096	\$292,059	\$736,051	\$(94,462)	\$146,875	\$826,165
% <i>Change</i> 1997- 2005	20.9%	-70.1%	41.7%	-117.0%	-63.7%	31.4%

## **Conclusions**

From the data presented in this report, it is clear that many television stations today in smaller markets are experiencing reduced profitability over the years examined. These financial pressures are particularly acute for smaller market stations that are not the top-rated station in their respective markets. Indeed, the average low-rated station in the smallest market size groupings (126+) experienced actual losses in 2001, 2003 and 2005. Even low-rated affiliates in medium-sized markets (51-75) experienced losses in 2005. As this study demonstrates, a relaxation of the television duopoly rule to permit common ownership of two stations in smaller markets would provide needed financial relief for these struggling stations, thereby increasing the strength of local television.

**ATTACHMENT C**



## U.S. Department of Justice

## Antitrust Division

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

08 AUG 1983

Edward P. Henneberry, Esquire  
Howrey & Simon  
1730 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Mr. Henneberry:

This letter responds to your request for a statement by the Department of Justice of its present enforcement intentions under the antitrust laws regarding the publication by the National Association of Broadcasters ("NAB") of commercial television station revenue and expense data for the preceding year aggregated by broadcast markets. This data had been published annually by the Federal Communications Commission until last year when budgetary constraints caused the termination of that program at the FCC.

On the basis of the information you have submitted, we understand that the NAB intends to collect and publish information to reflect the preceding year's total time sales, revenues, expenses, income and barter transaction figures for television stations aggregated on a market-by-market basis. The market-by-market survey will be published annually in mid-year using information from the preceding year. No individual station data will be published, and no information will be published for a market unless at least three stations from that market respond to the survey. Also, no information will be collected or disseminated regarding a station's past or current prices for advertising time.

We also understand that participation in the survey is voluntary and is not limited to NAB members. The survey will be available at no cost to those stations participating in the survey, regardless of whether a station is a member of the NAB. The survey will also be available to non-participating stations and the general public at a nominal charge.

Finally, we understand that individual station data reported to the NAB will not be made available to anyone other than those persons in the NAB responsible for publishing the survey and that the NAB has established internal procedures to protect the confidentiality of the individual station data.

Based upon your representations and the information currently available, the Department of Justice does not presently intend to challenge the proposed collection of television station revenue and expense data. However, if the actual collection and publication of this market-by-market survey proves anticompetitive in purpose or effect, the Department remains completely free to bring whatever action or proceeding it subsequently comes to believe is required in the public interest.

This statement is made in accordance with the Department's Business Review Procedure, 28 C.F.R. § 50.6. Pursuant to its terms, your business review request and this response will be made publicly available on the date of this letter. Thirty days from the date of this letter any materials you submitted in support of the business review also will be made publicly available unless you request that any of the materials be withheld in accordance with subparagraph 10(c) of the Business Review Procedure.

Sincerely yours,



William F. Baxter  
Assistant Attorney General  
Antitrust Division

**ATTACHMENT D**



National Association of Broadcasters  
1771 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-2800



Broadcast Cable Financial Management Association, Inc.  
550 W. Frontage Road, Suite 3600  
Northfield, IL 60093

February 26, 2007

Dear General Manager:

The National Association of Broadcasters and the Broadcast Cable Financial Management Association (BCFM) are conducting the 2007 Television Financial Survey. Enclosed is your station's copy of the survey along with a postage-paid return envelope for your convenience. Your completed surveys must be returned directly to the accounting firm of Hungerford, Aldrin, Nichols & Carter, P.C. No one at NAB or BCFM will ever see your completed survey or figures.

**We encourage you to complete this survey "on-line" by going to:**

**[REDACTED] entering your station's call letters in the "User Name" field, and entering your 8-digit ID (as shown on the survey label) in the "Password" field. Please note that security is in place to protect the confidentiality of electronically submitted surveys.**

As in past years, all responding stations will receive a complimentary copy of the *2007 NAB/BCFM Television Financial Report*. This report will include approximately 80 tables to compare your station's performances with those of similarly situated stations. No individual station's data are reported, just summary statistics (e.g., averages, medians, etc.) Your response is critical to help ensure the accuracy of this data.

Additionally, if all major stations in your market respond, we will generate and forward to you your **market totals** for the various revenue categories, total expenses and profits. In order to protect confidentiality, there must be at least 3 stations in a market for us to report these totals. We will only report markets when all the major stations respond.

**Important: In an effort to generate and distribute the *NAB/BCFM Television Financial Report* in a timely manner, this year's deadline for Hungerford, Aldrin, Nichols & Carter, P.C. to receive your completed questionnaire is **March 30, 2007**.** Your market totals will be mailed to you shortly after all stations in your market have submitted their survey form. We strongly urge you to respond as soon as possible.

We hope you will participate in this year's survey. Over 63% of all commercial television stations participated last year. If you have any questions, please call me at NAB, [REDACTED], or Chris Harper at Hungerford, Aldrin, Nichols & Carter, P.C. [REDACTED]. Thank you for your cooperation in this survey. With your help we can continue our success in this survey and provide broadcasters with useful information.

Sincerely,

Theresa J. Ottina  
Sr. Director, Research & Analysis  
NAB  
tottina@nab.org

**ATTACHMENT E**

## ANNUAL TELEVISION FINANCIAL SURVEYS

### Pre-Tax Profits – All Affiliates and All Independents – 25<sup>th</sup> Percentile

	Markets 176+	Markets 151-175	Markets 131-150	Markets 121-130
1997	(258,559)	(3,840)	(345,230)	(358,750)
1999	(95,050)	(146,003)	(825,747)	(710,348)
2001	(318,285)	(312,206)	(998,440)	(1,125,969)
2003	(362,498)	(315,702)	(854,781)	(294,479)
2005	(444,215)	(152,788)	(552,335)	(950,821)
1997-2005	Losses Increased 71.8%	Losses Increased 3878.9%	Losses Increased 60.0%	Losses Increased 165.0%

	Markets 111-120	Markets 101-110	Markets 91-100	Markets 81-90
1997	(718,967)	37,939	(235,276)	(307,523)
1999	(1,095,331)	(615,124)	(567,430)	(772,874)
2001	(1,696,665)	(849,021)	(2,168,276)	(1,932,492)
2003	(804,500)	(194,193)	(519,969)	(140,255)
2005	(286,671)	86,949	(671,316)	(576,918)
1997-2005	Losses Decreased 60.1%	Profits Increased 129.2%	Losses Increased 185.3%	Losses Increased 87.6%

	<b>Markets 71-80</b>	<b>Markets 61-70</b>	<b>Markets 51-60</b>
<b>1997</b>	240,170	159,461	713,055
<b>1999</b>	(1,105,739)	(412,170)	134,172
<b>2001</b>	(2,328,460)	(1,325,192)	(1,462,123)
<b>2003</b>	(781,202)	(147,554)	(399,194)
<b>2005</b>	(1,299,696)	(11,451)	(644,163)
<b>1997-2005</b>	<b>Profits Decreased 641.2%</b>	<b>Profits Decreased 107.2%</b>	<b>Profits Decreased 190.3%</b>

**ATTACHMENT F**

## ANNUAL TELEVISION FINANCIAL SURVEYS

**Pre-Tax Profits – ABC, CBS, NBC affiliated stations – 25<sup>th</sup> Percentile**

	<b>Markets 176+</b>	<b>Markets 151-175</b>	<b>Markets 131-150</b>	<b>Markets 121-130</b>
<b>1997</b>	(327,172)	45,309	(288,981)	(283,133)
<b>1999</b>	(95,050)	(119,528)	(825,747)	(603,607)
<b>2001</b>	(110,526)	(312,206)	(543,742)	(1,370,869)
<b>2003</b>	(290,025)	(269,569)	(872,056)	(478,323)
<b>2005</b>	(557,251)	(244,740)	(299,075)	(986,834)
<b>1997-2005</b>	<b>Losses Increased 70.3%</b>	<b>Profits Decreased 640.2%</b>	<b>Losses Increased 3.5%</b>	<b>Losses Increased 248.5%</b>

	<b>Markets 111-120</b>	<b>Markets 101-110</b>	<b>Markets 91-100</b>	<b>Markets 81-90</b>
<b>1997</b>	(727,623)	197,707	(393,524)	247,041
<b>1999</b>	(1,189,853)	(493,898)	(1,553,616)	1,003,323
<b>2001</b>	(1,938,209)	(317,402)	(2,643,217)	(1,767,991)
<b>2003</b>	(904,009)	381,304	(519,969)	59,069
<b>2005</b>	(69,096)	197,825	(709,825)	(525,404)
<b>1997-2005</b>	<b>Losses Decreased 90.5%</b>	<b>Profits Increased 0.1%</b>	<b>Losses Increased 80.4%</b>	<b>Profits Decreased 312.7%</b>

	<b>Markets 71-80</b>	<b>Markets 61-70</b>	<b>Markets 51-60</b>
<b>1997</b>	769,680	298,157	1,071,861
<b>1999</b>	(1,215,359)	446,852	1,689,309
<b>2001</b>	(2,239,489)	(255,360)	484,930
<b>2003</b>	(294,020)	74,282	1,299,541
<b>2005</b>	(222,395)	153,835	759,003
<b>1997-2005</b>	<b>Profits Decreased 128.9%</b>	<b>Profits Decreased 48.4%</b>	<b>Profits Decreased 29.2%</b>