

PRESS STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN KEVIN J. MARTIN

Over the past year and a half the Commission has had to grapple with the most contentious and divisive issue to come before it: the review of the media ownership rules. Today's Order strikes a balance between preserving the values that make up the foundation of our media regulations while ensuring those regulations keep pace with the marketplace of today.

A robust marketplace of ideas is by necessity one that reflects varied perspectives and viewpoints. Indeed, the opportunity to express diverse viewpoints lies at the heart of our democracy. To that end, the FCC's media ownership rules are intended to further three core goals: competition, diversity, and localism.

Section 202(h) of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, as amended, requires the Commission to periodically review its broadcast ownership rules to determine "whether any of such rules are necessary in the public interest as a result of competition." It goes on to read, "The Commission shall repeal or modify any regulation it determines to be no longer in the public interest."

In 2003, the Commission conducted a comprehensive review of its media ownership rules, significantly reducing the restrictions on owning television stations, radio stations and newspapers in the same market and nationally. Congress and the court overturned almost all of those changes.

There was one exception. The court specifically upheld the Commission's determination that the absolute ban on newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership was no longer necessary. The court agreed that "...reasoned analysis supports the Commission's determination that the blanket ban on newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership was no longer in the public interest." It has been over four years since the Third Circuit stayed the Commission's previous rules and over three years since the Third Circuit instructed the Commission to respond to the court with amended rules.

It is against this backdrop that the FCC undertook a lengthy, spirited, and careful reconsideration of our media ownership rules.

In 2003, when we last conducted a review of the media ownership rules, many expressed concern about the process. Specifically, people complained that there were not enough hearings, not enough studies, and not enough opportunity for comments and public input. When we began eighteen months ago, the Commission committed to conducting this proceeding in a manner that was more open and allowed for more public participation.

I believe that is what the Commission has done. First, we provided for a long public comment period of 120 days, which we subsequently extended. We held six hearings across the country at a cost of more than \$200,000: one each in Los Angeles,

California, Nashville, Tennessee, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Tampa Bay, Florida, Chicago, Illinois, and Seattle, Washington. And, we held two additional hearings specifically focused on localism in Portland, Maine and in Washington, DC. The goal of these hearings was to more fully and directly involve the American people in the process.

We listened to and recorded thousands of oral comments, and allowed for extensions of time to file written comments on several occasions. We've received over 166,000 written comments in this proceeding.

We spent almost \$700,000 on ten independent studies. I solicited and incorporated input from all of my colleagues on the Commission about the topics and authors of those studies. We put those studies out for peer review and for public comment and made all the underlying data available to the public.

Although not required, I took the unusual step of publishing the actual text of the one rule I thought we should amend. Because of the intensely controversial nature of the media ownership proceeding and my desire for an open and transparent process, I wanted to ensure that Members of Congress and the public had the opportunity to review the actual rule prior to any Commission action.

We cannot ignore the fact that the media marketplace is considerably different than it was when the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule was put in place more than thirty years ago. Back then, cable was a nascent service, satellite television did not exist and there was no Internet. Indeed the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule is the only rule not to have been updated in 3 decades, despite that fact that FCC Chairmen – both Democrat and Republican—have advocated doing so. In fact, Chairman Reed Hundt argued for relaxation in 1996 noting, “the newspaper/broadcast cross ownership rule is right now impairing the future prospects of an important source of education and information: the newspaper industry.” Application of Capital Cities/ABC, Inc., Memorandum Op. & Order, 11 FCC Rcd 5841, 5906 (1996). And noted above, in 2003 the Third Circuit recognized this fact when it upheld the Commission's elimination of the newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership ban, saying that it was “no longer in the public interest.”

Consumers have benefited from the explosion of new sources of news and information. But according to almost every measure newspapers are struggling. At least 300 daily papers have stopped publishing over the past thirty years. Their circulation is down and their advertising revenue is shrinking.

Newspapers in financial difficulty oftentimes have little choice but to scale back local news gathering to cut costs. In 2007 alone, 24 newsroom staff at The Boston Globe were fired, including 2 Pulitzer Prize-winning reporters; the Minneapolis Star Tribune fired 145 employees, including 50 from their newsroom; 20 were fired by the Rocky Mountain News; the Detroit Free Press and The Detroit News announced cuts totaling 110 employees; and the San Francisco Chronicle planned to cut 25% of its newsroom staff.

Some have suggested that it is not in the business of the FCC to regulate newspapers and their condition should be of no concern to us. If that is the case, then why do we have rules about what newspapers can or cannot own?

Without newspapers and their local news gathering efforts, we would be worse off. We would be less informed about our communities and have fewer outlets for the expression of independent thinking and a diversity of viewpoints. I believe a vibrant print press is one of the institutional pillars upon which our free society is built. In their role as watchdog and informer of the citizenry, newspapers often act as a check on the power of other institutions and are the voice of the people.

Allowing cross-ownership may help to forestall the erosion in local news coverage by enabling companies to share these local news gathering costs across multiple media platforms. Today's Order amends the 32-year-old absolute ban on newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership. The revised newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership rule would allow a newspaper to purchase a broadcast station—but not one of the top four television stations—in the largest 20 cities in the country as long as 8 independent voices remain. This relatively minor loosening of the ban on newspaper/broadcast cross-ownership in markets where there are many voices and sufficient competition will help strike a balance between ensuring the quality of local news gathering while guarding against too much concentration.

As I have previously stated, I always intended the negative presumption for all other transactions to be a very high hurdle. As I testified before Congress, I invited suggestions from my colleagues and those in the public interest community as to how we could tighten that standard so everyone would agree it was not a loophole. The edits we included in the order were made at the suggestion of the public interest and consumer advocacy groups to make more meaningful the presumption against transactions in smaller markets.

I believe we did that today by saying expressly that we will require any applicant attempting to overcome a negative presumption to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that post-merger, the merged entity will increase the diversity of independent news outlets and increase competition among independent news sources in the relevant market. Our analysis of the four factors will inform this determination.

In contrast to the FCC's actions 4 years ago and in response to many of the public comments we received in the proceeding, we do not loosen any other ownership rule. We do not permit companies to own any more radio or television stations either in a single market or nationally. Indeed this rule change is notably more conservative in approach than the remanded newspaper/broadcast cross ownership rule that the Commission adopted in 2003. That rule would have allowed transactions in the top 170 markets. The rule we adopt today would allow only a subset of transactions in only the top 20 markets, which would still be subject to an individualized determination that the transaction is in the public interest.

The new rule balances the need to support the availability and sustainability of local news while not significantly increasing local concentration or harming diversity.

As the Commission revises its media ownership rules, we must not lose sight of two critical public interest goals – localism and diversity. Indeed, I believe that it is incumbent upon the Commission to do everything it can right now to further these goals and I am pleased the Commission is going to act on both today. As difficult as these issues are they are some of the most important to come before us. In fact as many have noted throughout this proceeding, promoting localism and diversity as well as responding to the Congress and the Court on the media ownership rules themselves, have been pending before the Commission for far too long. These issues also are ripe for decision and should not be put off any longer.

Finally, I want to specifically address some of the comments made by colleagues here today. Commissioner Copps has criticized the process including what he considers to be insufficient time for the public to comment on the proposed rule change. I want remind my friend and colleague of the time period which the public was given just last year to review and comment on the commitments made by AT&T and Bell South during the review of their merger. In that context we provided ten days for the public to consider their initial pledges. However, Commissioners Copps and Adelstein then negotiated significant new concessions with the companies on December 28th. The Commission approved the merger based on those new concessions only one day later, on December 29th, with absolutely no opportunity to know let alone comment on what was adopted. Ironically, Commissioner Copps said at the time,

“Indeed, I believe that this proceeding has allowed for more comment and sharing of knowledge by interested parties than any merger consideration that I have participated in during the five years I have served on the Commission.”

Testifying before Congress, giving interviews to the press and again here this morning, Commissioner Adelstein has accused the Commission of an unprecedented act of defiance against Congress. It is worth noting however, that the net neutrality commitment he negotiated with AT&T and Bell South last was exactly the same proposal that had been rejected in legislation that failed to pass in both chambers of Congress. Indeed, the House of Representatives rejected the exact net neutrality proposal by a recorded vote of 269 to 152 just six months before he and Commissioner Copps insisted on including it.

I do not raise these issues to attack my colleagues. Despite the contentious and politically divisive nature of the media ownership issue we have good working relationships and 95% of the items that come before us are adopted by a bipartisan majority. I remind them of the previous process only to make a larger point. Much of the criticism about the process in this proceeding is really about difference on the substance of the issue itself. However, persistent opposition to the Commission acting on the media

ownership rules is not the same as lack of debate in the proceeding.

I appreciate that my colleagues and I have different views on the amending the newspaper broadcast cross ownership rule. But I reject the claims that the process has been unfair or even too rushed. At every step of the process during the last 18 months, whether it came to picking dates or cities for public hearings or commissioning independent studies, I have continually sought, albeit unsuccessfully, consensus with my colleagues throughout this process. For instance, I provided my colleagues a public notice announcing dates for all the remaining hearings, including the Seattle hearing, over a month before it was held, but they objected to its release. When we finally announced the Seattle hearing date publicly a week prior to the hearing, they objected that we hadn't provided enough notice. They also claim I didn't listen to the comments of the people in Seattle. However, only 2 people even mentioned newspaper cross-ownership, and one in fact supported relaxation. Indeed, the majority of people expressed concern about consolidation generally, and I believe we are responding by *not* changing the local TV rule, the local radio rule, the local TV/radio rule, the national TV cap, or the national cable cap.

Unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues have been quick to say no to whatever was proposed but never getting to yes or even putting forward their own ideas on the substance of the issues before us.

They wanted public hearings. We agreed. And we provided six.

They asked for independent studies. We agreed.

Only one Commissioner, later in the process, suggested authors for a study. We agreed again, and created another study for those authors to do.

They asked for the studies to be made public. We agreed. They then complained that the studies were posted on the web too soon.

They asked for the studies to be peer reviewed. We agreed. They asked for peer reviews to be made public. We agreed. They then presented us with new individuals they wanted to do additional peer reviews. We again agreed. They then demanded an entirely separate comment cycle on just the peer reviews.

They asked me to complete the localism hearings. We agreed. They then wanted to complete the localism report. We again agreed. They wanted an NPRM on localism. We again agreed. They then wanted more time for the Commission to consider the localism issues and do a final order.

And finally, they demanded I publish my proposed rule. I agreed. They then criticized me for making the proposal public in *The New York Times*. They asked for time for the public to comment on the proposed rule change. I agreed. They then demanded a new NPRM on the proposal with many months of comment.

This is a long way of stating the obvious. For a year and half, I have attempted to respond to the legitimate concerns about conducting an open and transparent process with ample opportunity for public input. At each step along the way, as I was crossing the goal line, the goal posts were moved.

While I have and will continue to seek consensus, I have come to the conclusion that it won't ever be possible to ever reach consensus on the media ownership issue. Nevertheless, I still believe it is important for the Commission and for the American people that we render a decision on this issue. We must respond to the Court remand and to Congress which requires us to review the rules. And we must provide certainty to the media industry which for years has operated in a climate of uncertainty.

In sum, I believe the time has come to act. And I believe today's very modest relaxation of the one rule not relaxed since 1975 is appropriate.

ATTACHMENT 1
FACT SHEET ON MEDIA OWNERSHIP PROCESS

- More than three years ago the 3rd Circuit remanded the Commission's Order.
- Almost 18 months ago, on July 24, 2006 we released a Further Notice Proposed Rulemaking.
 - 176 days of comment for the original Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
 - 76 days of comment for a second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to further detail minority-related ownership issues
 - Commissioned 10 media studies.
 - Almost all of these were done by outside experts in their fields. Every study author recommended by my colleagues was asked to do a study.
 - We put every study, as well as all the underlying data, out for comment. With extensions, the comment cycle was 93 days.
 - We had each study peer reviewed by independent academics.
 - Every peer reviewer suggested by my colleagues was asked to peer review a study. Thus, some studies were subjected to additional peer review.
- Held 6 public hearings around the country at a cost of over \$200,000. Hearings held in:
 - Los Angeles/El Segundo, CA (October 6, 2006)
 - Nashville, TN (December 11, 2006)
 - Harrisburg, PA (February 23, 2007)
 - Tampa-St. Petersburg, Florida (April 30, 2007)
 - Chicago, IL (September 20, 2007)
 - Seattle, Washington (November 9, 2007)
- Held the 2 localism hearings committed to by the previous Chairman. Hearings held in:
 - Portland, Maine (June 28, 2007)
 - Washington, DC (October 31, 2007)
- Reviewed over 167,000 comments
- Listened to and recorded over 1000 oral comments.
- Released the text of the rule I proposed to my colleagues that the Commission adopt, and invited the public to comment on it
- The total length of Commission consideration of the media ownership proceeding has been **512** days.

ATTACHMENT 2
TIMELINE OF MEDIA OWNERSHIP REVIEW PROCESS

- July 2, 2003** Commission releases 2002 Biennial Review Order
- June 24, 2004** The Third Circuit Court of Appeals issues its decision in *Prometheus v. FCC*, affirming some Commission decisions and remanding others for further justification or modification
- July 24, 2006** The Commission releases *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* to call for comment on the rules and to seek arguments and factual data about their impact on competition, localism and diversity.
- September 8, 2006** FCC Announces Public Hearing in Los Angeles on Media Ownership
- September 26, 2006** FCC Announces Details for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Los Angeles, CA
- September 29, 2006** FCC Announces Further Details for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Los Angeles, CA
- October 6, 2006** Public Hearing on Media Ownership, Los Angeles & El Segundo, CA
- October 23, 2006** Comments due in response to July 26, 2006 Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
- November 14, 2006** FCC Announces Public Hearing in Nashville, Tennessee on Media Ownership
- November 22, 2006** FCC Names Economic Studies to Be Conducted As Part of Media Ownership Rules Review
- December 1, 2006** FCC Announces Details for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Nashville, Tennessee
- December 5, 2006** FCC Announces Revised Agenda for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Nashville, Tennessee
- December 11, 2006** FCC Announces Further Revised Agenda for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Nashville, Tennessee

December 11, 2006 Public Hearing on Media Ownership, Nashville, TN

January 16, 2007 Reply Comments due in response to July 26, 2006 Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

February 8, 2007 FCC Announces Public Hearing in Harrisburg, PA on Media Ownership

February 16, 2007 FCC Announces Details for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Harrisburg, PA

February 21, 2007 FCC Announces Further Details for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

February 23, 2007 Public Hearing on Media Ownership, Harrisburg, PA

March 13, 2007 FCC Announces Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Tampa-St. Petersburg, Florida Area

April 13, 2007 FCC Announces Details for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Tampa-St. Petersburg Florida

April 23, 2007 FCC Announces Agenda for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Tampa-St. Petersburg Florida

April 26, 2007 FCC Announces Revised Agenda for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Tampa-St. Petersburg Florida

April 30, 2007 Public Hearing on Media Ownership, Tampa, FL

June 8, 2007 FCC Announces Localism Hearing in Portland, Maine June 28, 2007

June 12, 2007 FCC Announces Details for Localism Hearing in Portland, Maine on June 28

June 25, 2007 FCC Announces Agenda for Public Hearing on Localism in Portland, Maine

June 28, 2007 FCC Holds Hearing on Localism Issues in Portland, Maine

July 19, 2007 FCC Announces Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Chicago, Illinois

July 31, 2007 FCC Releases and Seeks Comment on Research Studies on Media Ownership

August 1, 2007 FCC Releases Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

September 4, 2007 FCC Announces Details for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Chicago, Illinois

September 17, 2007 FCC Announces Agenda for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Chicago, Illinois

September 20, 2007 Public Hearing on Media Ownership, Chicago, IL

September 28, 2007 Media Bureau Extends Filing Deadlines for Comments on Media Ownership Studies

October 1, 2007 Comments due in response to August 1, 2007 Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

October 16, 2007 Reply Comments due in response to August 1, 2007 Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

October 22, 2007 Comments due in response to July 31, 2007 release of media studies

October 24, 2007 FCC to Hold Localism Hearing and Open Commission Meeting, Wednesday, October 31, 2007

October 29, 2007 FCC Announces Panelists for Public Hearing on Localism at FCC Headquarters

October 31, 2007 FCC Holds Public Hearing on Localism in Washington, DC

November 1, 2007 Reply Comments Due in response to July 31, 2007 release of media studies

November 2, 2007 FCC Announces Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Seattle, Washington

November 8, 2007 FCC Announces Agenda and Witnesses for Public Hearing on Media Ownership in Seattle, Washington

November 9, 2007 Public Hearing on Media Ownership, Seattle, WA

November 13, 2007 Chairman Martin Publishes Revision to Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule

- December 4, 2007** Letter sent from Secretary of Commerce, Carlos M. Gutierrez to the Honorable Harry Reid, Senate Majority Leader, expressing opposition to legislation that would delay FCC action on media ownership rules
- December 11, 2007** The Commission waives the sunshine period prohibition contained in section 1.1203 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1203, until 5:30 pm on Friday, December 14, 2007
- December 14, 2007** Sunshine rules go into effect at 5:30pm; Last day to comment on Chairman's proposed rule
- December 18, 2007** FCC Open Meeting

ATTACHMENT 3
COMPARISON OF AT&T/BELLSOUTH
AND MEDIA OWNERSHIP PROCESSES

AT&T/BellSouth Merger	Media Ownership
Proposal put out for public comment by press release, not NPRM	Proposal put out for public comment by press release, not NPRM
Public Comment Period: 10 days	Public Comment Period: 28 days
Total Length of Consideration: 253 days	Total Length of Consideration: 512 days
Number of Commission Studies: 0	Number of Commission Studies: 10
Number of Public Hearings: 0	Number of Public Hearings: 6 media ownership + 2 localism
Length of time between AT&T's filing memorializing agreement with Democratic Commissioners and vote: 24 hours	Length of time between Chairman's published proposal and vote: 35 days. Length of time between end of comment period and vote: 7 days