FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY FOR COMMUNICATIONS IN THE DIGITAL AGE

+ + + + +

COUNCIL MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY,

MARCH 10, 2008

+ + + + +

The Committee convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Federal Communications Commission, $445\ 12^{\rm th}$ Street, S.W., FCC Meeting Room, Washington, D.C., Henry Rivera, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

HENRY RIVERA, Chairman

BARBARA KREISMAN, FCC Designated Federal Official

SALVADOR GUZMAN, WHEW Radio

DAVID HONIG, Minority Media &

Telecommunications Council

RODNEY HOOD, National Credit Union

Administration

CARLTON HOSKINS, National Credit Union Administration

REBECCA KLEIN, Loeffler Tuggey Pauerstein Rosenthal, LLP

ANNE LUCEY, CBS

ANDREW SCWARTZMAN, Media Access Project JAMES WINSTON, National Association of Black Owned Broadcasters

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

OPENING BY BARBARA KREISMAN
INTRODUCTION & AGENDA REVIEW BY HENRY RIVERA
WORKING GROUP INTERIM REPORTS:
ACCESS TO CAPITAL BY RODNEY HOOD4
TASK FORCE ON ELIGIBLE ENTITIES BY DAVID HONIG
OUTREACH BY BECKY KLEIN
ADJOURN

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

1

10:03 a.m.

MS. KREISMAN: Today is largely an informational meeting regarding the status of several projects. And with that, I turn the mic over to Chairman Rivera.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you,
Barbara. And thanks all for coming. We're
very pleased that you're with us this morning.

We've got several people here at the commission. With us we've got Jim Winston from NABOB, Salvador Guzman, Becky Klein, David Honig, Anne Lucey, Andy Schwartzman, Rodney Hood, and his assistant, Carlton.

So welcome to all of you. And again, thanks for coming.

As Barbara said, we're going to do primarily informational stuff this morning. But we've got some very interesting things going on. And I'm sure that you will be interested to know what's going on. Those of you who are participating your own little committee work.

 \downarrow

So, with that, I'm going to start things off by asking Rodney Hood, who's chairing our Access to Capital subcommittee, to give us a report on the status of our conference.

MR. HOOD: Okay, the status of the conference is the following.

Good morning, we have secured Barnard College for the venue for the conference. Scheduled now to take place on July the 30th, there in New York City.

We are also still continuing to work with potential funders. Right now the main thing that I'm hoping to work with you all on, is determining if we are in fact, going to go with a conference versus an en banc.

So those are one of the things that I think we hopefully can decide upon soon. Just so we can merely get our speakers invited and some of the other logistical things. But the important thing that was an outstanding

NEAL R. GROSS

issue from our last meeting was getting the date and all that confirmed.

So, the college president has indeed given her imprimatur to the event. The college is looking forward to making some of the students available. And, other than that, that's it as of right now.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Could you give a little details in terms of what we were thinking about in terms of a reception prior, and all that?

MR. HOOD: Yes -- yes, also ladies and gentlemen, we are also looking at the opportunity of doing a reception the evening before the conference. And that would afford opportunities for the funders and participants to all have a chance to meet and discuss things informally. It would be a networking reception, if you will.

We're hoping to do that with one of the either venture capitalists or with one of the investment banks, that would be

NEAL R. GROSS

participating in the program.

So we're looking to do that in New York. And that again, would be on the evening prior to the conference.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: And I'm thinking about -- assuming we go this route, of holding a Diversity Committee meeting in New York, that would be just prior to this reception that Rodney was just talking about.

So we'd have the Diversity Committee meeting, we'd go to the reception, and then the next morning we would have -- we'd move into the conference.

MALE: And that would be July 29th.

MR. HOOD: Yes, that would be the 29th, yes. And the event as we're looking at now, will begin around nine that morning with a continental breakfast. And then we would begin the sessions. We have given some work or attention, to speakers. But the main thing is just knowing that we would hopefully begin at nine and I think we would be breaking up

around three o'clock.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And then for those who wanted to stick around, they could still maybe meet in informally.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Well, what we've got going on here, as Rodney mentioned, is once we had settled on a conference, then someone raised the notion of having a commission en banc in New York.

Basically to hear from the investment community about how capital ought to be raised. What the problems are with the capital markets, now in particular. The problems that minorities and females have raising capital. And the issue now, whether we're going to go with an en banc, which we thought was a really good idea. whether we're going to go with a conference.

And, we have been trying to get some guidance from the Chairman's Office, in terms of to see what they prefer.

And, we are still seeking that

guidance. So, at some point, we're going to have to make a go/no-go decision because we're running out of time. If we're going to organize the *en banc*.

MR. WINSTON: Chairman, can I ask, if it's not *en banc*, does that mean that we won't have a good number of the commissioners there?

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: No, the commissioners seem to be very excited about this. The notion of the conference was actually Commissioner Tate's idea. We're pretty sure we can count on her at least. But we've talked to the others, and they are interested in coming.

In fact, our tentative agenda for the conference had a commissioners panel. So we're -- we're certainly anticipating that they will come in either event.

MR. WINSTON: Okay, and the difference would be, that if it's an en banc, they will -- they'll listen to all day long's

NEAL R. GROSS

1	as opposed to just being one panel?
2	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, and we'll
3	have testimony scheduled, and it would be
4	it will be a full-blown en banc.
5	MR. WINSTON: Okay.
6	MS. LUCEY: Either way is it an FCC
7	or a Diversity Committee?
8	MS. KREISMAN: It is an FCC event.
9	MS. LUCEY: It is.
10	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Either way.
11	MS. KREISMAN: Either way it would
12	be an FCC event. Understanding that a lot of
13	the planning, is by Mr. Hood, actually.
14	MR. HOOD: With your help, yes.
15	MS. KREISMAN: And in fact
16	(Off record comments.)
17	MS. KREISMAN: the Chairman is
18	in fact giving this consider now, I'm told.
19	And hopefully, if you have a conversation with
20	him, Rodney, you could maybe bring a deal to
21	closure.

MR. HOOD: Oh, yes.

MR. WINSTON: So is it fair to say that the distinction between the a conference and an *en banc* would be the length of time the commissioners are in attendance?

MS. KREISMAN: No, I think if you look at all our other *en banc's*, I mean, basically if it's an FCC *en banc*, I think the presentations are directed to influencing what the commissions policy should be. I think it's a little different.

I think maybe there's some elements that could be combined. But, the *en banc*, basically the commissioners are up here, as are traditional ones. And people are making presentations to them, we can direct what we want them to be.

I mean, the financial community maybe could bring in to their attention, what really are the issues that this commission has to address, in order to get appropriate investment into more diverse entities.

I think -- I think our conference

NEAL R. GROSS

was more of an educational, how to do it approach, versus I look at the *en banc*, maybe incorrectly, as more of a policy. You all can speak to that if I have it wrong.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, and there will the materials differences in terms of actual event. But you're right, if it's an en banc, obviously the commissioners will be there a longer period of time. We don't know how long if it's an en banc. The Chairman will want to take testimony. That's another we don't know.

But if it's a conference, they will be primarily affiliated with the -- with this commissioners panel.

Hopefully, they'll be there longer, but they certainly wouldn't be there as long as -- we couldn't count on them being there as long, as we could if there was an *en banc*.

MR. WINSTON: So, our request then is for an *en banc*, is what we're asking for?

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: No, what we're

NEAL R. GROSS

asking for is what -- what would the Chairman 1 2 like to do. He's -- the commission has incorporated this notion of a conference in 3 the latest diversity order. It's there and it 4 says we're going to put it on. 5 So, they've -- we're under 6 mandate to do that. 7 MS. KREISMAN: It's really at our 8 request. At this Diversity Committees request 9 10 of -- Henry circulated a suggestion by, I

And basically, it's at our request, that the commission consider having a full *en banc* versus a conference.

guess it was a columnist, that the commission

So, it's really us.

hold an en banc hearing on this issue.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes. So we're asking -- so we're asking him what he wants to do. What the commissioners want to do at this point.

MR. HONIG: There's a practical and a policy reason why it might be more desirable

NEAL R. GROSS

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to have an en banc now. The policy reasons, we haven't had an en banc on this subject since December 2000. And before that, the

previous one was July 1984.

It's just a subject that the commissioners haven't had an opportunity to hear testimony on in a long time. And to have their understanding of it refreshed.

The practical question derives from the fact that, on July 21st and 22nd, dates that have been locked in for months, MMTC has its annual conference on almost exactly the same subject as the contemplated conference here.

The only difference being that the pool of capital funds would be somewhat different, in that the larger New York funds would be taking the lead. But, will we address that question? Before, I think we were contemplating that there wouldn't be a conflict if it were being held in say April or May, or September or October as a conference.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

_ _

22

An en banc though, would present no conflict. And I think it's a higher priority.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, we'll work through that. And a smaller task force is working on this. But we're very aware of the conflict.

Becky?

MS. KLEIN: Just wondered if it was your perception that the Commissioner and the Chairmans Office was looking at this an indoor option, or might it be possible to do both of them over a course of time?

MS. KREISMAN: We presented it as Basically, you know, we -- the an and/or. commission basically indicated in the item, order, that it wanted to do and an Basically taking a conference. suggestion And basically when Henry circulated from us. the idea to the committee here, it was basically an and/or.

I think it's a practical matter. I don't see how we can pull them both off at the

1	same time. Just a matter of location in New
2	York. It's not so easy to get a place in New
3	York, as Rodney can tell you.
4	So, I think as a practical matter,
5	right now, I think it's one or the other.
6	There are other years and other days and other
7	time. But now it's presented as an and/or.
8	MS. KLEIN: Yes, I can't imagine
9	doing both at the same time either.
10	MS. KREISMAN: No.
11	MS. KLEIN: I just wondered if it
12	was feasible to do one at the end of July, and
13	then save whichever other for another date?
14	MS. KREISMAN: I think that's a
15	very good suggestion.
16	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: That's a
17	possibility.
18	MS. KREISMAN: Yes.
19	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: We'll have to see
20	how the and the Chairman may decide that's
21	what he wants to do.
22	MR. HOOD: And also, Mr. Chairman,

I would just like for the committee to note that, when we decide whether to go en banc versus conference, as soon as we make that determination, that's going to then change the level and scope of the funding sources that I'll be searching for from the venture capital

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Right.

MR. HOOD: So, that's one of the things that's really pressing, is determine what would be our needs then. Will we still wish to go with the reception the night before, and things of that nature.

Right. Well, and CHAIRMAN RIVERA: that brings back Ι briefly me to what mentioned earlier. We're going to have to make a go/no-go here pretty quick. And I think we're -- as Barbara mentioned, you know, if you have your conversation with Chairman, maybe you can close the deal one way or the other for us.

Meanwhile, we'll continue to press

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

community.

with the staff to ask them for guidance, to get us a decision. But we're going to have to make a decision pretty soon here.

Any other questions on this? I -
MS. LUCEY: And the topic will be access to capital?

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, indeed.

MS. LUCEY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: We -- I just have to thank Rodney for all the work that he's put in on this thing. He's really owned this conference. He's worked very hard to get us a place. He's set to go with the -- trying to help find the funding. All of us will have to be engaged in that process as well.

And David has been working hard on a draft to format for the conference, if we go that route. So, we've had a lot of people working on this.

Becky, as well, has been helping us to try and -- with this conference.

So, I thank all of you for your

NEAL R. GROSS

very hard on work on this. I think it's going to pay big dividends when we get this thing off the ground.

MR. HOOD: I agree.

MS. KREISMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay, David -I've asked David to report on what's going on
with this task force on eligible entities.

Again, this is an item that has been thrown to
us by the commission in the recent diversity
order. And they're expecting a recommendation
from us on this very difficult question.

And I've asked David to chair this task force that's addressing this -- this very difficult issue and challenging issue.

So David, would you please tell us what's going on with that?

MR. HONIG: We were created as a subcommittee of the Diversity Committee a couple months ago, to examine what might be some alternative paradigms for eligible entities, under various FCC rules and

NEAL R. GROSS

policies, including some of those just announced.

It might be less dilute, but nonetheless, constitutionally sustainable than the small business paradigm that figures in the order.

To give you a sense for the urgency of the task, in the order that came up this commission past Tuesday, the presented statistics which we understand actually were developed the night before they voted. for Showing that instance, for radio, minorities comprise 7.78% of all radio only 8.5% radio stations. However, of stations owned by small businesses.

That means as a practical matter, that in the very unlikely event that all radio stations owned by non-small businesses were sold to small businesses, minority ownership would increase all the way up to 8.5%.

And in fact, the direction of transactions is occurring the other direction,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

as the industry consolidates. So, actually, it could be said that this would have a very

dilute, or possibly no effect on diversity.

Certainly therefore, we have to think to think of what are some other paradigms. In the outline there, circulated around today, and for those on the call, I quess I can e-mail it around.

This is version four of the work plan, of the subcommittee. And we also mention the subcommittee members are Andy Schwartzman, Jim Winston, Anne Lucey, Tara Sweeney, Vonya McCann, Susan Fox, Sylvia Strobel, and myself.

We have met once, to just develop a work plan. And are now in the phase of our work, which involves interviewing subject matter experts.

The first subject matter expert that we'll be interviewing on the constitutional questions, 1st, 14th, and 5th Amendment issues, is Matthew Berry, who is

NEAL R. GROSS

general counsel of the commission. That interview is here at the Agency March 19th.

The second interview, we're trying to find a date for, about two or three weeks after that, is with Tom Henderson. Who is a partner at Springer and Lane, and was most recently the Director of Litigation for the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights.

We'll then be interviewing representatives of the state higher education departments in Michigan, California, Washington state, and/or Texas. All of which have had some experience with full file review.

And then we'll be interviewing experts on the administration of policies before the commission -- former commission officials and maybe some current ones, on some of the issues related to implementation.

In the commission's order this past Tuesday, that order, Paragraph 85, sets out 11 specific questions, that the commission wants

NEAL R. GROSS

the public to comment on. The majority of those questions weren't included in our regional outline. That's why you have this

4 draft that now incorporates them.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In a nutshell, what we're going to try to do, is to present a report. Which ideally, would be done in June. I think that may slip a bit going to the greater complexity of the task. That would discuss each of the five potential paradigms.

One being small businesses. One being designated entities understand as we that term to be used in the wireless context. One being new entrants, which happens to be the criteria used for broadcast auctions. being socially and economically disadvantaged businesess, SDBs. And the other being full file review, which is known in the educational context sometimes under the name of comprehensive review.

This full file review is the paradigm that we'll be most focused on. Not

because it's the ideal, but because there is a much more glandular and detailed process that would be needed to develop an SDB model, which is beyond the ability of our community, given the need to refresh the record, that was developed in 2000.

Full file review, in a nutshell, is procedure developed in higher education which individuals under present their credentials based on grades and test scores -sorry, and also show that they have I'm personally overcome disadvantages, which may of may not be disadvantage related to race or discrimination. gender Ιt could be disadvantage of other types.

Where the overcoming of those disadvantages is predictive of their success in a challenging environment.

That seemed, in at least some respects, to be a good model to try and import if it can be imported into our space.

The report would focus then on how

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

this works constitutionally. How it can be administered in a way which, both in theory and in practice would be race neutral. How we would avoid any potential for First Amendment issues to arise.

And then, the questions of administration with any new program. Some of which Commissioner McDowell raised with us when we met with him.

When there is a new program that unavoidable involves some subjectivity, who makes the decisions as to who's qualified. How do you make sure that the decisions are made consistently among applications?

you make that How do sure rendering those decisions, they're done in a fair, that doesn't interject way that's attributes into the decision making process that are unintended. How do you avoid the possibility of fraud or abuse, as sometimes happens in the administration or commission programs that involve conferring of advantage

on one group as opposed to another. However that's defined.

And how you deal with the question of just, the mechanics of certifying a group - a company as compliant, and thus giving them in effect a coin they can use to raise access to capital. Because they'll already have been certified.

So, that's kind of a nutshell of what we hope to achieve.

The writing of this report, we've had some discussions with Skadden Arps about whether they, or a center at the Berkman Center at Harvard University, that they work with, might be in the position to help us take the fruits of the expert witness interviews that we'll develop, and cobble them together into a report.

It'd be great if they could do that and could do it pro bono. If they can't, then it will probably be viable upon us to write the report. That will take more time.

NEAL R. GROSS

Probably won't be done as well. But we could get it done if we had to. It would just take considerably more time.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right.

Thanks David. The object of the -- or the goal of the task force will be to produce, as David said, this report. Which will contain a recommendation.

That recommendation will come to this -- to the Full Committee for a vote and discussion. And any modifications we want of that committee -- of that report, hopefully the report as edited by the Full Committee would then be put into the record and sent to the commission, pursuant to the commissions request for information from the committee.

So, are there any questions about the process and/or what the task force is doing, from anyone?

MALE PARTICIPANT: No.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: No. Okay, well David, thanks for all your work on this. And

NEAL R. GROSS

for all the work that is yet to We leadership appreciate your well in galvanizing the task force and moving moving things forward. With that, Becky, do you have any report for us today on the Outreach Committee? MS. KLEIN: Not really, only that I have reached out to Clear Channel, to discuss

have reached out to Clear Channel, to discuss their conference previously held. And they're going to be able to refer me to a couple of people to help assist in getting names and collecting entities that we may want to include in our list -- in our clearinghouse.

So, I think what is especially relevant is now having a date that we're working towards. Whether conference or en banc, to work towards that as the debut of this clearinghouse brochure.

And so that -- this is --

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right.

MS. KLEIN: This is our trigger I think, to -- to be able to move forward --

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: That's right. MS. KLEIN: -- more actively 2 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Right, wonderful. 3 The New Technologies task -- subcommittee is 4 not on our agenda today. 5 And the news from that subcommittee is that our chairman, Max 6 7 Navarro, has decided that he -- his business just can't, won't 8 demands allow continue in that in 9 the capacity as 10 chairman. So, he is -- however, he is going 11 to stay with us on the Diversity Committee. 12 13 And I'm looking for a new subcommittee chair. And again, I'm looking to the Chairman's 14 15 Office for some guidance on that. And I will -- I should have an answer and a person soon I 16 17 hope. So, stay tuned on that. 18 19 Does anyone have anything else to bring before the committee? 20 Yes, Jim? 21 Yes, I'd like to --22 MR. WINSTON:

_ _

this is Jim Winston for those folks on the phone. I'd like to bring to the committees attention, a new matter of concern to minority broadcasters. For both black and Hispanic broadcasters in particular.

For those of your who are not that familiar with the broadcast industry, there's a company called Arbitron, that measures radio audiences for the radio industry. They have a monopoly in that business.

And, for years, they have used something called a diary. Where they send out a report to a select number of people in a market. Those people fill out each day what they've listened to on the radio that day.

And in recent years, it was thought that electronic -- some sort of electronic measurement would be more reliable. And industry has been asking for that. Advertisers have been asking for that.

And Arbitron has come up with something they call the Personal People Meter.

Which is a device that looks like a pager.

And you wear it on your person all day long.

And the radio stations send out a signal with

their broadcast, that identifies that station.

The Personal People Meter picks up that signal and then reports what you're -- you have exposed to each day. Because it -- part of the problem with the Personal People Meter, is it picks up radio stations whether or not you've turned them on.

So if you're at work, and your boss is listening to a particular radio station, you're identified as listening to that station.

If you're in a store, and it's playing -- and the station's playing as background music, you're identified as a listener to that station.

So conceptually, there's a concern about what exactly the Personal People Meter is measuring. Because it's measuring expose, as opposed engagement, as opposed to what I've

NEAL R. GROSS

1 actually chosen to listen to.

But, the problem that we found with the Personal People Meter, actually goes much deeper than that. Because what's happening is that in the initial -- additional report -- the initial reports found the Personal People Meter, the listening ascribed to African American, Hispanic stations has fallen dramatically.

And the principle reason, although I don't think it's the exclusive reason that, that has happened, is that Arbitron has not been measuring African American, Hispanic audiences at the level that Arbitron says it should.

So, they have done statistical studies that say, we should have this number of people in the study for each reporting period. And they're coming in at numbers well below that.

So, that if their target is 100% in each demographic segment, they started off

measuring blacks and Hispanics at the 30% level.

You know recently, they've been getting up to the 50 and 60%. But there's still a lot where they need to be.

And what we -- the problem appears to be, that Arbitron's not been willing to commit the time and money needed to get a decent sample.

Arbitron and NABOB have been meeting on this issue for about a year. And it's still -- we're still continuing to meet.

Overlaying this process is something called the Media Ratings Council. The Media Ratings Council was created at the request of Congress, by the advertising and broadcast industries some time ago. I think a couple decades ago. Because of concerns about rating inaccuracies at that time.

And Congress said to the industry, we really appreciate you doing a voluntary watchdog organization, so that we don't have

NEAL R. GROSS

to legislate in this area. And as a result of that, the Media Ratings Council was combined - was created, consisting of members from the advertising agency community, national advertisers, and the broadcast industry, both

And the MRC accredits research to avoid the kinds of issues we have here with the Personal People Meter.

radio and television.

The MRCs chiefs always divert deliberations quiet, private. So that you only know if the MRC publicly announces that it's accredited somebody.

And what has happened, is that Arbitron had been pending accreditation in Philadelphia and New York. It has three markets. It has Houston, which was accredited with -- in a joint program with Nielson. There was a time when Arbitron and Nielson were planning to do this -- the Personal People Meter as a joint activity.

That -- that accreditation wasn't

NEAL R. GROSS

received. In Philadelphia and New York,

Nielsen pulled out. They said we'll do a

separate program. Arbitron went along.

As said, Arbitron had been pending accreditation for about a year Philadelphia and for about six months in New York. It was just reported in the trade press last week, that Arbitron submitted a statement in its most recent Securities and Exchange Commission filing, advising the SEC that it had been accreditation by the MRC in both Philadelphia and New York.

That information became public, Arbitron has since confirmed that is the case.

In spite of that and -- missing one little piece. Because of industry concern about the inaccuracy that seem to exist with the Personal People Meter, Arbitron agreed to delay further deployment of the Personal People Meter for nine months. They did that back in December, I guess. So the nine months end like September 1st.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And that was still while PPM was awaiting accreditation results in Philadelphia and New York.

After it was denied accreditation in Philadelphia and New York, we went back to Arbitron and said, well obviously you can't begin deployment again until you get accredited.

Arbitron advised us that they had no intention of delaying the rollout any further. They will again begin deploying the Personal People Meter, in additional markets, starting in September.

So, where we are with Arbitron is, we think that -- and, there's no legal impediment of course, because MRC is a voluntary activity. Getting accreditation is a volunteer activity.

There's no legal impediment to Arbitron moving forward with accreditation. I mean, with deployment, in spite of having no accreditation -- having been denied

NEAL R. GROSS

accreditation.

And our view of course is, there's a distinction between awaiting accreditation, while you rolling out, and actually having been denied accreditation and still moving forward anyway.

And so, we believe this is an issue for consideration. We're not exactly sure what the commissions role might be in this. But, our view is that, PPM has the potential, if not corrected, to do serious damage to minority ownership in the broadcast industry for blacks and Hispanics.

And so, it's an issue that we know the commission needs to be made aware of, as we work through what role the commission might have in trying to address this issue.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, David.

MR. HONIG: In the order that the commission issued last Tuesday on diversity, right in the second paragraph, they start right out quoting Associated Press, and

talking about the widest dissemination of diverse and antagonistic sources. And the importance of minority and women-owned --ownership, to -- to achieve that objective.

More than any other factor that I'm aware of, this problem that Jim has identified, poses the greatest risk of frustrating the commission's diversity objectives.

Just to give you a sense of the math. The commission also in this order, undertook to ban discrimination in advertising — in broadcast advertising. A practice which MMTC estimated cost black and Spanish radio about \$200 million a year.

If you look at the initial PPM results, and you extrapolate. I was just curious and did the math. The impact of this technology, if it were rolled out fully on black and Spanish radio, is about two-and-a-half times the impact of all of the advertiser discrimination put together. About half-a-

million -- half-a-billion-dollars a year.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That is an extraordinary burden on the ability to raise capital to deploy assets, and to serve the public.

And, I therefore think it squarely falls within our jurisdiction. Either in the access to capital sphere, or the new technology sphere, or both.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you.

Anybody else?

I appreciate you bringing that to our attention, Jim. And David, I appreciate your remarks.

I think that maybe we ought to talk offline, maybe the three of us, to see if there's some hook here for the some Diversity Committee, in some way to forward specifically and assign this to some -- one of our existing subcommittees, or create a task force to try to deal with it. I agree with you. It seems to be a serious problem for the folks that we're supposed to

be looking out for.

So, we ought to take this in hand and try to do something about it.

MR. WINSTON: And just to try to put it in perspective, for folks who may not be that involved in the broadcast industry. The way this will manifest itself in a day-to-day world, is if a broadcast station has an advertiser, let's say a car company, that advertises on its radio station.

The effects are going to have one of two results. One possibility is that they go back into the advertiser, which is a regular advertiser on a station, and say it's time to renew your contract. Let's do another whatever, 26-week, 30, 52-week contract.

And the advertisers going to say, well, I see your ratings have fallen from number two to 12 in the market. We can certainly talk about renewing a contract, but not at the rate you were talking about before. At these numbers, we're talking about giving

1 you half the advertising rate that we gave you 2 before. So, you know, if you're a radio 3 4 station, and you see your revenues drop by that kind of margin, you know, 5 nobody's offering at those kinds of margins anymore. 6 7 So, you're immediately in the rid. other possibility The is the 8 says, well it's nice, 9 advertiser but you 10 dropped from two to 12. You know, we only advertise on the top five stations in the 11 period. 12 market, You're offer's bye 13 completely. So, you know, these -- these are 14 15 the kinds of real world impacts that we're talking about for -- for radio stations. 16 So theoretical, 17 it's not it's actually real. And a very serious threat. 18 19 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Right. I'm just thinking 20 MS. KREISMAN:

NEAL R. GROSS

by

out loud. I wonder if maybe, you could draft

for

our

resolution

21

22

committee.

failure 1 Basically supporting the to 2 accreditation. Indicating in a very public the negative impact way, minority 3 on And at least make sure that 4 broadcasters. there's good publicity. 5 I know many of us have been working 6 And that we make it -- information 7 on it. available to the commission. And then I could 8 forward the e-mail or the resolution, if it's 9 10 adopted to the commissioners offices. would start getting some good publicity on 11 this issue. 12 MR. WINSTON: Fine, thank you. 13 Something like that MS. KREISMAN: 14

15 | --

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

(Simultaneous speakers.)

MR. WINSTON: I think -- at some point in time, we do need to bring it to the commissioner in a -- in some sort of action item. But I think right now, resolutions are a good way to start.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Great. Good

idea. All right, anybody else have anything to bring before the committee?

Well, then I think we -- we can go ahead and adjourn. You see can see there's a lot of work going on. A lot of substantive stuff that's going to be made public here, and we're going to be able to take action on in the very near future.

And I thank everyone for all of their hard work. And we'll see you at the next meeting.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was concluded at 10:40 a.m)