UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY FOR COMMUNICATIONS IN THE DIGITAL AGE

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

SEPTEMBER 17, 2013

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met in the Commissioners Meeting Room, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C., at 1:00 p.m., Henry Rivera, Chairman, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

HENRY RIVERA, (Chair), Emma Bowen Foundation for Minority Interests in Media

BARBARA KREISMAN, (Designated Federal Officer)
Federal Communications Commission

CAROLYN FLEMING WILLIAMS, (Deputy Federal Officer), Federal Communications
Commission

NICOLE McGINNIS, (Deputy Federal Officer), Federal Communications Commission

KARLA BALLARD, Broadband Opportunities Coalition*

MARIA BRENNAN, Women in Cable Telecommunications*

ERIC BROYLES, Expert Connect

BRIGETTE DANIEL, Wilco Electronic Systems, Inc.

ERIN DOZIER, National Association of Broadcasters

ANITA STEPHENS GRAHAM, Opportunity Capital Partners*

JESSICA GONZALES, The National Hispanic Media Coalition*

CHANELLE HARDY, National Urban League CHARLES HARRELL, The IT Architect* JO ANN HELLER, for Antonio Guitano, CBS DAVID HONIG, Minority Media Telecommunications

Council

RON JOHNSON, Solutions4Change

FAYE KUO, Communication Services for the Deaf*

JASON LAGRIA, Asian American Justice Center

NICOL TURNER-LEE, Minority Media

Telecommunications Council

STEVE ROBERTS, The Roberts Companies

ANDREW JAY SCHWARTZMAN, Free Press
DIANE SUTTER, Shooting Star Broadcasting*
SYLVIA STROBEL, Alliance for Women in Media
LORIS ANN TAYLOR, Native Public Media*
JOSEPH TORRES, Free Press
WALTER ULLOA, Entravision*
MARK WALLACE, Cipher Communications

JIM WINSTON, National Association of Black Owned Broadcasters ALSO PRESENT:

BOB BUTLER, President, National Association of
Black Journalists

RUTHANNE M. DEUTSCH, Akin Gump

JEFFERI LEE, WHUT-TV

THOMAS REED, FCC

EDWARD SMITH, FCC

*Participated by teleconference

	Page 4
TABLE OF CONTENTS	
Opening, BARBARA KREISMAN, FCC	5
Introduction and Agenda Overview,	7
HENRY RIVERA, Diversity Advisory	
Committee	
Chairwoman Remarks, MIGNON CLYBURN,	13
FCC Chairwoman	
Office of Communications Business	18
Opportunities, THOMAS REED, Chief	
Incentive Auction, EDWARD SMITH,	22
Incentive Auction Task Force	
PRESENTATION	
Follow-Up Presentation	56
WORKING GROUP PROPOSALS	
Supplier Diversity, RONALD JOHNSON,	69
Chairman	
Market Entry Barriers, DIANE BUTLER,	n/a
Chairman	
Unlicensed Devices, NICOL TURNER-LEE,	93
Chairman	
EEO Enforcement, DAVID HONIG,	112
Chairman	
New Business and Adjournment,	162
HENRY RIVERA	

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

2:02 p.m.

MS. KREISMAN: Welcome to the fall meeting of the Diversity Advisory Committee.

We have a number of people on the phone, and we have a number of people in attendance.

Thank you very much, I hear it's a nice fall day out there.

Today, our format will be more of a discussion about the areas where we believe our membership has the expertise to provide best practices information from the Commission to assist it in achieving its public interest goals.

Our focus is to get away from the laundry list of recommendations and issues that we want the Commission to address, because there are many ways that companies, the companies you represent, can ask the Commission to address a particular issue. We call them Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, among other vehicles.

But rather, we'd like to have a discussion today about the ways that we can provide support to the Commission, and to the public, to achieve a diverse community and many aspects of communications industries.

So today, we'd like to consider all presentations, where we can all provide input as to whether we think we here have the expertise to take the issue up, and recommend the project to the Chair.

The idea is, looking at the companies that we represent, whether we, and in our companies, can amass information and expertise that the Commission doesn't ordinarily have, and provide it with respect to a particular project.

And so, I didn't distribute paper on this one, because I'd like the chairs of the committees to consider taking a look at the projects that they had on their pieces of paper, and thinking about which is the one that looking at the paper here, and the

companies that are represented, that we have the information that if we put it together collectively we could provide the Commission with information that would help understand best practices in a particular area.

advisory committees that really worked in a really effective way, that's what they've done. They haven't said, here Commission, you look at this issue, but instead they said, here's an issue that we think that we have knowledge, and we have experience with, and if we get together collectively we think we can provide you with a basis upon which to arrive at best practices, recognized best practices, in that area. And, that's the new approach that I think we'd like our Committee to try to take.

And, I guess so that's a little bit of a difference, and with that I guess I'll turn it over to Henry here.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Well, welcome

all. Thank you for taking your time out of your busy schedules to be with us today.

has just suggested, we are going to do something a little different than this Commission has ever done. And, that's because Chair Clyburn did want us to give some thought to some ideas that we could put before her, and say to her, essentially, here, these are some things that we think, as Barbara pointed out, we can help you with, and that we'd like you to ask us to work on.

So, that's where we are coming from. That's what we will be discussing later today.

I want to thank all the subcommittees, and, particularly, the subcommittee chairs for their leadership and jumping on this as quickly as they did, so as to set the stage for those conversations.

I want to also thank Barbara for all her work in getting us ready for this

	Page 9
1	meeting, and, of course, Tom Reed from our CBO
2	for all of his help. So, thanks very much.
3	Do we want to take the role on the
4	phone?
5	MS. KREISMAN: That might make good
6	sense.
7	So, why don't I go to the phone
8	now, phone people, why don't you state your
9	names.
10	MR. ULLOA: Walter Ulloa.
11	MS. KREISMAN: I couldn't hear you.
12	Bad start.
13	MR. ULLOA: Walter Ulloa.
14	MS. KREISMAN: Thank you very much.
15	MS. GONZALES: Jessica Gonzales.
16	MS. KREISMAN: Try that one again.
17	MS. GONZALES: Jessica Gonzales,
18	from National Hispanic Media Coalition.
19	MS. KREISMAN: Thank you.
20	MS. TAYLOR: Loris Taylor from
21	Native Public Media.
22	MR. HARRELL: Charles Harrell, II,

	Page 11
1	Erin, do you want to start, and
2	we'll come around this way, follow with David
3	and so forth.
4	MS. DOZIER: Erin Dozier, with the
5	National Association of Broadcasters.
6	MR. HONIG: David Honig, with the
7	Minority Media and Telecommunications Council.
8	MS. TURNER-LEE: Nicol Turner-Lee,
9	now with the Minority Media and
10	Telecommunications Council.
11	MR. JOHNSON: Ronald Johnson,
12	Solutions for Change.
13	MS. KREISMAN: Barbara Kreisman,
14	DFO.
15	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Henry Rivera.
16	MR. SMITH: Edward Smith, Incentive
17	Auction Task Force.
18	MS. DEUTSCH: Ruthanne Deutsch,
19	Akin Gump.
20	MR. REED: Tom Reed, OCBO.
21	MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Carol
22	Fleming-Williams, OCBO.

	Page 13
1	MR. BROYLES: Eric Broyles, Expert
2	Connect.
3	MR. BUTLER: Bob Butler, President,
4	National Association of Black Journalists.
5	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Very good. Thank
6	you all for being here.
7	We will hear from Chairman Clyburn
8	at some point during our meeting.
9	MS. KREISMAN: She's got a video.
10	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: She's a video,
11	that's what I meant.
12	MS. KREISMAN: Yes.
13	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: She's already
14	recorded it.
15	MS. KREISMAN: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay. So, we can
17	play it now.
18	MS. KREISMAN: It's all set.
19	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right, well,
20	let's roll the Chairwoman.
21	Thank you.
22	CHAIRWOMAN CLYBURN: (Through

1 video)

2 Good afternoon, everyone.

First, let me thank Chairman Henry Rivera for his dedication of leadership,

Barbara Kreisman, for working so diligently to organize this meeting, and Designated Federal Officers Carolyn Williams and Nicole McGinnis, for their efforts and support of the Committee's endeavors.

Regretfully, I am unable to join you in person, but I couldn't let this moment pass without again extending my sincere thanks to each member of this Committee for all the hard work you do on behalf of the Agency and the American people.

As you know, the mission of this

Committee is to strengthen the FCC's diversity

agenda, and examine regulatory policies to

enhance opportunities for minorities, women,

and small business in communication.

I am excited that we have taken up the task of delivering innovative ideas on how

1 to accomplish this important goal.

I would also like to recognize the subcommittee chairs, Ron Johnson, Dianne
Sutter, Dr. Nicol Turner-Lee, and David Honig, who have been hard at work with their groups on suggested avenues of research or possible initiatives that might further our objectives.

The initiatives you have identified for today's agenda are all important, but one I would like to highlight is a licensed devices and services. It's an area that I think has the potential for many small business opportunities, since the spectrum is unlicensed there's less capital needed to develop business models.

Over the past two decades, the Commission has adopted rules to promote communication services and devices over unlicensed spectrums, which as you know is largely used for devices like monitors and garage door openers. Now, due to the development of WiFi services, it is an

integral part of how nation-wide and regional commercial mobile wireless companies are providing service to consumers.

unlicensed spectrum that I hope will yield considerable benefits. The FCC adopted final rules in 2010, and we are already seeing a number of companies creating devices that can provide services to businesses and across college campuses. More small businesses need to understand and take advantage of the opportunities that unlicensed spectrum has to offer.

I look forward to hearing your ideas about cultivating this area, as we stand ready to work alongside you to develop these concepts.

Before I leave you, I must acknowledge that the FCC has taken another step forward in its effort to understand have media outlets serve our community.

I also know Tom Reed is here

today, to talk to you about the study

commissioned in 2012, to examine the current

body of literature of the critical information

needs of the American public. He will provide

you with an update on this research and answer

your questions.

We are now poised to field test
the model, and will run a pilot in a single
market. The study will look at media
ecologies, the types of critical information
made available in a single ecology, as well as
how individuals obtain information within that
ecology.

Final policy cannot be made in a vacuum. With your help, encouragement, and professional muscle, I know we can continue to do good work.

Have a great and productive afternoon, and I look forward to our continued collaboration.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Tom and Barbara,

I hope you will carry back to the Chair our

gratitude for her taking time to make that
make those remarks to us.

MS. KREISMAN: The only reason she's not here is she's away on travel.

5 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Right, no, I know 6 that.

So anyway, tell her thanks, and we will certainly take her words of encouragement to heart.

So, Tom, you are up.

MR. REED: Thank you, Henry.

Good afternoon, everybody, and as Chairman Clyburn mentioned I'm going to talk to you a little bit about where we are with the Critical Information Needs Research Project. And, as she said, I'm very happy to report that we are at the next stage.

I think as many of you know, and maybe I'll just go back and do a brief overview, in 2012 we commissioned a study by USC Annenberg, School of Journalism. They pulled together a group of scholars to do an

inventory of all of the scholarships that have been on critical information needs and studies of various media ecologies, and how they impact diverse communities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That study was released in June of 2012, and one of its recommendations was that we do a more detailed and in-depth study of markets that then was pulled together in September of 2012. We gathered another group of experts, social scientists, political scientists, and a media specialist, to answer questions about what kind of research design would we pull together in order to study particular markets, digging into markets, answering questions like what kind of information was being provided in a particular market. How do individuals and diverse minority groups extract information, important information, from those various media ecologies.

And so, the research design was completed. We, actually, commissioned a

company, Social Solutions International, that completed, with the consultation of that research group, a research design model.

The model was released and made public in April. We've gotten comments back on that model and incorporated it, but now we've gone back to SSI, and as the Chairman mentioned, we now have the go ahead to test that research design model. So, we are excited about that.

We are in the process now of working with SSI to select a market, one that we think is going to be as diverse as possible, that's going to be able to kick out the kind of information that we are going to need so that we can go on and make sound policy.

But again, this is a test pilot.

I think this process is probably going to
take, I think we've been told, about eight to
ten months to select a market, and to pull all
the research design in that market, to

determine where the bugs are, what questions we need answered, and to make sure that we are getting the data back that we need.

The last, our hope is that we can take this tool and deploy it in a number of markets, so that we can get a broad swap of data that the Agency can, actually, act on.

So, this was an important next step, and we all have Chairman Clyburn to thank for making sure that we can martial the resources to get it done. It's taken time. It's been incremental, but we'll get this stuff done, and then the stage will be set to more expansive study.

So, I just - if you have any questions I wanted to cede most of my time, Edward Smith, Smitty, is here to talk to you about incentive auctions. I know that's high on everybody's list.

But, certainly, if you have any questions about where we are with critical information needs I'm here to answer them.

1 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you, Tom.

2 Any questions for Tom?

Seeing none, Smitty, you've got

4 the floor. Welcome, we are glad you are here.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Henry, happy to be here. Thank you.

So, this presentation can take as long as an hour, so I promise I will keep it very short, and will give you a high overview, ten to 15 minutes. But, of course, you know, if you have any questions feel free to ask after the presentation, and, certainly, we are open to ex partes for anybody who is interested. So, talk to us later about it, or just talk to me after the meeting, I'll be happy to answer any questions you have.

So, if they could turn on the okay, there we are. All right, so, I guess it
would be good to start by giving a quick
definition of what the incentive auctions are.
They are a voluntary, and that's key, marketbased needs of re-purposing the spectrum by

encouraging licensees, in this instance we are talking about broadcast television licensing, full-power Class A stations, to voluntarily relinquish some of their spectrum usage rights in exchange for the share of proceeds from another auction of new re-purposed licenses to mobile broadband providers for flexible use.

So, the really key and important thing here that we are talking about is that this is a voluntary process. Now, this is voluntary for participants such as the broadcasters, but not so much for the FCC. So, the auction will be happening, and we are targeting 2014. So, you know, we are in the process right now of our rulemaking, and moving right along. We've had a lot of support. It's something that crosses multiple bureaus, so it's a full Agency effort.

So, to get to why we are doing this, aside from the fact that Congress directed us to do, I'll talk a little bit about our four key objectives.

The first is to relieve the spectrum crunch, and to give you an idea of what I mean by spectrum crunch, it's, basically, summed up by saying, more users, using more devices that themselves use more spectrum.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

To give you a sense of that in the overall view, Cisco right now projects that by year 2016 U.S. consumers will be consuming 1,700 pedabytes of data per month. And so, a pedabyte is equal to 1 million gigabytes, which is a tremendous amount of data. To give you an idea that might be a little bit more tangible, your average flip phone user, non-Smart Phone user, you know, a few of you probably still have those, you would use about 4 megabytes of data per month. Your average Smart Phone user, something that is probably more common in the room, your iPhones or your Android devices, those users use on average about 150 megabytes of data per month. And, for your tablet users, you are talking about

517 megabytes of data per month on average.

So, you can see the dramatic step up that has resulted in part in the increased data consumption that we are talking about when we say spectrum crunch.

So, that is one of our prime objectives in conducting the auction, is to free up spectrum in pursuit of reaching the President's goal of 500 megahertz of new spectrum for mobile broadband use by 2020.

Second objective is to provide for a healthy broadcast initiative. We expect that coming out of the auction there will continue to be a vibrant and healthy broadcast initiative. They can expect that the auction will be something that a lot of broadcasters will be interested in, but not all. And, it is structured in such a way to provide a range of options for broadcasters who are interested in participating, and while still preserving the service of broadcasters who are not.

What I mean by a range of options

is, the statute lays out three main ways for a broadcaster to participate. First, the broadcaster can opt to relinquish it's license and go off the air, cease operation, and receive the money from the forward auction, receive compensation for their six megahertz of spectrum.

Two, a licensee can opt to channel share, that is, technically, it's very similar to multi-casting, but partnering with another broadcaster to share the 19.4 megabytes down stream that that broadcaster provides on a 6 megahertz channel. And, in many cases they could arrange to share dynamically, depending on the needs of the individual broadcasters at the time.

Or, to bid to move from UHF, ceding their 6 megahertz spectrum, and receiving a 6 megahertz channel in VHF, which depending on the broadcaster in question, and the population they are trying to reach, and how they reach that population, may be an

1 attractive option for them.

And so, as you can see, this is not a zero sum equation. This is a situation in which there are options for broadcasters to participate and continue broadcasting, or continue distributing their content by alternative means, using the compensation they receive in the auction.

Also, it's critical always to fulfill statutory fiscal objectives. So, that's, basically, you know, meeting the requirements that Congress set on us, with respect to how much money is supposed to come out of the auction and how it's supposed to be used.

So, forward auction proceeds must exceed reverse auction payment. So, what that means is that the auction of the wireless mobile broadband licenses, the proceeds from that auction, must be enough to pay broadcasters for the cost of their licenses in the reverse auction. We have to cover

reimbursement for moving broadcasters, so unlike the DCB transition Congress allocated \$1.75 billion, or up to \$1.75 billion, for the cost of paying the reimbursement costs of channel reassignments. So, when a station moves from one channel to another, the cost of that, the reasonable cost of that, would be compensated for. And also, the cost for MPVDs to continue carrying their signals.

And also, administrative costs of the FCC for conducting the auction. And, above and beyond that, for anything beyond those closing conditions, we also are to help fund other priorities, such as First Net, deficit reduction, and e-911.

And then finally, promoting innovation in a vibrant mobile market, and what that means is, that goes towards what the Chairwoman just talked about, which is, you know, making sure that there is a spectrum allocated to unlicensed purposes, because of the important of un-license for a catalyst for

the mobile broadband environment. And, this is something that all of the Commissioners have expressed strong support for, and also, you know, something that, you know, that we received significant comment on, and support from license providers as well.

So, key design goals. I'll move through this quickly, but simplicity, efficiency and transparency. Simplicity, we recognize that the key to the auction being a success is that it attract the interest and participation of broadcasters. And so, we want to make it as simple as possible for broadcasters to participate in the auction.

This does not, unfortunately, mean simplicity for the FCC. It is a very, very complicated process that we are engaged in, but the complexity that we have to deal with is aimed at making sure that it is less complex for the broadcasters better interested in participating.

Efficiency, again, we want optimal

outcomes, and we also want the auction to be conducted in as quick a manner as possible, while doing it right. One of our sort of mantras is get it done quickly, but get it done right. And so, efficiency is key for us.

And transparency. Again, we believe that in order to make sure stakeholders, particularly, broadcasters, are engaged in this, and willing to participate, that it's as transparent a process as possible, which is why we are very active in our outreach and are constantly trying to, you know, make sure that people have all their questions answered, and understand how this auction works.

You know, we have a website, fcc.gov/learn, where you can find a lot of interesting resources that can help you understand more and more about the auction, and we are constantly doing workshops, and presentations, and going out to conferences when we can afford to do so.

So, this graphic is a very, very basic illustration of what I've just been talking about, the reverse and forward auction, and how they are interrelated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

As you can see, in box 1, broadcasters, we have, you know, these are the people who have the goods. All right. Broadcasters who have spectrum that we are hoping will participate in the auction. work through a reverse auction process, box 2 and 3, and in Appendix C of Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, we proposed a particular - we call it straw man, but a proposed auction design that is a descending clock auction. type of dynamic auction, where price begins high and will continue to drop, and as the price drops in the reverse auction broadcasters, depending on how they value their stations, will either elect to continue participating in the auction, or elect to drop out, at which point they will receive a channel in their current band, and receive

protections as required by the statute,

protections of their populations served and

service areas.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And then we see on the other side, so the reverse auction, basically, gives you your supply curve. The other side we have the mobile broadband providers, and the forward auction. And so, mobile broadband providers are buying re-purposed and re-packaged licenses for mobile broadband. We proposed in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that this be done on an EA basis, but, you know, all of this is still open and no decisions, obviously, have been made. So, that is all up to the Commission. But, this is a forward auction, that is similar to forward auctions we've done in the past, and the Commission has had experience with forward auctions since 1993. But, it's different, because unlike any other forward auction the Commission is in the process of auction - well, will be in the process of attempting to auction a spectrum

1 that it does not itself have.

interrelationship between the reverse and the forward auction. And, as you can see down there in No. 6, it's the integration of the two, trying to make sure that the forward and reverse auctions operate in sync, and also sort of 6 represents what will be our closing condition, making sure that, you know, we have established a condition that will allow us to recover the right balance of spectrum, as relates to the amount of revenues that come out of the auction. So, this is also a very important decision for the Commission to make.

So, there is a close

And 7, again, goes back to the point that I will be talking about more today, and that the Chairwoman identified as being a top priority for the Commission, but, you know, making sure that there is adequate opportunity for unlikely spectrum, both as TV white space devices and other unlicensed devices, you know, and guard bands and duplex

gaps for the band plan.

So, this is our time line. So, we are past the NPRM stage. We put that out back in late September. September 28th was when it was adopted and released October 2nd. We went through a period of stakeholder input, received well over 400 comments. We have done - the Commission as a whole has done over 200 ex parte meetings. We've had, you know, countless meetings on this.

We are working towards the report and order, and then once we put the report and order out we will be moving through preauction stages with additional notices and, perhaps, additional orders, working towards the auction itself in 2014. And then, post auction will have a transition period that will be a period during which broadcasters are moving off of their channels to new channels if they were to be repacked, or off air if they've opted to go off air, and mobile broadband providers are engaged in their

1 build-out processes.

So, that is, hopefully, my short enough version, and if - I don't know if we have time for questions.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, that we do.

Anyone have any questions for

Smitty?

MS. DANIEL: Thank you, Edward "Smitty" Smith for the presentation. This is probably the first time we've had it explained, so this is very good to see.

I think this is going to be a very interesting time for our country to kind of have this opportunity. So, I wasn't sure if the Commission is already looking at diversity goals, minority goals, wondering if there's any type of incentive to have companies partner.

I don't think you want to see what has happened in the past happen in the future, particularly, talking about license spectrum.

So, I didn't know if that has been planned or

1 if that's in the works right now.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SMITH: So, yes. The Commission, in our NPRM we asked a lot of questions about how could we best promote diversity, whether we are talking about on the reverse auction side, in trying to maintain opportunities for broadcasters, you know, to continue, you know, sort of broadcasting and distributing their content, or on the forward auction side with respect to bidding credits, designated entity status, or, you know, other types of auction design mechanisms that could help make sure that there are opportunities for, you know, people beyond, you know, purely major players.

So, we are definitely looking into that, and we are definitely looking at those questions.

One question that I have gotten before, with respect to the reverse auction in particular, is the concern about the possibility that given, you know, we believe

this is a very attractive economic opportunity for broadcasters, given the attractiveness of the opportunity, does it create the possibility that we'll see broadcasters going off of the air that serve minority communities, especially, with respect to language communities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And, you know, in response to that, you know, our thinking has often been, you know, (A) as I said, this is not a zero sum equation, and so there are opportunities for broadcasters to participate and receive substantial revenues from the auction, while still continuing to broadcast or to distribute their content through other means. You know, we are constantly sensitive to trying to make sure that since we do believe it's a good economic opportunity, we are not foreclosing opportunities from anyone in the interest of trying to preserve a particular sort of services in areas.

But, we are always looking into

1 that.

And, on the forward auction side,
you know, both with respect to the
opportunities for innovation and for small
business - for entrepreneurship and small
business owners with respect to unlicensed, we
are definitely considering things with respect
to bidding credits and deeds.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Good question, Brigitte, thank you.

Nicol.

MS. TURNER-LEE: Hey, Smitty.

MR. SMITH: How you doing?

MS. TURNER-LEE: Good. So, I want to follow up on Brigitte's comment, and this, actually, going to be part of the presentation on the unlicensed spectrum side.

We had talked a little bit about having some of the commercial spectrum allocated for public use. But, looking at your equation, it looks like all of the spectrum will be sort of auctioned off for

commercial use, or for some kind of resale, you know, rightfully so for the revenues.

However, in our group we did talk about, you know, will there be some partitioning of some of that spectrum that is a little bit more steady and reliable than white space for schools, or libraries, or other types of community use benefits.

MR. SMITH: So, with respect to more stable - first of all, we will look at any options that are presented to us. And so, to the extent - and I'm very familiar with the record, because I've read a lot of comments, but to the extent that you feel that there are comments with respect to that, that you haven't gotten in, please do get them in.

MS. TURNER-LEE: Yes.

MR. SMITH: So, first.

Second, with regard to stability, access that is more consistent than TV white spaces, you know, that is definitely something that we are sensitive to, which is why we

Page 40

proposed in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and are considering now, making sure that we have unlicensed use in the guard bands, and unlicensed use in the duplex gap.

that.

So, you know, this is clearly something that we think is very important, especially, with respect to guard bands and the duplex gap, looking at providing enough uniform spectrum for unlicensed nation-wide, as opposed to just on a, you know, area-by-area piecemeal basis, as you might find with white spaces.

And also, you know, making sure that we have sufficient amounts of spectrum allocated to unlicensed, you know, through things like guard bands and operations in the duplex gap, to create enough of a market incentive for, you know, the manufacturers to, actually, make the devices necessary to operate on that spectrum.

So, yes, we are thinking about

	Page 41
1	MS. TURNER-LEE: Okay, thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, please,
3	Jefferi.
4	MR. LEE: I don't know you, Smitty,
5	but hi, Smitty. That seems to be the way to
6	get started here.
7	On the side where you have a non-
8	commercial license, and channel sharing comes
9	into play, an education channel or license can
10	share with a commercial license, as I
11	understand it. That's the proposal, so that
12	the limitations that education channels have,
13	licensees have, that limit them in some
14	aspects to using part of their spectrum for
15	commercial, will be abated?
16	MS. KREISMAN: No, not really,
17	because the way sharing works - do you mind if
18	I get that?
19	MR. SMITH: No, go ahead.
20	MS. KREISMAN: The way sharing
21	works is that, basically, you are sharing by
22	agreement the spectrum, but you are individual

licensees, with all the rules and obligations of a licensee.

So, with respect to the noncommercial station, it would be held to the same rules as always, and the commercial to their own set of rules.

But, even by agreement you are sharing spectrum, you -

MR. LEE: So, there would be two separate licenses given.

MS. KREISMAN: - right, that's exactly right.

MR. LEE: So, there are two separate licenses.

So that, when the expansion of the use of the spectrum is given through technology advancement, and what you can actually do with your part of the spectrum that you end up with, the commercial licensee that gets half a spectrum today, but through technology advances may end up with the same net effective value of a full spectrum.

1 MS. KREISMAN: Correct. Also,

there's one assumption you had in there, which is not, necessarily, an assumption, and that's

4 by agreement, "...doesn't have to be split

5 evenly." So, I just wanted to point that out.

And again, to protect us here, these are all proposals, and there will be final decision on this, of course, that will come out in the rules.

MR. LEE: Is there any proposal to have a test period, where if you decide to go with a partner in a sharing provision, and you do it, and then you just find out this isn't working.

MS. KREISMAN: Well, no, there's not, but - but, we are really looking for a pilot. So, if you have any candidates now, we would be delighted to give you authority to do that on a test basis. And, we've got a deal, we'll get you a deal that your just spectrum that you normally would be on will just sit there, you have an STA to operate an alternate

me has some other - he may on Tuesdays and

much. But, this other partner that's come to

21

22

1 Thursdays may want this much of the spectrum.

MR. SMITH: You are speaking to the long version of the presentation, but yes, indeed. We are talking about dynamic spectrum sharing.

MR. LEE: Dynamic spectrum sharing.

MR. SMITH: Based upon, you know, the particular needs of the broadcasters.

And so, if you've got a guy who is using - who is broadcasting in HD, and he's got basketball, and football, and things like this, you know, where you are going to need a larger percentage of that 19.4 megabyte per second downstream, then, yes, you can have - you know, you can shift and you work that out with your sharing partner, your channel sharing partner.

But, as Barbara said, you know, we are very much looking for that.

MS. KREISMAN: There will not be a testing period once the report and order comes out, but now there's a great opportunity for

Page 46 1 you to see whether it works with no obligation to return spectrum, with no obligation to keep 2 3 it going. It's really a great - and we would 4 ask that you let us use you as a poster child, 5 so everyone can see if it works or doesn't work. So, we are really hopeful that it will 6 7 work. 8 MR. SMITH: As long as you can get 9 a divorce without - I mean, a no fault 10 divorce, I think we might be -11 MS. KREISMAN: Right now you can. 12 MR. SMITH: - you can, okay. 13 MS. KREISMAN: Later you can get a 14 divorce, too, but you better do the pre-nup 15 real carefully. 16 MR. LEE: The pre-nup real 17 carefully. I got my man right here. We are 18 working on our pre-nup already, as far as 19 finding a perspective date. 20 Okay, thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you, 22 Jefferi.

Anyone else with questions? Yes? MR. LEE: Jason, from Asian 3 Advancing Justice. As the staff knows, there 4 aren't that many minority-owned broadcasters, and there is that worry that a lot of them are going to sell their stations during this 6

1

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

option.

And, I know, for example, in the Asian-American community a lot of them have already sold their stations to prospectors, for example.

So, I'm just wondering if you could talk about what kind of outreach and education the Commission has done to broadcasters, minorities in specific, about educating about the options, like sharing, for example, so they do stay on the air, versus just selling out. Selling their station, not selling out, sorry.

MR. SMITH: Well, so as I said, you know, we have been sort of doing as much outreach as we can, given our sort of funding

restrictions right now. Obviously, you know, things are tightened in Washington right now.

But, you know, we were out at the NAB show.

We've gone out to a number of conferences. We do a lot of webinars and we think that webinars are a good way to get people information without having to, actually, go out and see somebody in person, and pay for the plane ticket and the hotel costs. So, you know, we've done online presentations and online webinars.

Our media chief, Bill Lake, and Rebecca Hanson, have been very active in our outreach so far.

We accept ex parte requests from anyone who submits them. So, we have - we are batting 1,000, and if anybody wants to come in to talk to us about it, we'll certainly, you know, meet you right here on home turf.

But, you know, we can always be doing more, and we are trying to, you know, do more outreach to make sure that people are

fully informed, and that's definitely one of our big priorities.

So, you know, if you have any folks who are interested in working with us, or coming to talk to us, or even if you were interested in working with us to do a presentation, you know, whether it's online or a teleconference, we'd be more than happy to.

But, yes.

MS. KREISMAN: We have a number of companies that have done also their own webinars, based upon the information of PBS.
We've had several of them.

So, if there are any organizations represented here that want us to participate with you, we are happy to do that. But, NAB has done some. PBS has done a lot of them.

So, the word is getting out, but we can always look to more education.

And, there is also a consumer education piece that will be reflected in our rules also, as we did during the DTB

1 transition.

2 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, Jim.

MR. WINSTON: Yes, I just wanted to say that Bill Lake and Gary Epstein are both planning to participate on a panel at the NABOC conference October 2nd through 4th here in town.

So, yes, they were very eager to help us try to get the word out as well.

A question, low-powered

television, what is the Commission

contemplating in terms of trying to preserve

some of the existing low-power television,

because I know they are not officially

protected.

MR. SMITH: Right.

MR. WINSTON: So, is there anything the Commission is doing, particularly, in trying to preserve some of those?

MS. KREISMAN: We have some ideas, actually, that I'm not - we are still working on, but we think that, especially, in rural

what really the impact is, and also we have some ideas that we're developing now as to maybe there are ways that we can help them find spots, but we have to further explore those.

But, they cannot participate in the auction and they are not protected.

MR. SMITH: And, this is statutory, so for those that don't know, the statute provides protection and allows participation by Class A full-power stations, but not low-power TV or translators.

But, yes, we are sensitive to, you know, the concerns of the low-power TV community, and also, you know, translators, especially, in the Western states.

MS. KREISMAN: I always look at them as a little service that could, because,

you know, their demise was predicted during the DTV transition, and as you know that didn't happen.

So, while I'm not telling you there won't be an impact on them, I'm really hopeful that, especially, in more rural locations there won't be an impact on them.

But, that remains to be seen, and the repacking and the band plan gets developed.

MR. SMITH: And, just last point on that is, you know, one concern that folks have had, especially, with respect to LPTV, is that when - our proposed market variable band plan would result in us reclaiming more spectrum in certain rural areas than a national baseline, and that by doing so we would squeeze out stations that don't have interference protection, LPTV and translator stations.

And, the fact of the matter is, at least what we are looking at right now, and expecting to propose, is that we would reclaim a national baseline amount that would not seek to reclaim

MR. SMITH: Yes, or send one out.

22

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Because we have not seen it. We've been trying to get more data.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: On what you guys are doing on that.

And, what's your time line? You said 2014, that's a long time. Is that first quarter, second quarter, third quarter, any idea?

MS. KREISMAN: Everyone says there is no way we are going to make it.

MR. SMITH: Yes, it's funny what people think.

You know, right now we are still figuring out our time line. You know, 2014, I would be - I would not expect to see it happening early 2014, but I think you'd be pretty safe thinking later 2014, because, yes, as Barbara said, you know, people are already saying that's going to be a challenge for us to make.

MS. KREISMAN: The key will be when we get our rules out, and the timing, and that also may, you know, be influenced by when our new chairman comes on board, and there are a lot of other factors.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Sure. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Anything else?

No?

Smitty, you done good. Great job, thank you very much.

Lots to consider from the minority perspective. That's one of the reasons we wanted this committee to have this briefing, and I know this is an issue that's very near and dear to Chairwoman Clyburn. So, that's another reason we wanted you to have this briefing.

The Chair is going to exercise a prerogative or rearranging our agenda, so that we can get a guest, Ruthanne Deutsch, who has been good enough to come and brief us on the second part of Fisher v the University of

MS. DEUTSCH: Six months ago. So,

22

about as long as it took to decide this case, or even around the same time.

This was one of the most anticipated and longest-delayed cases of the term, and at the end of the day it came out not with a bang, but with a whimper.

so, the good news is that Grutter was not overruled, and the parties, in fact, in their briefing, and at oral argument, even the challenger, Abigail Fisher, the Counsel on behalf of this white woman who was claimed to have been denied admission to the University of Texas because of affirmative actions policies there, her counsel clarified it in oral argument that they were not asking the court to overturn Grutter.

So, wait, wait, wait, wait, all term. The first arduous case is one of the last decided, and at the end of the day you get an almost unanimous opinion authored by Justice Kennedy, Justice Ginsburg was the only dissenting Justice, 7:1, because Justice Kagan

was recused from the case, because she had been involved when she was Solicitor General prior to joining the court, that, basically, says right standard, wrongly applied, go back and decide whether Texas' plan really satisfies strict scrutiny.

But, affirming Grutter, but with a little bit of caution in the sense of, we are not - we are not deciding today, we are not questioning today, our precedent that the educational benefits that come from diversity is a compelling state interest that can justify race-based measures.

And so, the only thing that the court really questioned is kind of, you know, nothing majority opinion in some ways, was whether the 5th Circuit, which was the Court of Appeals in the case, gave too much deference to the University of Texas on how that interest was satisfied.

And, Justice Kennedy, writing for seven, said, yes, you did, you took the

university at their word, when they said they made good faith efforts, and they had tried other things and they didn't work, and that was not strict scrutiny. You misapplied our standard. And, he gave a tweak on a very famous adage the court often says in many cases, that strict scrutiny is strict in theory and not fatal - and can be fatal in fact, but shouldn't be.

And, here he says, well, it also shouldn't be feeble in fact, and here it was.

In her dissent, Justice Ginsberg said, I don't see how on this record this plan could not satisfy strict scrutiny, so she was a little skeptical, but, you know, a lot of commentators think that one of the reasons for the delay was that the court was trying to reach some kind of internal compromise. And, you know, effectively, got a lowest common denominator, where they agreed to let Grutter live for another day, and as one commentator said in an analysis that his first year law

students, you know, could have done before the court even heard the case, you know, just march through the routine application of the strict scrutiny standard and not get involved in the details, because I would bet there was not - there were not seven justices on the court that agreed that the university's program did not satisfy strict scrutiny.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The interesting thing about the opinion, or, perhaps, the concurrences, and, in particular, Justice Thomas concurred, Justice Kennedy's opinion is 13 pages long. You know, most of it marches through the court's prior precedents on affirmative action, and just sort of like, you know, law review articles, interesting part of that march through is he's very careful to say that in Bakke, the original affirmative action decision 25 years before Grutter, where Justice Powell and a concurrence that sort of became the principle that Grutter endorsed and made, you know, precedential.

Page 61

When he talked about how diversity could be a compelling state interest, he also disavowed the idea that remedying past discrimination could justify affirmative action programs in higher education, and Justice Kennedy sort of took pains to note that, which I think is an interesting part of the opinion.

So, we are only talking about education benefit for diversity interests, as sort of remaining clearly endorsed by the court at this point, but the remedying past discrimination perspective has been cast aside at least in the higher education context.

And then, he talks about strict scrutiny, and he, basically, says, you know, you really - the court really has to make the university, or make the government prove, that there are no race neutral alternatives. And, it's not - you can't just take them at their word at that.

And, you know, Justice Ginsberg,

also in dissent kind of questions that and said, well, you know, the total idea of having a race neutral alternative is problematic as well, because even the university's top 10 percent plan, which says, you know, top 10 percent from every public high school in Texas are automatically admitted, has a racial undercurrent, because the neighborhoods are segregated, and, you know, there is socioeconomic bases that explain, you know, where different high schools are. And so, her dissent kind of questions that.

But, let me make sure I'm not missing anything - so, at the end of the day the majority remands, and, in fact, the 5th Circuit just recently, which is the court it was remanded to, announced a briefing schedule, so the parties are going to have another round of briefing in the Appeals Court, and argument probably before the end of the year, where they are going to argue about whether or not the university already has a

critical mass of diverse student body, whether or not race neutral workable alternatives were really tried, whether or not the petitioner, Abigail Fisher, has standing even to pursue this case. That could be a way of just kicking it out of the courts completely, because she's already graduated. So, there's about eight questions that they've asked the parties to read, and we'll see what happens on remand. And, the devil is in the details.

In terms of the aftermath at the court about this decision, the concurrences are, basically, an invitation for the next case to frontally challenge Grutter, which was not done here, maybe as a litigation tactic by the parties.

Justice Gullia has a one-paragraph concurrence, which he had a bunch of this term, basically, saying Grutter should be overturned. And, I said that, you know, in my dissent of Grutter, and I reiterate it here, but because the parties don't ask for it I

concur in the result that the plan doesn't withstand scrutiny.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Justice Thomas wrote a 20-page concurrence that was longer, you know, by 50 percent, than Justice Kennedy's majority, and this might be another reason that the case took so long to cook at the court. And, his concurrence was - it chronicles how, I mean, his theory, basically, is that today's proponents of affirmative action in university admissions are no different than the defenders of segregation when cases like Sweatt and Brown v Board of Education were briefed, and he has a sort of chilling, you know, page after page of quoting from briefs, and saying compare this with that, compare this with that.

And, you know, the bottom line,
this quote sort of crystallizes his tone and
rhetoric throughout the opinion, and I
recommend reading it because he is sort of one
of the strongest voices, I think, in the

Page 65

intellectual discourse today in this country of how affirmative action, actually, hurts minorities, and this is quite a strong piece about it. But, he says, "The Constitution does not pander to faddish theories about whether race mixing is in the public interest."

Strict scrutiny, in his view, is only satisfied in the court's precedence outside of higher education when it's a threat to national security, so he quotes Korematsu, the Japanese evacuation case, or to overcome past discrimination. He leaves that door a teeny bit open, outside of higher education.

But, in terms of the educational context, he said the alleged benefits to the races that were argued in defending segregation were insufficient to justify racial segregation then, and they are equally insufficient, you know, the benefits of diversity could justify racial discrimination now. That's his position.

And then, Justice Ginsberg, as I alluded to already, dissented, and, you know, was pretty clear that the university's plan could satisfy strict scrutiny on the existing record, and we'll see what happens on remand.

But, that was Fisher, it was more a story about what wasn't done than what was, because at the end of the day universities that are pursuing the types of admission policies that they've been pursuing since Grutter can continue to do so, and arguably the same legal standard applies. But, it's definitely in the cross hairs, I would say, this law.

And, you know, I'll leave it to
David, who I think is also going to talk to
you, talk about the import for this committee
and for the work of the Commission, obviously,
you know, there's a statutory mandate here
that is not the case with public universities,
but I think this opinion confirms something
that we suggested in the last presentation,

that the serious evaluation of race neutral alternatives, you know, wink, wink, as Justice Ginsberg says, with the eye that you are really using those, you know, socioeconomic or geographic or whatever, that they are effectively going to get at racial diversity questions as well, whether or not, you know, your face is more constitutionally protected to be race neutral than not.

And, I'll pass the mic to David, but I'm more than happy to answer questions as well.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: I think David is going to make his remarks in connection with his subgroup's recommendations.

So, are there any questions for Ruthanne on this case?

Andy?

MR. SCHWARTZMAN: This is not a question. It's just - it's an expression of appreciation, this is a wonderfully cogent and

1 have to vote, and we'll vote by majority rule.

And, if there's a majority to send something

3 up, we'll do that.

Again, these are not recommendations to the Chair for action.

These are recommendations from the subcommittees asking the Chair to consider having us develop these ideas into full-blown recommendations.

So, with that, I will turn the floor over to Ron Johnson, and ask him to go forth.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Good afternoon.

MR. JOHNSON: It's good to be here.

First, let me say we do have one of our task force members in the audience with us today, Channel Hardy, from the National Urban League, or did she leave? I think she left. Okay. And, Charles Harrell from the IT architect called in.

1 Several of our members had 2 conflicts today, and certainly send their 3 apologies for not being able to participate. 4 Are there any members - other 5 members of the task force on the phone now? Okay, thank you. 6 7 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: You got a yes from somebody. 8 9 MR. JOHNSON: Would you give your 10 name, please? 11 MS. BALLARD: Hi, this is Karla 12 I'm still on the phone. Ballard. MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you. 13 14 Thank you. 15 First of all, let me thank our rappateur on this, Jocelyn James, the 16 17 attorney, all of you know her. She has added 18 a great sense of understanding to me about the 19 legal ramifications of some of this. 20 And also, I would like to 21 especially thank, going forward, and I think

this will be of interest to the Chair and all

22

of you all, that Virginia State University
School of Engineering and Technology, and
their Research Institute, Advanced Research
Institute, has a real interest in this, and
have agreed to provide whatever pro bono
services that they can to help us in this
process, Mr. Chairman. So, we'd like to
welcome Virginia State to this discussion.

My Alma Mater, I will have to give full disclosure on that. Thank you.

Undergraduate Alma Mater.

I guess I will start my remarks by saying that supply diversity and leveling the playing field really has to do with job creation and economic growth for diverse communities. And, we've talked about that somewhat already this morning.

Chairman Rivera gave our task

force, and I suppose I speak for all the task

forces, some pretty clear instructions about

our concepts today, so that my colleagues will

not have to repeat these I will tell you what

1 they are right now.

First, that our concepts would have to be realistic, and secondly, they should take, at least in our case, will take into consideration the Adarand constraints, and most of you all are very familiar with what those might be, and for all of the task forces we were charged to consider the budget constraints that the FCC has, as they begin to consider and, hopefully, try to implement some of the recommendations or comments that we are going to make here today.

So, let me first begin by saying also that we have three concepts. The Chair asked that we either have two or three, and you can imagine I would take the liberty - our committee would take the liberty of offering up three. And so, if he said two we would have offered two, if he said four we would have said four. But, he said two to three, and so we have elected to present three for your hearing this afternoon.

The overall purpose of our task force is to try to design a feasible way to help the Commission eradicate barriers to entry, which, hopefully, will increase opportunity for greater access to capital, and access to procurement opportunity for diverse companies, meaning MWBEs.

One of our task force members suggested, and we adopted this suggestion, that we would also include persons with disabilities, PWDs, as a part of our consideration. And, we are looking at whether or not that is something that we can do in the context of this first concept, and concept two and three. I think we can. We might have to have further consideration along those lines.

In addition to that, our work is being guided by, basically, principles, and let me tell you what they are very quickly.

Our recommendations will look at best private sector procurement practices by diverse companies, obviously, what the FCC can do to

stimulate private sector actors to recruit, and retain, and grow diverse companies in their supply chain, and how the FCC should design a supply diversity program conference and stimulating relationships between diverse companies and the regulated industry.

As most of you know, and as a practical matter, much data is needed to determine the value of the supply diversity market, which means what WMBEs have to offer, number one, and some estimate of how much business is currently being done between regulated industry and diverse companies. We think this information is very important to the FCC. At the same time, we think it is essentially, as we go through this process, that we ask a couple of questions.

And, first of all, whether or not the FCC regulated industry is, actually, syncing to engage MWBEs in this process, whether or not the FCC is providing an effective forum, or can provide an effective forum, for these groups to come together and discuss matters of mutual interest, and thirdly, whether or not we can suggest, or should suggest, to the FCC that it create a sustaining venue for private industry, the regulated private industry, and diverse companies, to come together on a periodic basis to discuss these matters around supply diversity.

And so, we had three concepts our committees does that we would like to share with you right now very quickly. I know time is of essence here.

Our first concept is to measure in some way the outreach to minority and women entrepreneurs by FCC licensees, who are currently engaged in broadband employment and infrastructure development.

As a quick background, according to FCC-regulated industry SEC filings, billions of dollars are spent annually on deployment and infrastructure development by

companies providing wireless and wire-line broadband services. A number of regulations exist that require multi-channel video programming distributors to engage in outreach efforts. But, similar efforts are not required of other licensees.

As technology continues to converge, many Commission licensees provide similar services to communities, without the benefit of a standardized way to outreach and report their requirements to their constituents.

Now, without these these uniform requirements, it is difficult for us to access the level of participation by minority and women-owned suppliers as a whole.

There is a need for a platform
neutral method of assessing market
participation by these companies, as
contractors, and as subcontractors. Taking
into account Adarand restrictions and budget
constraints, the task force would recommend

that we would examine how the Commission could
measure the level of participation of these
companies who contract with FCC-regulated
licensees that are engaged in broadband
deployment and, particularly, broadband
infrastructure development.

And so, we've come away with an expected outcome if this recommendation or concept is accepted by the body. And, that expected outcome would be the establishment of a viable tool that could provide a constitutional defensible and practical way for the FCC to measure MWB participation in the regulated industry. That would be the outcome as a result of this concept, if this concept is accepted.

The second concept -

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Can you hold off just a second?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Let's go ahead and consider this recommendation.

MR. JOHNSON: All right, thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you.

So, does anyone have any questions for Ron on this idea from that subcommittee?

Steve?

MR. ROBERTS: Could you restate that again, and give us a little more clarity, because I'm not quite sure what those tools would be that you mentioned in your presentation.

MS. KREISMAN: What would be our role, the Committee's role, in developing those tools? How would they go about it?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I think, to your point, Barbara, I would suspect that that analysis of where we go from here is something we probably need to think about, because we are not sure as a committee. We have not gotten, in our task force at least, you know, that much work done on this concept. We, essentially, wanted to lay it out and get your

1 comments and then move ahead.

But, I think, Steve, to your point, one of the greatest issues in looking at, from our perspective, the extent to which diverse companies are participating in the industry, is that we don't know. We simply don't know the extent to which diverse companies are participating in terms of dollars.

At the same time, we are not certain of the extent to which the regulated industry is, actually, reaching out to diverse companies to engage their services and their business.

And fundamentally, I think to creating an environment where vendors can take place, it's important that we have those two analyses done. And so, our concept would be to first do that analysis.

MR. ROBERTS: That's - I understand your framework, and I would certainly support that.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Anyone else?

Yes, Jim.

MR. WINSTON: It sounds like you describe two things. One was finding out who the companies currently do work with, and then second, figuring out what they are doing to reach out to minority women businesses.

It seems to me that finding out
who they are doing business with now is simply
- we don't need a tool, we just need something
- we just need someone to say, tell us. Now,
I don't know if the Commission feels it has
the authority to do that, but it seems to me
that the first part is, tell us who you are
doing business with.

And then second, you measure - the second part is to measure what they are doing to outreach to more.

I don't know if that - it sounds like that's what I heard, you tell me if I'm hearing correctly or not.

MR. JOHNSON: No, I think you are right on point, Jim. From our perspective, though, we are not certain whether or not the FCC has the authority to require the regulated industry to report that information to it.

And, perhaps, it does have that authority, but we are not sure at this point.

And, if it does, that's a good thing. I mean, certainly, the FCC could request it. If it does not have the authority from a regulatory perspective, we would have to find a way to get to that point, where industry is willing to provide that type of data to the FCC.

It is fundamental data, from our perspective, to developing an approach to getting more diverse companies engaged with these companies.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the FCC have the authority to create something like an NFL Rooney Rule?

MS. KREISMAN: Well, I think we are

going to the area where exactly I didn't want to go.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

MS. KREISMAN: We are not really here on the proposal, it's that I think it would be really helpful for those of you who are very knowledgeable, have businesses, to come up with a plan as to what data you, for example, would feel comfortable sharing as a first step.

Again, to emphasize the emphasis to be on what our expertise could be, and what we can find from fellow industry participants, as opposed to what the FCC does or does not have the authority to do.

Again, we are going down this same path we sort of usually end up with, which is not always particularly helpful. I don't know that the FCC wants to take this on right now, but I think it would have a much better basis to take it on if at least it knew from us what the industry here would feel comfortable with,

as opposed to it going out, if that makes any sense.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, it does.

MS. KREISMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: David?

MR. HONIG: There is a path there that the Commission has quietly been focused on. And, that is, in the - Congress requires the Commission to provide various reports on competition. The Video Competition Report that was presented, I think, in April, and which a public notice is issued regarding the subject of the questionnaire to be used for the 2013 report that will be issued in the spring of 2014.

Acting Chairwoman Clyburn had a public notice issued by the Wireless Bureau a couple months ago, going to the question of whether that wireless competition report should also inquire into minority women-owned business participation insofar as it relates to and demonstrates the health of the industry

1 in terms of competition.

Interestingly, then Commission

Kevin Martin, in 2002, when the concurring

statement of the EEO rules really first

proposed that we not just look at minority

participation in terms of diversity, but also

look at it in terms of its impact on

competition, where the Commission's authority

is quite clear.

Our task force, that will report later, has also addressed this in the context of, as Ron pointed out, the fact that the procurement reporting rule applies right now only to cable and MVPDs as a consequence of it being in the '93 Cable Act. But, there probably, I guess you could discuss this with OGC, there's no legal impediment given 334 of the Communications Act to extending that to other platforms. The Commission would have to develop a record, but it can be done.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you, David.

Again, as Barbara has pointed out,

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr.

2 Chairman.

Concept 2 was to - or is to establish a self-measurement of how minority and women-owned entrepreneurs engage in contracting with the FCC-regulated industries.

This is probably a little easier to get to, I would think, from a process perspective. So, in an effort to assess the market for diverse suppliers, with FCC-regulated industries, the Commission's Office of Communication Business Opportunities should engage, in our opinion, a two-step process, and let me explain what that two-step process would be.

First, it could, with our assistance, invite diverse suppliers to voluntarily complete a confidential survey discussing their experiences in providing services across all sectors, all industry sectors. This information could include the types of services provided by those suppliers,

whether these suppliers are provided to
whether these services are provided to
government or private sector entities, or
both, how these businesses come across
opportunities in the private sector, the
length of the contracts, opportunities to
leverage their relationships across
industries, and how their experiences working
with various sectors differ within industry,
meaning carriers, equipment manufacturers, OEM
systems integrators, service providers, et
cetera.

and secondly, the OCBO could replicate a panel discussion that we had the last year, consisting of diversity in industry, at which time two members of our committee, by the way, served on that. And, following that successful forum, a select number of survey respondents then could engage with industry executives on procurement best practices in sort of a closed kind of discussion, or more narrow discussion. And,

out of that we would be able to identify more clearly what some of the barriers to entry would be with respect to diverse companies.

And so, the outcome of this, or expected outcome, would be an increased level of awareness of diverse experiences and expectations that could be shared with the FCC-regulated industry, and then develop that into a publishable set of procurement best practices for the public and for the FCC to have available to it.

And so, Mr. Chairman, that is the second concept that we would like to proffer.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: So, essentially, data gathering with the end result that the FCC and the public would have a list of best practices that could guide.

MR. JOHNSON: That is correct.

And, through a format that has already been established by Tom Reed's office.

21 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Questions? Any 22 questions?

1 All those in favor say aye.

2 (Chorus of ayes.)

3 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Anyone opposed?

4 Thank you.

5 Last recommendation, Ron.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay, thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

No. 3, our concept recommendation is that the FCC would host a website on industry and procurement best practices, and access to capital.

As a continuous learning tool, the conference panel discussions, along with previous discussions, convened by the FCC, on access to capital and procurement practices could be inexplicitly, we think, packaged into a FCC e-learning website, and to further advance the FCC's commitment to procurement that this website could house similar panels and workshops that other organizations and government entities have sponsored, or intend to sponsor.

The internet searches could be directed to the website via various internet search engines currently available to the public, and so the FCC would not have to spend any money to ensure that that occurs.

And so, the expected outcome here would be, basically, two. The public and the FCC-regulated industry would have access to a repository of information in one credible location, the FCC.

And secondly, the regulated industry could be assured that the FCC is aware of issues about procurement diversity, and access to capital, and begin to look more closely at what some of these barriers are.

And so, that would be - No. 3 is a mechanism to have this information that we gather from concepts one and two available, not only for the FCC to see, but, more importantly, for the FCC-regulated industry to have access on an ongoing, real-time basis.

We think that 3 is very important

happened to the report, but we should have our
Chair do it.

But, I just want to let you know, we have been busy working.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, Diane was kind enough to share the minutes with me, and it was obvious that you had a very robust conversation, both at the meeting and, apparently, subsequently.

MR. ROBERTS: Right.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: So, again, that's another reason I'm reluctant to proceed without her.

So, Nicol, you have the floor,

MS. TURNER-LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So, I represent the Unlicensed

Devices Inspection Subcommittee, with several
of you, actually, who are here in attendance.

And, what I will do is, basically, just go
over some of the concepts that we discussed,

and tie that into some of the work of the subcommittee, because we saw this as sort of an ongoing extension. But, we do have a couple that, actually, fall out of the purview that the subcommittee just thought they were important to offer as concepts.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay.

MS. TURNER-LEE: So, for those of you that aren't familiar, the subcommittee has been working on the use of unlicensed spectrum and devices for the benefit of minority entrepreneurs, as well as communities, and it was very great to hear the IT gentleman, actually, talk about that as one of the concepts of consideration, because we feel it's such a burgeoning market that we have to pay attention to this area, particularly, as we look at the rate of innovation and the inclusion of people of color in this innovation.

So, I'm not going to take the time, I'm, basically, going to go right into

our four concepts for consideration, and I
will do as my colleague here has done, and
kind of stop to explicate and take questions
on what our thinking was around those
particular areas.

The first one that we introduced to the Chairman for consideration was around strategies and best practices for involving MWBEs and upcoming incentive spectrum auction. How timely, making our presentation today to the Committee.

And, we recommended that this particular Committee assist in recommending outreach technical assistance, public/private sector matching to ensure some level of participation in the upcoming auction.

And, I want to, and I'm sort of off record here, include the comments of Brigitte Daniel, who is on this Committee, of ensuring that there's some diversity goals around this upcoming auction, and what that looks like.

So, I thought her comment was spot on with

regards to having some type of outline plan, and it appears that there's been some mention and comment, but we think that this Committee should play a critical role, sort of codifying what those goals are as we move forward. So, we'd like to offer that up.

One other thing we were going to offer as an example to sort of help this

Committee in our education round why this is such a critical area.

On September 4th, a deal was solidified with Grain Management, in partnership with AT&T and Verizon Wireless, for the purchase of spectrum in the bandwidth of 700 megahertz, Band B, from Verizon, and C brought form AT&T. That deal was the largest minority-owned business deal, valued at \$287 million, and we feel that there are some best practices. It was addressed by the FCC. It was, obviously, some good principles and practices that were in play, and we'd like to, actually, recommend something I think that is

the Commission's authority, which is to invite
them to one of our meetings to discuss how
that deal went through and what was involved
with that. What was the discussion? What
were the benchmarks? How did the companies
work with the Grain Management to, actually,
make that happen?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In addition to that, some of you may not be aware, National Urban League, MMTC, as well as NCLR, were also offering advice to that deal. So, we think that's, again, a very nice model to look at as we move forward with the incentive spectrum auction. And, since we have until next year, I'm sure we'll have another meeting to, actually, have them So, that is our first invited. recommendation, to just again ensure that this Committee has some role in helping the Commission in the creation of diversity goals, and strategies and best practices for involving MWBEs and offering up for the next meeting Grain, as well as the corporate

22

education.

We felt that this Committee could suggest ways that the Commission could leverage unlicensed spectrum, to create community-wide by hot spots that promotes access to these services for seniors, lowincome people, and rural residents.

So again, as we heard today, I
guess you all again were reading our
Committee's mind. It's very important to
think about unlicensed spectrum for community
access, as well as unlicensed devices.

And, in listening again to the Acting Chairwoman, there's a possibility also to have this exploration of new devices that could be catered to schools, and libraries, and hospitals, et cetera, particularly, as we are looking at broadband as the platform to enable many of these social functions.

So, our Committee, in particular, was working towards some policy language that we would like to introduce to this Committee that we think might be good language as a way

to kind of introduce into, not only the incentive spectrum auctions, but also E-Rate and other initiatives that the FCC is currently taking on, that just, again, carves out some level of bandwidth for these types of functions.

We feel, in our Committee and our discussion, at some point this will come around to us, and we'll be trying to figure out why the kids that are in certain schools are not getting access to the latest devices. That can run, you know, e-book as opposed to text books, that conversation. So, that is one of the concepts that we'd like to put before this Committee.

Our Committee has volunteered to work on that policy language to bring to this Committee for discussion and for clarification, and also for some type of approval that can be brought up to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay.

1 MS. TURNER-LEE: So, that is our 2 second concept approach.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Any questions on the use of unlicensed spectrum for these uses that Nicol has outlined? No?

All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Anyone opposed?

Great, thank you.

MS. TURNER-LEE: And now, these last two, and again, these aren't, necessarily, within our bandwidth of our Committee, but we felt that these were really important, and in many ways, Chairman, they are, actually, kind of connected, but I'll split them out, and then I'll share them, just like Ron did, because they probably need to be together.

The third concept was the discussion and documentation of best practices in public/private sector partnerships around educational and community digital learning initiatives.

We thought that this Committee

could support the Commission in development of
a guide for how these partnerships are

cultivated, resources implemented for other

people who are interested into that game.

Many of us are aware of the successes of what we see by the private sector side, educational initiatives, what we see broadcasters do, you know, what we see innovators do, with regards to STEM, et cetera. And, what we had thought in our Committee, that they are not documented, and they are not, necessarily, in one place to think about ways for the Commission to take those best practices and encourage others to actually get more involved.

We also feel, MMTC just filed comments, for example, around E-Rate, that there are some possible rules that can be looked at, in terms of charitable giving of the private sector towards many of these initiatives. That type of conversation could

come out as well if we had a guide to how these public/private sector partnerships, actually, are panning out.

So, we thought, again, this

Commission - this Committee could offer to the

Commission something that's very quick and

easy, based on the talent that is already on

this Committee, which is to really think about

what has, actually, happened out there to

advance digital learning and community

education goals.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. So, any questions for Nicol on the assembling of best practices for education and digital learning?

MR. LEE: This is not a question,

I'd ask you to look at public television.

MS. TURNER-LEE: Public television, too, yes.

MR. LEE: And, how we do those things already creating public/private partnerships, and especially around education

22

MS. TURNER-LEE: So, and this last

one, as I close, could possibly tie to the third one. I like our Designated Officer,

Barbara's comment, because we don't have a committee on this last one as well, which is the importance of core principles around STEM.

So, all of us have had a conversation around STEM. Our Committee talked extensively about STEM. We've all researched it. We know the implications of communities of color by not having core values and core competencies around STEM and the types of jobs that are created around STEM concepts, as well as the way it bridges the educational achievement gap.

So, our recommendation here was to come up with a core set of principles, a core digital learning and science, technology, engineering map, or STEM principles, that serve as a guide for bridging national educational achievement gaps, especially, among people of color and low-income students. And, we thought that this Committee could

bring a set of principles and practices that can be considered by the Commission in the development of digital learning initiatives.

So again, that could, actually, be tied to No. 3, as part of the work much like Ron had talked about some of these things being sort of interrelated. But, we felt that there was, again, this Committee could drive the leadership on thinking about what are those core principles.

Right now we see a lot of great conversation of value coming out of the Department of Education. We've seen stuff coming out of the FCC, again, with the expertise around this table, the importance of really putting out those values and principles, coupled with our No. 3, right, which are best practices, might, actually, advance this conversation on what that looks like for communities of color.

Just a last plug on that. One of the things that I learned recently is that,

with STEM, if you don't introduce that to young people, or young Black boys, for example, before 6th grade, they tend not to want to pursue those careers. And so, we have all had the conversations of the different times of intervention, but we've not seen this very progressive conversation and set of principles and practices, and things that are being implemented now, that could, actually, advance this dialogue.

So, we put that forth. And, in fact, I'd like to - my Committee is okay - kind of combine 3 and 4 to not offer so many ideas, but to see if there's a way to, actually, have this conversation around best practices around digital learning and education processes, in addition to strategies and principles for advancing STEM and digital learning and knowledge among communities of color.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you.

I'd just note that should the

	Page 109
1	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes.
2	MR. LEE: So, there's a great wealth
3	of apps and information in education and STEM
4	money, but we can't use it in the communities
5	of color, because they don't have laptops,
6	they don't have internet access.
7	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Right.
8	MR. LEE: They don't have all the
9	tools that you need to use all the technology
10	that out there.
11	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: And, some of them
12	are digital illiterate.
13	MS. TURNER-LEE: Right. Right.
14	MR. LEE: Exactly.
15	MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: I would just
16	like to add -
17	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, Carolyn?
18	MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: - that under
19	the FCC's National Ordering Plan, there are

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

provisions that talk about digital literacy

that's a place where you can get a start.

and private and public partnerships.

20

21

22

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Excellent, so they
may be a link there.

Nicol?

MS. TURNER-LEE: Any time, actually,
I mean, if you look at the bigger picture, and
the bigger tunnel, right, it does tie to the
conversation that we want to have around the
use of unlicensed devices in these schools,
because if you have those core principles, and
you can accelerate access to these devices,
then they don't have to go to private schools
to get access to iPads and others for
learning. But, they need the unlicensed
spectrum to be able to run the devices.

so, it's part of the whole
ecosystem that our Committee - and I think
that's one of the reasons why our Committee
sort of supported this, because we see it as
the broad highway for, actually, making sure
the schools are up to par on that.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, Brigitte.

MS. DANIEL: Just to piggy-back off

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

1 thank you to all the Committee members.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: David.

MR. HONIG: First, I'd like to thank the members of the EEO Working Group, who met September 4th, and had a number of conversations after that, and worked on the recommendations that we presented to the full Committee, a rather thick, granular version has been presented, fully footnoted, and I'll summarize it today.

The members of the working group are Jason Lagria, Karla Ballard, who is on the phone, Sylvia Strobel, and a few members who could not make it do, Jessica Gonzales, Karen Narasaki, Rudy Brioche and Andy Schwartzman, who I wanted to especially acknowledge because the underlying Equal Opportunity Rule was the subject of a petition for rulemaking that the Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ filed. And, Andy is, actually, old enough to have written it, which he did. And, thank you.

So, one thing that's important to realize about the issue of equal employment opportunity is that it has a very long history at the FCC. The FCC was the first Federal agency to require non-discrimination and broad outreach for employment for its regulatees.

That happened originally in 1968 with the Statement of Non-Discrimination, and then with rules first proposed in `69, and enacted in 1971 under the chairmanship of Chairman Wiley, and when Commissioner Hooks served on the Commission, and those rules took effect and they are assiduously enforced. Fourteen stations got designated for hearing over a period of five years, because of evidence of discrimination.

Minority women employment in broadcasting increased by over 50 percent, and that has never happened before or since. So, clearly, enforcement of rules does result in diversity.

Diversity has always been the

primary basis for these rules, as well as preventing discrimination. As we know, and we summarized some of it in our presentation, there has been some controversy over what the Commission can do without it being regarded as race conscious. But, as the Commission has kind of stalled in figuring out the answers to that question, we've, unfortunately, had some retrogression. There's been no data collected officially. Fortunately, there has been some data collected by industry stakeholders, most significant of which is the study done every year by the National Association of Black Journalists, their Diversity Census, and examination of TV newsroom diversity. study has been put together each of the last several years by Bob Butler, a member of NABJ, as a labor of love.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

He was just elected the President of NABJ, and he has driven in and has visited with us, and is here today, and I'd like to yield some time to him to present the study,

1 and put it in context.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, David.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the

Committee.

NABJ started collecting this information about back in 2007, because we tried to find out the diversity of the industry, the networks, the TV stations. And, the industry, basically, said, thanks, but no thanks. We are not going to give you the information.

So, we began, basically, an investigative reporting project to find out who was calling the shots in newsrooms. We think it's very important to know who calls these shots, because we constantly have reminders why it's important.

We had the Boston Bombing, in which the suspect was described as a dark-skinned male. Even though I know for a fact that there were people of color in the newsrooms of some of these organizations saying, wait a

minute, how do we know that, why are you
saying that? And, it turned out to be wrong.

There was nobody in a position that could have said, wait, stop, let's not do that. So, I think it's important to have this information. We started doing this report, it's released every year. We are working on the most recent report that should be coming out, I say should be because I was elected President this year, and it kind of got in the way of my research.

But, I think it's important to note the report looks behind the scenes in newsrooms. We don't look at the reporters and the anchors. We look at the managers, because those people are the ones who decide the news agenda.

We know that in this report there are 295 stations owned by 19 different companies, and the diversity of management is, basically, 12 percent. 12 percent includes African Americans, Native Americans, Asian

1 Americans and Hispanics.

I point out this, because the country diversity is about 35 percent. There's a big disparity there.

Now, I have no trouble if you are in a place that does not have much diversity. Take a city with very little diversity, you have none in your newsroom. I have a big problem with that, if you are in a place like New York City, or Washington, D.C., or Chicago, and you have a newsroom that's run by people, nobody that looks like me, or looks like Joe, or other people that might have the sensitivity.

So, I just wanted to be - to point this out to the Commission, and it's very timely. Mr. Reed was talking about the CIN study, which NABJ was a partner in developing the research model. And, one of the things missing from that was employment data, and that's something that we are very good at getting now, because we are reporters, and we

1 know how to get the information.

So, I just wanted to come and talk to you about this report, the importance of it, and the fact that it's going to continue, we are going to continue getting the report out, and we'd like you all to take a copy of the report, it's available online at nab.org/diversitycensus, or you can Google it at 2012 NABJ Diversity Census. There's a lot of data in there.

What you can do with this report, you can look at the stations in the report, and it can tell you the race and gender of all the news managers. And, like I said, 12 percent is a far cry from 35 percent. We want to make sure that one day the people that are calling the shots in the newsrooms represent America, but they do not do that right now.

Thank you.

MR. HONIG: Thank you so much.

One of the recommendations, we have four from the working group, goes to whether

this - these rules that kind evolve under the premise of promoting diversity, which is vitally important, how does that apply in the context of common carriers or Title 1 services that may, to a lesser extent, but not to it's full extent, is broadcasting or cable, directly impact diversity of content.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The Committee has, in the past, recommended that under the principle of platform neutrality these broadcast and cable rules be extended to other regulated platforms, which are kind of merging the lines, or blurring among them in any case. And, the working group recommends this first recommendation, that the Commission consider how it might do that, and under what justifications, irrespective of whether strict scrutiny applies, all rules should be well justified. And, in particular, should consider the diversity rationale, should consider whether these rules would promote competition has been discussed, would prevent

discrimination, and would remedy the present effects of past discrimination in these businesses. And, that would be a dialogue that the Committee should have with OGC.

Second recommendation -

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Let's hold off there, David. Let's just vote on that one recommendation.

MR. HONIG: Oh, sure.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay? So, any questions for David on extending the EEO rules to platforms other than broadcasting and cable?

MS. DOZIER: Question, sorry, this has been brought up in another proceeding currently, this proposal that you just made.

MR. HONIG: Yes. The Committee

voted on a similar recommendation a few years

ago, and it's also been the subject of filings

in the ongoing broadcast EEO proceeding, but

there is no separate docket that's been

created to look at EEO in other industries

1 besides broadcasting and cable.

MS. KREISMAN: I would, respectfully and politely, urge you not to approve this, because this is exactly the kind of thing that I don't think - we need to focus on issues where we are sharing our expertise.

There's another vehicle for this kind of a proposal, it's a proposal, a notice of rulemaking, a request for rulemaking.

There's a legal way to do this, where there's comment, and there's an opportunity, a formal opportunity for people in the industry to respond.

I would, respectfully, argue that
we would better - better use of our time would
be to look around us, take our collective
expertise, and look at the type of issues that
the other two committees have suggested.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: And, it's being it's in another - it's already being
considered as Erin points out in another
docket.

MR. HONIG: It's in 98-204. And, has been put forward as a proposal and the Diversity Committee has endorsed it. So, it's the Commission's call whether to expand the scope of that docket to, specifically, include this, or whether to break it off into another docket, but it's been fully briefed up. So, it's really the Commission's call.

MS. KREISMAN: And then, the

Commission already has it before it, and they
can decide its timing. But again, it's not an
issue where we are - we are in a unique
position to use the extraordinary expertise,
and there have been some examples today, this
isn't one. This is a really - just addressing
an issue that's already before the Commission
in another context, and using it as a way to
lobby it, I suppose, I don't know.

But again, I don't think it's a good use of our resources. Again, I would, respectfully, request that you not approve it.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: I think - I don't

mic is working, but, perhaps, what might be
appropriate is to hold off on this for the
next meeting, and maybe have a dialogue
between the Committee and Commission staff,
and decide whether or not to bring it back for
next meeting.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: I think that's a course the Chair would prefer to take, David. Let's hold off on it, and see whether we want to do that.

So, if that's all right with everyone, we'll just go ahead and table this. We won't need to vote on it right now.

So, Erin, thank you for pointing that out. Appreciate it.

Go ahead, David, with your next recommendation.

MR. HONIG: So, the second recommendation that we made relates to audits and enforcement, which the Commission has used for the last 12 or so years to review broadcasters and cable companies recruitment,

and whether their EEO programs that they filed with the Commission have been effectuated.

Here we looked at the fact that very few stations fail an audit. The level of enforcement is about 2 percent of where it was in the mid 1990s. Of course, we know that the rules have changed, but we did not feel that that should inhibit the Commission from assiduously enforcing the rules that it has.

And, we've come up with some kind of sub-recommendations, or things that the Commission could do to enhance the strength and effectiveness, and credibility in some instances, of EEO enforcement.

One of those is to simply recognize that presently it's housed in the Media
Bureau. I think it may be the only enforcement staff in the Commission which is not housed in the Enforcement Bureau, and thus, we've suggested that the Civil Rights Branch should be created there that would encompass other similar areas of civil rights

enforcement, such as transactional advertising and procurement non-discrimination across all platforms, that the commission enhance and kick up a notch the audits that it does, and not hesitate to take cases that involve egregious misconduct and look at them in hearing, and to conduct kind of more audits and deeper ones, on-site review, and looking particularly at the single most important factor I think that we identified is to look at what the Commission has honed in on in the past as most indicative of discrimination.

Presently, audits only examine whether an employer recruits broadly from places other than word of mouth from its own staff. That is one element that the Commission considers when determining whether a licensee has engaged in intentional discrimination.

But, the other element that it considers is whether that excessive word of mouth recruitment was done from a homogenous

staff. What the case law says, and makes clear, is that if your staff is heterogenous, and you rely, primarily, on that staff for recruitment, it doesn't tend to replicate a homogenous staff over time. It may be inefficient and unbusinesslike, but it's not unlawful.

Unfortunately, the Commission kind of treats that the same as if you are doing word of mouth recruitment, primarily, from a homogeneous staff, which the Commission has found and the courts agree, is inherently discriminatory, would be grounds for hearing.

The way to cure that is to, and we address in our next recommendation, actually, which relates to Form 395 data, is that if there appears to be excessive use of word of mouth recruitment to then look at the second step, which was, well, was the workforce homogenous or not.

So, before turning to that recommendation, I'd like to put forward these

specific proposals relating to audits for consideration.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And also to note, and we say this in the report, that there is a particular area where minority employment, particularly, seems to have just collapsed, and that's radio journalism. That has never been examined by the Commission. Data seems to show that almost no minorities work in radio journalism anymore, except at Spanish language, Asian language, and minority-owned stations, and that this might be a proper subject for the Commission to consider under 403 of the Communications Act, just as it considered matters such as payola back in the say under that statute that allows for broad investigation into an area that goes to the Commission's effectiveness of its rules.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: So, this is,
basically, a proposal to enhance EEO
enforcement, and you mentioned several - the
audit, and looking, specifically, at radio

1 journalism and so forth.

2 | So -

MS. KREISMAN: Again, I would urge you not to support these proposals. We've seen these from you, David, before.

The value of this Committee really is the expertise it brings cumulatively. It's not recommending that the Commission do something that it's been asked to do before in a different context.

To do that devalues the goal - our goal. If we can be perceived as a Committee that has a unique perspective, based upon the industries and the information that you have, that really makes our work product extremely valuable and special.

Again, I urge you not to, because these are recommendations that have been made before. They are not based on our cumulative expertise, and they are fine to be considered in another forum, but not here.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Anyone else?

Jim?

MR. WINSTON: I'm a bit troubled,
because I think the charter of the Committee
is changing, and I got that from Barbara's
opening statement today. And, I was curious
about what she meant when she made that
statement. And, I'm curious now about what it
is the Commission wants from this Committee.

MS. KREISMAN: To operate as a Federal Advisory Committee, which it really never has. I've, actually, had a lot of experience with Federal Advisory Committee, and I've seen the wonderful work that can be done when a committee brings its joint experience together and shares its expertise in a way that we can't gather the information.

I'll give you an example. Let's say we wanted to do something on recruitment and hiring. And, you wanted to give us information that we otherwise couldn't get.

One way to do it, for example, I've just picked this out, I'm not suggesting this

be it, that all of your companies put together in a room, all of the people that you have, actually, doing that job, sharing what works for them, and what they've been successful at and what they haven't. All of a sudden, you are bringing together a bunch of different minds representing different areas, putting together a best practices approach that has worked across various industries.

There's no way for us here at the FCC to get - have access to that kind of an expertise in such a defined way. What we've traditionally done is not anything different than your organization can do without this committee, come in with a bunch of suggestions or rule proposals, that's not sharing your expertise. And that, I think, is the unique charge of this Committee, and I don't think we've been successful in the past doing it, and there's been a lot of frustration.

We've made recommendations, people have knocked their brains out making

recommendations, but what the Commission needs
from us is our expertise.

Your proposals hit on it
beautifully. Your proposals hit on it
beautifully. Don't you see the distinction
between that and the proposals that are being
made now? I don't know how else to describe
it. I'm not as articulate as some of you.
Maybe you could help.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Let's let Jim have - do you have a follow-up?

MS. KREISMAN: Okay.

MR. WINSTON: I'd like to hear some of my other colleagues.

15 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Joseph, you are 16 up.

MR. TORRES: Yes. I just want to before I worked at the Free Press I was the
Deputy Director for the National Association
of Hispanic Journalists. And, as Bob said, it
shouldn't be the job of an DJ to have an
investigative reporting project. And, I know

a little bit, and Maurice Foster for NABJ
writes this as well, to get the data I mean
they, literally, have to do a covert - before,
ask members within NABJ within these newsrooms
to help them with it, because, as he says, the
companies don't want to give them data, and
they are partners with the companies. He's
saying companies come to their conferences and
recruiting, and these best practices you are
talking about, these conversations have been
going on for years about conferences. What is
the best practice to recruit people of color?

And, when it comes to color, what should you be aware of in trying to go to the job fair and, you know, to put out your - to represent yourself well for the job. This has been happening for a long time.

And yet, Bob, has to be - he has to have investigator journalism skills, NABJ Vice President, now President, and I think this is the frustration, that we are not getting any results. And meanwhile, you may have a

situation where newspapers and broadcasts,
they say newspapers, the number of journalists
of color that work in newspapers is
dramatically declining.

So, it gets to the point where Bob said in the very beginning, that this is a real issue that really impacts people's lives, and how, ultimately, at the end of the day we are getting how we are covered and how we are viewed.

And, we are trying to, I think what Bob is saying, and what David is saying, I think this gets to the heart of it. So, to think that we are just relying on industry best practices, a lot of us around the table have been trying that for years with not much success.

MR. REED: Just sort of to echo what Bob was saying. Obviously, there's a lot of agreement around this table about what the issues are.

I think, you know, my focus, and

Barbara's focus, has been to marry what the FCC is looking at, what we can do with the expertise that's in this room. That's one of the reason we put together the subcommittees.

so, nobody is saying that EEO enforcement is not a problem. One thing I will point out is that, a number of these proposals, I think all of them, are all pending before the CWA docket. So, if they are pending, it's, frankly, not the best use of this Committee's time, if those proposals are already pending before the FCC.

As Barbara pointed out, I think, as we've seen in a couple of the subcommittees, we are seeing concepts that are being advanced that can come back to us.

I think Andy's suggestion is a good one, too, aside from the fact that these proposals are already pending before the FCC and the CWA docket, it may be useful for us to have an off-channel conversation about them, in terms of understanding exactly what's

happening with them at the FCC at this moment.

So, it's not taking these things off the table, but it is certainly making sure that we have our focus appropriately set on the issues that the FCC is looking at, that we need some advice, broad advice and expertise on, and that's what we are getting, at least partially here.

So, I just wanted to add that.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you, Tom.

Nicol?

MS. TURNER-LEE: No, I think this I think this whole conversation today has been
valuable, and we appreciate the Commission,
actually, coming to this Committee, and, you
know, to agree with Barbara from the
standpoint of finding ways to make this
Committee much more effective, and getting the
Commission to understand how we can be a
helpful and value add.

I guess the challenge is, by not putting any proposals on the table around EEO

enforcement sends a really big message that that's not important to us. And, I think if you look at all of the proposals that have come forth today from supplier diversity to more inclusion of minorities in some of these, you know, popular and up-and-coming and emerging technologies, EEO is, actually, probably one of those critical areas that's probably a little bit more mature than these other spaces, but has to be addressed.

And, I think one way to, actually, have the Committee that worked on those proposals walk away feeling that they've contributed to the dialogue is, perhaps, to do what I think Ron recommended in his, which is to really go a little deeper than that with what has been done in this area. We have seen this platform quickly grow, where it's not the traditional companies and media that are under-represented when it comes to people of color.

As has been mentioned from this

Committee, we've seen enforcement, maybe not yet heavy as it was before, in a time where we are seeing economy with tightening controls, and tightening opportunities, and seeing the space that, essentially, becomes the next gateway for people of color, not just in the professional realm, but also on the blue collar realm.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So, I don't know. I mean, I put it out to this Committee to think about ways to, actually, bring back, I think, several of those good recommendations of just revisiting, to see how well we are doing, and maybe offer that more as a recommendation, as opposed to, you know, coming in with that, what I think I'm hearing, is reiteration of the preceding, but being a little bit more proactive as an advisory committee, as to how do we go back and revisit what was before us, and maybe taking some models like the NABJ model, or things that NAMIC has done and WIPP has done, to really see where we are, because if we

don't take that on I think we are going to miss some of those opportunities going forward.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right.

Yes, David?

MR. HONIG: When this Committee was established in 2003, it was very clear that one of the core areas that it was going to address, and in which members were recruited because they had broad expertise, was equal employment opportunity. That was one of the three major purposes of the Committee, and has been ever since.

We've been down the path, and let me just acknowledge that in this room alone is over 100 years of collective experience on equal employment opportunity. The experts in the country are in this room today. We went down the path of developing best practices, which, appropriately, was the right first step and first approach.

We, actually, wrote a book that was

commissioned and put in the Commission's website in 2004, and came up with specific recommendations for how the equal employment opportunity rules could be tweaked to take account of the fact that the industry was shrinking and that more issues were arising for enforcement purposes in the context of retention, as opposed to recruitment.

Unfortunately, no action was taken on those recommendations, and it has been nine years. Other organizations have filed comments at the time that this happened and since, and nothing has been done. This is not an area that a credible advisory committee can retreat from.

We have seen a collapse in enforcement. We are seeing a collapse in employment, at a time when the Nation is becoming - going into having a digital economy. There's no issue more critical on which we have more expertise.

So, I just wanted to encourage,

with great respect for the Commission's prerogatives, the body to not retreat from this area, which I think is fundamental to what it does, and fundamental to what the Commission does.

I would close by just noting that what has been asked of us is to propose concepts. The Chair of the Commission can accept or reject them. That's a dialogue that the Committee can have with the Chair, or the incoming Chair, as to what direction to take it, but, certainly, one thing that the task force found not acceptable is another nine years of no significant action on a matter that's vital to competition and diversity.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: David, why don't we go ahead and - did you have something else, Jim, that you wanted to add?

MR. WINSTON: Well, I think this is an important dialogue we are having right now.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: I agree.

202-234-4433

MR. WINSTON: And, I'm sorry that

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc.

Diane Sutter wasn't able to be on the call today, because some of the recommendations, or some of the concepts that came out of our Committee probably got caught up in this same conversation. And so, that's why I wanted for us to understand what it is we are saying the Committee's role is going forward, because I think it needs clarification. Let me put it that way.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Point taken.

David - Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: If I may, thank you very much.

My members are wondering why it is that the FCC is quick to fine a network when there's a wardrobe malfunction in the Super Bowl, yet allows employers to get away with not hiring our members. That doesn't make sense to my members. It doesn't make sense to me, as to why the Federal Government, in its regulatory role, doesn't have the kind of data

it needs to do a proposed rulemaking, and, actually, relies on an outside organization to collect the data for it.

We just have a lot of questions in the role of the FCC in regulating the industry. You know, we have companies out there that are putting product on the air that is biased, and it's supposed to be unbiased, because they are part - they are on the public airways. We have companies and stations putting information out there that is inaccurate, and, in fact, can be construed as violating FCC policy, and nothing is done.

So, I understand that you want the Committee to come back to you with things that would move the process forward, but a lot of people are asking, how long is it going to take before we get actual enforcement from our Federal regulators.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you.

David, what I'd like to suggest is, we hear your other two recommendations, and

then we come back and revisit this, see what kind of reaction we get with the other two recommendations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. HONIG: Sure.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: We're not going to vote on this second recommendation at this point.

MR. HONIG: The third recommendation speaks to the question of transparency in the 395 data. One reason for that was already stated, which is being able to know whether a recruitment practice rises to the level of intentional discrimination. And, the other is, really, just in the interest of transparency, and ensuring that members of the public have information about their licensees that serve them, that would help them to make good choices, in terms of viewer-ship, listener-ship, and participation themselves as job applications and as people who work in the industry.

The recommendation is simply that

the Commission restore the collection and public access to this critical information, and notes that there is no legal impediment to doing so.

And, if I can just state briefly, the fourth recommendation relates to the FCC EEOC Memorandum of Understanding from 1978.

This, actually, is a matter that has not been taken up. I think it's the only matter that we have that's not presently before the Commission.

And, right now, that Memorandum of Understanding requires both agencies, when they receive a complaint of discrimination against a broadcaster or cable company to notify the other, and decide which of them will take the lead.

Here, now that the Commission has gone to the process - gone to a - gravitated to a procedure based on audits, this would suggest that that memorandum be amended such that when a Commission audit uncovers possible

add to that, and so we can sort of honor the work of the Committee, should the conversation be around how can we take this bigger rock issue of EEO enforcement and, perhaps, bring before the Commission a concept of looking at maybe a culmination of what we've heard today, you know, taking that head on.

I mean, David mentioned the 2004 best practice document, 2013, almost 2014. I know a lot of traction was not met, but I'm just curious, I think, Barbara, this is kind of what you are getting at, to sort of shovel out rocks and paths we can effectuate change around.

MS. KREISMAN: Using the expertise of this body, right, as opposed to, you know, saying, Commission, you haven't done this or this. There are other forums - I'm not telling you you shouldn't be upset about it, but there are other forums to do that. I'm looking at this to be a constructive forum, and again, using the expertises of many people

1 here.

MS. TURNER-LEE: I honestly think
that we'll get back to some of these issues.
They are not going to go away, they are,
actually, still there, and they are still
unresolved. But, I think in terms of
repackaging it, so that it can be heard, I
think - I mean, I speak for myself, but it's
imperative that we bring before the Commission
a concept around EEO and EEO enforcement.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Point well taken.

I think also, it's difficult, as I said initially, again just conceptually, going to the Chair to say, we want you to help us - we want you to ask us to develop these concepts, so that you might consider them, when the Commission has already considering them in other dockets. I mean, we've got to kind of deal with that.

That isn't what Chair Clyburn asked us to do. So, we've got to deal with that. I like your suggestion.

It's a nuance, but I think it's an

22

changed.

1 important one.

2 MR. WINSTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: In the way that we are doing our work.

This Chair has said, I'm willing to consider your suggestions about what it is that you want to work on. We haven't had that up to this point.

MR. WINSTON: And, I think that's what I heard David providing, was these are our thoughts about issues pending before the Commission.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Right.

MR. WINSTON: But, I hear you all saying that they are already being considered, and I understand that. I guess, my concern is that the Diversity Advisory Committee, as you said, we represent a variety of viewpoints.

It seems to me that if we come together as this diverse body and say to the Commission, collectively, we believe these are important issues, that has a different weight than if we

1 come separately in our individual capacities.

So, saying that we shouldn't repeat it here troubles me, because I think it does have a different message if it comes from this body, as opposed to as if it comes from us in a common rulemaking proceeding.

So, I feel like, to some extent, the voice of this Committee is being narrowed, and, you know, and maybe what I'm hearing from Barbara, maybe what you are saying to me is that, if you do it now your voice will be heard.

MS. KREISMAN: Also, there's a piece missing in your recitation.

MR. WINSTON: Okay.

MS. KREISMAN: Not just - all the issues mentioned here are important, but the piece is, which of these issues can we, actually, help with the expertise that we have in the industries that we represent. This is another piece of it here. What can we provide by cumulatively putting our information and

actually, in my role I can tell you what I

22

think, because it's in the constructs of our charter. I think that is my role here, first of all.

And, I don't think our role here is to use this body to raise issues we've already raised with the Commission in another - as a way to lobby them, or repeat it, especially, if it's pending in another proceeding. I do not think that's the role, and I do not think that's contemplated by our charter.

So, I will say that. And, I don't think every idea is appropriate to be raised, not that they aren't important ideas, but, no, I don't see the role of this Committee has broadly as it has, and I think it could be more effective if it's narrower, sticks to the charter, and sticks to the expertise of the Committee. I think it will be much more valuable, and much more appreciated, and much more effective.

MR. WINSTON: This is a very helpful dialogue. I think shortly as we go forward in

our subcommittees we need to be conscious of the guidance you are providing us today.

So, I thank you for that.

MS. TURNER-LEE: Barbara, I just have a question.

Can we go back, though, before the Commission and ask, as part of the Subcommittee work, that the Committee is interested in kind of revisiting, you know, where these things are, and if they are progressive enough to sort of accommodate, you know, this changing landscape, something like that.

I mean, I think there's some value in doing that.

MS. KREISMAN: I think, you know, that's something to explore, I think, in your working group. And, basically, you know, I break it down as, what is it that we want to explore, how can we bring our expertise to help explore it, as opposed to just say you do it. What we want to get away from is that,

this Committee has been a lot like this, you
do it Commission. Here's another idea for you
to do.

I think the most successful committee, actually, produce their own body of work. I think I can point to them, Security Reliability Council, they, actually, put - they, actually, came up with defense plans that have been adopted by many of the broadcast television and radio stations, that would have been putting all people in the room from different companies, and combing their cumulative expertise to come up with best practices. Then there's a body of work.

There's a body of work that they claim is attributable to them.

I'd love us to be able to come up with something that we say, this is the work of our Committee, look at it. Here it is on the website, we've done it, you can rely on it for this reason.

It's hard. It's harder. It's

harder than just saying, okay, here's an issue, you do it. And, I'm not being disrespectful, please.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: I think also I'd just like to note that, you know, we have been operating under a structure where we have been asked to work on certain things. And, when I was told that that was how we were going to operate, I thought that was going to be better for us than the other way we had been operating.

You've been on this Committee since its beginning, and you know how we used to operate. And, I thought that because of the fact that we were sending up all these recommendations and they weren't acted on.

So, I thought, well, that's fine, let them ask us to - tell us what they want us to work on, and then we can do that, and we would do that, and I told them, look, if we're going to operate this way, then when we send you stuff you've got to act on it. After all,

you told us you wanted us to work on it.

so, but that hasn't worked out so well, from my perspective, and I know from other people it's been fairly frustrating. A lot of you have shared your frustration individually. And now, Chairwoman Clyburn has offered us another way. She said, okay, you tell me what you want to work on, and then we can consider it up here, and then we can send you some stuff.

So, I would hate to go back to her with something that she didn't mean. If we send some stuff back to her that we didn't - she didn't mean this, you know, and I think we are hearing from Barbara what she's talking about.

So, this is the kind of thing that we don't - we don't want to send her back, I don't think. I like Nicol's - I like Nicol's approach. I think that this - the Committee worked hard on this. I know David put a lot of blood, sweat and tears into these

recommendations, but I think it can be repackaged to meet the criteria that Chairwoman Clyburn has established, in terms of how we ought to look at this going forward.

So, you know, and the buck has got to stop here. I put this email out after I chatter with her, and, obviously, it's created some confusion, at least among two of the subcommittees, and so I apologize for the confusion that I caused.

But, I think, David, we ought to follow Nicol's suggestion and not vote on these, to table them, and try to repackage them and try to understand how we can better meet Chairwoman Clyburn's criteria and give her something that meets those criteria that we can go to work on.

MR. HONIG: I can concur with that.

I don't want to speak for the entire working
group, but just for myself.

I would like to note, there is a question of jurisdiction that it might be

useful to clarify, because it really lies in other places, and that is whether the fact that there is a pending petition for rulemaking, or that a matter has been raised by third parties in a docket, deprives this Committee of jurisdiction over it.

What would happen, for example, if the Committee put forth a recommendation, and while it was considering it a third party filed a petition for rulemaking? Would that take it off of our table? Or, is it relevant to whether we ought to be heard about it?

Many of the best recommendations from the advisory committee on civil rights came from the industry experts, and private sector experts, and academics came together, specifically, to consider recommendations that third parties had made, the Nation's rules on red line, environmental justice, on environmental regulations in many cases, consumer protections often came about because of the intervention and participation and

guidance of advisory committees at a time when agencies and departments were somewhat vexed considering aggressive proposals that had been made and propounded by third party organizations.

And, it was, particularly - and this - we've had some experiences like that here as well. So, it's just a question, just to be sure that we understand what we can do and what we can't and why, that would be useful to be clarified.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Well, under the instructions, as I received them, as I understand them, what you suggest is not within our purview right now.

Now, that doesn't mean it couldn't be. The Chair could say, you know, this petition has been filed, we'd like your collective expertise on it, and we think you have something to offer to the Commission's process here.

But, right now, that's not what I

understand we are supposed to be doing.
So, if it's all right with
everyone, we'll table these recommendations at
this point, and we will revisit them when
they, hopefully, can be repackaged, and we've
still got to deal with the other - with market
barriers to entry recommendations.
So, we'll take that up as soon as
we can.
MS. TURNER-LEE: So, Mr. Chairman,
the protocol, will we do a conference call, or
will those just be delivered to us in some
type of package, so that we don't delay the
deliverable to the Commission?
CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Right. I don't
know. A lot of it will depend on David's way
to repackage this.
MS. KREISMAN: Can't do a conference
call, but it still counts as a meeting.
CHAIRMAN RIVERA: So, we have to

MS. TURNER-LEE: Okay.

give notice and so forth.

21

22

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: So, it's not
it's just not as easy as calling a conference

call.

MS. TURNER-LEE: Okay, yes, because we still have to hear the other committees.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Right. So, I'd like to adjourn this meeting, unless there is anyone who has anything else to bring before this August body.

Yes, Steve?

MR. ROBERTS: When do you think the next meeting might be?

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Well, I haven't had an opportunity to talk to Barbara or to Tom about this, but I'm hoping that we can meet some time in December. I know December is not a great time, but we have not - we've only met twice this year, and so I'd like to get another meeting under our belt.

And, as soon as we - Barbara has got to find out when this room is available.

It's in great demand. So, we'll see what we

A	Adarand 72:5	affirmative 57:13	alternative 27:7	62:19
abated 41:15	76:21	60:14,18 61:4	62:3	appears 96:2
Abigail 57:10 63:4	add 109:16 136:9	64:10 65:2	alternatives 61:19	127:17
ability 149:15	136:20 141:18	affirming 58:7	63:2 67:2	Appendix 31:11
able 20:14 70:3	147:1	afford 30:22	amass 6:13	application 60:3
	added 70:17	African 116:22	amended 145:21	108:20
88:1 110:14 142:1	addition 73:17 97:8	aftermath 63:11	America 1:1	applications
144:11 155:17	107:17	afternoon 14:2	118:18	144:20
above-entitled	additional 34:14,15	17:19 18:12 69:14	American 2:18	applied 58:4
163:14	address 5:17,20	69:15 72:22	12:7 14:15 17:4	applies 66:12 84:13
Absolutely 149:9	127:15 139:9	AGE 1:5	Americans 116:22	119:18
149:12	addressed 84:11	agencies 145:13	116:22 117:1	apply 119:3
academics 159:16	96:19 137:10	160:2	amount 24:12	appreciate 68:1,11
accelerate 110:10	addressing 122:15	agency 14:14 21:7	33:12 52:22	124:15 136:14
accept 48:15 141:9	149:11	23:18 113:5	amounts 40:14	163:11
acceptable 141:13	adequate 33:19	agenda 4:3 14:18	analyses 79:18	appreciated 153:19
accepted 77:9,16	adjourn 162:7	15:9 55:19 98:7	analysis 59:22	appreciation 67:22
access 39:20 73:5,6	adjourned 163:13	116:17	78:17 79:19	approach 7:16
76:14 89:11,15	Adjournment 4:23	aggressive 160:3	anchors 116:15	81:16 101:2 131:8
90:8,14,21 91:13	administrative	ago 56:21,22 83:18	ANDREW 2:20	139:21 157:20
99:5,11 100:11	28:10	120:19	Android 24:20	appropriate 124:2
109:6 110:10,12	admission 57:12	agree 127:12	Andy 12:10 67:19	152:7 153:12
131:11 145:2	66:9	136:16 141:21	112:15,20 123:21	appropriately
accommodate	admissions 64:11	agreed 59:20 60:7	Andy's 135:17	136:4 139:20
154:11	admissions 04.11	71:5	ANITA 2:12	approval 100:20
accomplish 15:1	adopted 15:17 16:6	agreement 41:22	Ann 2:15,22 10:4	approve 121:3
account 76:21	34:5 73:9 155:9	42:7 43:4 134:20	Annenberg 18:21	122:21
140:5	advance 89:18	ahead 20:8 41:19	announced 62:17	apps 108:15 109:3
achieve 6:4	103:10 106:19	77:21 79:1 124:12	annually 75:21	April 20:5 83:11
achievement	107:10	124:16 141:17	answer 17:5 19:11	architect 2:14 10:1
105:14,20	advanced 71:3	aimed 29:19	21:22 22:16 67:11	69:22
achieving 5:13	135:15	air 26:4 34:20,21	answered 21:2	arduous 57:18
acknowledge 16:19	advancement	37:5 47:17 143:7	30:14	area 7:5,16 15:12
112:16 139:15	42:17	airways 143:10	answering 19:15	16:15 40:11 82:1
act 21:7 84:15,18	advances 42:21	Akin 3:3 4:13	answering 17.13	94:17 96:10
128:14 156:22	advances 42.21 advancing 47:3	11:19	anticipated 57:4	123:14 128:4,17
acted 123:14	107:18	alleged 65:16	Anton 10:5	137:17 140:14
156:16	advantage 16:11	Alliance 2:21 12:9	Antonio 2:15	141:3
Acting 83:16 99:13	advertising 126:1	allocated 28:2,21	anybody 22:13	areas 5:10 32:3
action 60:15,18	advice 97:10 136:6	38:20 40:15	48:17	37:21 51:1 52:15
61:5 64:10 65:2	136:6	allow 33:10	anymore 128:10	53:1,3 95:5
69:5 123:17 140:9	advisory 1:4,19 4:4	allows 51:14	anymore 128.10 anyway 18:7 56:14	125:22 131:7
141:14	5:4 7:7 130:10,12	128:16 142:18	56:16	137:8 139:8
actions 57:13	138:18 140:14	alluded 66:2	apologies 70:3	area-by 40:10
active 30:11 48:13	150:17 159:14	Alma 71:9,11	apologize 158:9	arguably 66:11
actors 74:1	160:1	alongside 16:16	apparently 93:9	argue 62:21 121:14
actual 143:18	advocated 123:15	alternate 43:22	Appeals 58:18	argued 65:17
adage 59:6	auvocateu 123.13	anti nate 43.22	Appeals 30.10	argucu 03.1/
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

argument 57:9,15	23:6,13 25:7,13	back 17:22 18:19	115:9,12 116:21	bigger 110:5,6
62:20	25:15 26:5 27:8	20:5,7 21:3 33:15	128:20 154:18	147:3
arising 140:6	27:14,16,17,18,20	34:3 44:11 56:18	basis 7:14 32:12	Bill 48:12 50:4
arrange 26:14	27:14,10,17,18,20	58:4 115:6 124:5	40:11 43:19 75:8	billion 28:3,3
arrive 7:14	29:14 30:1,15,19	128:15 135:16	82:20 90:21 114:1	billions 75:21
articles 60:16	31:4,9,10,13,14	138:11,18 143:15	basketball 44:20	bit 7:20 18:14
articulate 132:8	31:4,9,10,13,14	144:1 148:3 154:6	45:11	23:21 24:13 38:18
Asian 2:18 12:6	32:8,16,20,21,22	157:11,13,18	batting 48:17	39:6 58:8 65:14
47:2 116:22	33:4,13 34:14,16	, ,	beautifully 132:4,5	130:2 133:1 137:9
128:10	34:17 36:6,10,12	background 75:19 Bad 9:12	becoming 140:19	130.2 133.1 137.9
Asian-American	36:20 37:13 38:2	Bakke 60:18	began 115:12	Black 2:24 3:2
47:9	51:11 95:9,16,21	balance 33:11	beginning 134:6	12:15 13:4 107:2
aside 23:20 61:13	97:13 98:10	Ballard 2:6 10:2,2	156:13	114:13
135:18	auctioned 38:22	70:11,12 112:12	begins 31:15	blood 157:22
asked 36:3 63:8	auctions 21:18	band 31:22 34:1	behalf 14:14 57:11	blue 138:7
72:15 129:9 141:7 148:20 156:7	22:20 32:16,18 33:7 100:2	52:9,13 96:15 bands 33:22 40:3,7	believe 5:10 30:7 36:22 37:17	blurring 119:13 board 55:4 64:13
	audience 69:18	40:16	150:21	Bob 3:2 13:3
asking 57:15 69:7 143:17	audit 125:4 128:22	bandwidth 96:14	belt 162:19	114:17 132:20
aspects 6:5 41:14	145:22 146:6	100:5 101:12	benchmarks 97:5	
aspirational 91:11				133:18 134:5,12 134:19
_	audits 124:19	bang 57:6	benefit 61:10 76:10	
assembling 103:13	126:4,7,13 128:1	Barbara 2:2 4:2	94:11	body 17:3 63:1
assess 86:9	145:20	8:10,21 11:13	benefits 16:6 39:8	77:9 141:2 146:16
assessing 76:18	August 162:9	14:5 17:21 45:18	58:11 65:16,20	147:16 150:20
assiduously 113:13	authored 57:20	54:20 78:16 84:22	best 5:12 7:5,15,15	151:5 152:17
125:9	authority 43:18	92:17 98:6 135:13	36:4 73:20 87:20	153:5 155:5,14,15
assist 5:13 95:13	80:14 81:4,6,10	136:16 146:9	88:9,16 89:10	162:9
assistance 86:17 95:14	81:20 82:15 84:8	147:11 151:10	95:8 96:18 97:20	Bombing 115:18
	85:8 97:1	154:4 157:15	98:2 101:19	bono 71:5 book 139:22
association 2:10,24	automatically 62:7	162:14,20 163:7,9 Barbara's 105:3	102:15 103:14	
3:2 11:5 12:11,15	available 17:11		106:18 107:15	books 100:13
13:4 114:13 132:19	88:11 90:3,18	130:4 135:1 barriers 4:18 73:3	131:8 133:9,12 134:15 135:10	Boston 115:18 bottom 64:18
				Bowen 2:1
assumption 43:2,3 assured 90:12	avenues 15:6	88:2 90:15 92:12	139:19 147:9 155:13 159:13	
	average 24:14,17 24:20 25:1	161:7		Bowl 142:18
attempting 32:22 attendance 5:6		base 44:19	bet 60:5 better 29:20 46:14	box 31:5,10
93:20	aware 90:13 97:9	based 22:22 45:7		boys 107:2 brains 131:22
	102:6 133:14	49:12 103:7	68:21 82:20	
attention 94:17	awareness 88:6	129:13,19 145:20	121:15,15 156:9	Branch 125:21
attorney 70:17	aye 85:17 89:1	baseline 52:15,22 bases 62:10	158:14	break 122:6 154:19 Brennan 2:8 10:6,6
attract 29:11	91:22 92:3 98:11		beyond 28:12,12	,
attractive 27:1	ayes 85:18 89:2	basic 31:2	36:14	bridges 105:13
37:1	92:1 98:12 101:7	basically 24:4	biased 143:8	bridging 105:19
attractiveness 37:2	104:19 111:16	27:11 32:5 41:21	bid 26:17	brief 18:19 55:21
attributable 155:16	B	58:3 61:16 63:13	bidding 36:10 38:8	briefed 64:13 122:7
AT&T 96:13,16	B 96:15	63:19 64:9 73:18	big 49:2 56:12	briefing 55:13,17
auction 4:9,9 11:17	70.1J	90:7 93:21 94:22	117:4,8 137:1	57:9 62:17,19

briefly 145:5	broadly 126:14	capacities 151:1	cetera 87:12 99:16	149:14,21 150:3
briefs 64:15	153:15	capital 2:12 15:14	102:11	150:13 156:4
Brigette 2:9 12:21	brought 96:16	73:5 89:11,15	chain 74:3	160:12 161:10,15
Brigitte 38:10	100:20 120:15	90:14 91:14	Chair 2:1 6:10 8:7	161:20 162:1,6,13
95:18 110:21	Brown 64:13	career 56:8	17:22 55:18 68:15	163:7
Brigitte's 38:15	Broyles 2:9 13:1,1	careers 107:4	69:5,7 70:22	chairmanship
bring 100:17 106:1	buck 158:5	careful 60:17	72:14 85:3 92:7	113:10
124:5 138:11	budget 72:8 76:21	carefully 46:15,17	92:20 93:2 123:2	chairs 6:18 8:18
147:4 148:9 152:8	bugs 21:1	Carol 11:21	124:8 141:8,10,11	15:3 68:17
152:15 154:20	build-out 35:1	Carolyn 2:4 14:7	148:14,20 149:16	Chairwoman 4:5,6
162:8	bunch 63:18 131:6	109:17	150:5 160:17	13:20,22 28:19
bringing 104:15	131:15	carriers 87:10	chairman 1:22	33:17 55:15 83:16
131:6	Bureau 12:3 83:17	119:4	4:17,18,20,22	99:13 157:6 158:3
brings 129:7	125:17,19	carries 98:15	7:22 10:20 11:15	158:15
130:14	bureaus 23:18	carry 17:22	13:5,7,10,13,16	Chair's 108:1
Brioche 112:15	burgeoning 94:16	carrying 28:9	13:19 14:3 17:21	challenge 54:21
broad 21:6 110:19	business 4:7,23	carves 100:4	18:5,13 20:7 21:9	56:12 63:14
113:5 128:16	14:20 15:13,15	case 57:1,18 58:1	22:1 35:5 38:9	136:21
136:6 139:10	38:5,6 74:12	58:18 60:2 63:5	41:2 46:21 50:2	challenger 57:10
broadband 2:6	79:14 80:10,16	63:14 64:6 65:12	53:7 54:1,5 55:4,6	chance 92:10
10:3 23:7 25:10	83:21 86:12 92:13	66:20 67:18 72:4	55:7 56:20 67:14	Chanelle 2:14 12:4
27:19 29:1 32:7,8	96:17	119:13 127:1	68:2,9,13 69:14	change 11:12 104:6
32:10 34:22 75:17	businesses 16:9,10	cases 26:13 57:4	69:15 70:7 71:7	147:13
76:2 77:4,5 99:17	80:8 82:7 87:4	59:7 64:12 126:5	71:18 77:18,21	changed 125:7
broadcast 23:2	120:3	159:20	78:2,3 80:2 83:5	149:15,15,22
25:12,14 37:14	busy 8:2 92:13 93:4	cast 61:13	84:21 85:19 86:2	changing 130:4
119:10 120:20	Butler 3:2 4:18	catalyst 28:22	88:12,14,21 89:3	154:12
155:10	13:3,3 114:17	catered 99:15	89:7 91:5,18 92:2	channel 26:8,13,19
broadcaster 26:2,3	115:2 142:12,13	caught 142:4	92:4,9,11 93:5,11	28:5,6 31:22 41:8
26:11,12,20	buying 32:9	caused 158:10	93:17 94:7 95:7	41:9 44:18 45:16
145:15		caution 58:8	98:5,13 100:22	69:19
broadcasters 2:11	C	CBO 9:1 91:11	101:3,8,14 103:12	channels 34:19,19
2:25 11:5 12:16	C 31:11 96:15	CBS 2:15 10:5	104:11,14,20	41:12
23:12 25:16,19,21	cable 2:8 10:7	cease 26:4	107:21 108:6,21	charge 131:18
26:15 27:4,21	84:14,15 119:6,10	cede 21:16	109:1,7,11,17	charged 72:8
28:1 29:12,14,20	120:13 121:1	ceding 26:18	110:1,21 111:5,9	charitable 102:20
30:8 31:6,8,18	124:22 145:15	Census 114:14	111:12,17,21	Charles 2:14 9:22
34:18 36:7 37:2,4	call 5:21 31:12 44:3	118:9	112:2 113:11	69:21
37:12 45:8 47:4	122:4,8 142:1	Center 2:18 12:7	115:3 120:6,10	charter 130:3
47:15 102:9	161:11,19 162:3	certain 52:15 79:11	121:19 122:22	153:2,10,17
124:22	163:12	81:3 85:10 100:10	123:6,9,19 124:7	chatter 158:7
broadcasting 2:21	called 69:22	156:7	128:19 129:22	Chicago 117:11
12:20 27:5 36:8	calling 115:14	certainly 18:8	132:10,15 136:10	chief 4:8 48:12
45:10 53:11	118:17 162:2	21:20 22:12 48:18	139:4 141:16,21	child 46:4
113:18 119:6	calls 115:15	70:2 79:21 81:9	142:10 143:20	chilling 64:14
120:12 121:1	campuses 16:10	91:10 104:7 136:3	144:5 146:7,19	choices 144:18
broadcasts 134:1	candidates 43:17	141:12	148:11 149:9,12	Chorus 85:18 89:2
			,	
	•	•	•	

92:1 98:12 101:7	collapsed 128:6	59:21	Commission's 84:8	1:2,5 2:3,4,6,23
104:19 111:16	collar 138:8	commentators	86:11 97:1 108:4	4:7 6:5 84:18
Christ 112:20	colleague 95:2	59:16	122:4,8 128:18	128:14
chronicles 64:8	colleagues 71:21	comments 20:5	140:1 141:1	communities 19:4
Church 112:19	132:14	34:7 39:13,15	160:20	37:6,7 71:16 76:9
CIN 117:17	collect 143:3	72:11 79:1 95:18	commitment 89:18	94:12 104:2
Cipher 2:23	collected 114:9,11	102:18 123:19	committee 1:4,19	105:10 106:20
Circuit 58:17 62:16	collecting 115:5	140:12 146:14	2:1 4:4 5:4 7:17	107:19 108:16
circumstances	collecting 115.5	commercial 16:2	14:13,17 55:13	107.19 108.10
85:10	collective 121:16	38:19 39:1 41:8	66:17 72:17 78:19	community 6:4
Cisco 24:8	139:16 160:19	41:10,15 42:4,5	87:17 95:11,13,19	16:21 39:8 47:9
city 117:7,10	collectively 7:3,13	42:19	96:3,9 97:18 99:1	51:19 98:1,20
civil 125:20,22	150:21	commission 1:2 2:3	99:19,21 100:7,15	99:10 101:21
159:14	college 16:10	2:5,6 5:12,17,20	100:16,18 101:12	103:10
claim 155:15	color 94:19 105:10	6:3,14 7:3,9 8:6	100:10,18 101:12	community-wide
claim 133.13	105:21 106:20	15:17 32:15,17,20	102.1,12 103.3,8	99:4
clarification	103.21 100.20	33:14,18 34:8	104.8,10 103.4,7	companies 2:19
100:19 142:8	115:21 133:12,13	35:15 36:3 47:14	103.22 100.8	5:18,19 6:12,13
clarified 57:14	134:3 137:21	50:11,18 66:18	110:16,17 112:1,8	7:1 16:2,8 35:17
160:11	134.5 137.21	73:3 76:8 77:1	115:4 119:8 120:4	49:11 73:7,22
clarify 159:1	combine 107:13	80:13 83:7,9 84:2	120:17 122:3	74:2,6,13 75:7
clarity 78:8	combing 155:12	84:19 85:7 97:19	123:16 124:4	76:1,19 77:3 79:5
Class 23:3 51:15	come 11:2 27:13	99:2 100:21 102:2	129:6,12 130:3,8	79:8,13 80:6
clear 66:3 71:20	33:12 43:9 44:21	102:14 103:5,6	130:10,12,14	81:17,18 88:3
84:9 127:2 139:7	48:17 55:21 58:11	106:2 113:12	131:15,18 136:15	97:5 116:20
clearly 40:5 61:11	75:1,7 77:7 82:8	114:5,6 117:16	136:18 137:12	124:22 131:1
88:2 113:20	87:4 98:1 100:8	119:15 122:10,16	138:1,10,18 139:6	133:6,7,8 137:19
clock 31:14	103:1 105:16	123:3,13,13 124:4	139:12 140:14	143:6,10 155:12
close 33:2 105:1	118:2 125:10	124:20 125:2,8,12	141:10 142:4	company 12:20
141:6	131:15 133:8	125:18 126:3,11	143:15 147:2	20:1 145:15
closed 87:21	135:16 137:4	126:17 127:8,11	149:5 150:17	compare 64:16,16
closely 90:15	143:15 144:1	128:8,13 129:8	151:8 152:8	compelling 58:12
closing 28:13 33:8	150:19 151:1	130:8 132:1	153:14,18 154:8	61:2
Clyburn 4:5 8:7	152:5 155:13,17	136:14,19 141:5,8	155:1,5,19 156:12	compensated 28:8
13:7,22 18:13	comes 41:8 44:6	145:1,11,18,22	157:20 159:6,8,14	compensation 26:6
21:9 55:15 83:16	45:21 55:4 133:13	146:5 147:5,17	committees 6:19	27:7
148:20 157:6	137:20 151:4,5	148:9,17 149:7	7:7 75:11 121:18	competencies
158:3	comfortable 82:9	150:12,20 152:11	160:1 162:5	105:11
Clyburn's 158:15	82:22	152:18,20 153:6	Committee's 14:9	competition 83:10
Coalition 2:7,13	coming 8:13 25:13	154:7 155:2	78:13 99:9 104:5	83:10,19 84:1,8
9:18 10:3	49:5 106:12,14	161:14	135:11 142:7	119:22 141:15
codified 91:2	116:8 136:15	commissioned 17:2	common 24:19	complaint 145:14
codifying 96:4	138:15 163:13	18:20 19:22 140:1	59:19 119:4 151:6	146:3
cogent 67:22	comment 29:5	Commissioner	communication	complete 86:18
collaboration	38:15 95:22 96:3	113:11	2:17 14:20 15:18	completed 19:22
17:20	105:3 121:11	Commissioners	86:12 112:19	20:2
collapse 140:16,17	commentator	1:20 29:2	communications	completely 63:6
	<u> </u>	I	I	I

complex 29:20 complexity 29:18 Compliance 10:11 complicated 29:17 composite 91:12 compromise 59:18 **concept** 73:14,14 75:14 77:9,15,16 77:17 78:21 79:18 86:3 88:13 89:8 91:2 101:2.18 108:8 147:5 148:10 concepts 16:17 71:21 72:2,14 75:10 90:18 91:9 93:22 94:6,15 95:1 100:14 105:13 135:15 141:8 142:3 148:16 conceptually 148:13 **concern** 36:21 52:11 150:16 concerns 51:18 **concur** 64:1 158:18 concurred 60:11 concurrence 60:20 63:18 64:4.8 concurrences 60:10 63:12 concurring 84:3 **condition** 33:9,10 conditions 28:13 **conduct** 126:7 conducted 30:2 conducting 25:7 28:11 conference 50:6 74:4 89:13 161:11 161:18 162:2 conferences 30:21 48:4 133:8.11 confidential 86:18 **confirms** 66:21 conflict 163:5

conflicts 70:2 **confusion** 158:8.10 Congress 23:20 27:12 28:2 83:8 **Connect** 2:9 13:2 connected 101:15 connection 67:15 conscious 114:6 154:1 consensus 68:21 consequence 84:14 **consider** 6:6,19 55:11 69:7 72:8 72:10 77:22 119:15,20,21 128:13 148:16 150:6 157:9 159:17 considerable 16:6 consideration 72:5 73:12,16 94:15 95:1.7 128:2 considered 106:2 121:21 128:14 129:20 150:15 considering 38:7 40:2 148:17 159:9 160:3 considers 126:17 126:21 consistent 39:20 consisting 87:15 constantly 30:12 30:20 37:16 115:16 constituents 76:12 Constitution 65:4 constitutional 77:12 constitutionally 67:8 constraints 72:5,9 76:22 constructive 147:21

constructs 153:1

construed 143:12

consultation 20:2 **consumer** 49:20 159:21 consumers 16:3 24:9 consuming 24:9 consumption 25:4 contemplated 153:10 contemplating 50:12 **content** 27:6 36:9 37:15 119:7 CONTENTS 4:1 **context** 61:14 65:16 73:14 84:11 115:1 119:4 122:17 129:10 140:7 **continue** 17:16 25:14 27:5,6 28:9 31:16.19 36:8 66:11 118:4,5 continued 17:19 continues 76:7 continuing 37:14 continuous 89:12 contract 77:3 contracting 86:6 contractors 76:20 contracts 87:6 contributed 137:14 controls 138:3 controversy 114:4 convened 89:14 converge 76:8 conversation 92:21 93:8 100:13 102:22 105:7 106:12,19 107:7 107:15 110:7 135:21 136:13 142:5 147:2 conversations 8:20 107:5 112:6 133:10 cook 64:7

copy 53:13 118:6 **core** 105:5.10.11.16 105:16 106:10 110:9 139:8 corporate 97:22 Corporation 10:1 **correct** 43:1 88:18 146:15 correctly 80:22 **cost** 27:21 28:4,6,7 28:8 costs 28:4,10 48:9 **Council** 2:16,19 11:7,10 155:7 **counsel** 4:13 57:10 57:14 countless 34:10 **country** 35:13 65:1 117:3 139:18 **counts** 161:19 **couple** 74:17 83:18 94:4 135:14 **coupled** 106:17 course 9:1 22:10 43:8 124:8 125:6 **court** 57:16 58:3,15 58:17 59:6,17 60:2,7 61:12,17 62:16,20 63:12 64:7 courts 63:6 127:12 court's 60:14 65:9 cover 27:22 covered 134:9 **covert** 133:3 **create** 37:3 40:17 75:4 81:20 99:3 **created** 105:12 120:22 125:21 158:7 **creating** 16:8 79:16 103:21 creation 71:15 97:19 credibility 125:13 credible 90:9 140:14

credits 36:10 38:8 **criteria** 158:2.15 158:16 **critical** 17:3,10 18:15 19:2 21:21 27:9 63:1 96:4,10 137:8 140:20 145:2 **cross** 66:13 crossed 85:3 **crosses** 23:17 **crunch** 24:2,3 25:5 **crv** 118:15 crystallizes 64:19 **CSB** 10:12.18 culminated 91:2 **culmination** 147:6 cultivated 102:4 cultivating 16:15 cumulative 129:19 155:13 cumulatively 129:7 151:22 cure 127:14 **curious** 130:5,7 147:11 **current** 17:2 31:22 currently 74:12 75:17 80:6 90:3 100:4 120:16 **curve** 32:6 **CWA** 135:9,20 D **Daniel** 2:9 12:21,21 35:8 95:19 110:22

dark-skinned 115:19 data 21:3,7 24:10 24:12,17,21 25:1 25:4 54:3 74:8 81:14,15 82:8 88:15 114:9,11 117:20 118:10 127:16 128:8 133:2,6 142:22

111:6

142.2 144.10	dofongo 155.0	datamina 21.1	dicital 1.5 101.21	di vorgo 6.4 10.4 17
143:3 144:10 date 46:19	defense 155:8 defensible 77:12	determine 21:1 74:9	digital 1:5 101:21 103:10,14 105:17	diverse 6:4 19:4,17 20:13 63:1 71:15
dates 163:4	deference 58:19	determining	106:3 107:16,18	73:6,21 74:2,5,13
David 2:15 4:21	deficit 28:15	126:17	109:12,20 111:3	75:6 79:5,7,12
11:2,6 15:4 66:16	defined 131:12	Deutsch 3:3 4:13	140:19	81:17 86:10,17
67:10,14 83:5	definitely 36:16,17	11:18,18 55:20	diligently 14:5	88:3,6 150:20
84:21 85:9 112:2	38:7 39:21 49:1	56:6,22 68:7,11	directed 23:21 90:2	diversity 1:4 4:4,16
115:2 120:7,11	66:13	devalues 129:11	direction 141:11	5:4 14:17 35:15
123:1 124:8,16	definition 22:20	develop 15:15	directly 119:7	36:5 58:11 61:1
129:5 134:12	delay 59:17 161:13	16:16 69:8 84:20	Director 132:19	61:10 65:21 67:6
139:5 141:16	delight 56:7	85:4 88:8 91:17	disabilities 73:11	71:13 74:4,9 75:9
142:12 143:21	delighted 43:18	108:1 148:15	disavowed 61:3	84:6 87:15 90:13
147:8 150:10	deliverable 161:14	developed 52:9	disclosure 71:10	91:13 95:20 97:19
157:21 158:11	delivered 161:12	108:14 123:2	discourse 65:1	113:21,22 114:14
David's 161:16	delivering 14:22	developing 51:6	discrimination	113.21,22 114.14
day 5:8 57:5,19	denvering 14.22 demand 162:22	78:13 81:16	61:4,13 65:13,21	116:20 117:3,6,7
59:21 62:14 66:8	demise 52:1	117:18 139:19	113:16 114:2	118:9 119:2,7,20
92:19 118:16	demonstrates	development 15:22	120:1,2 126:12,19	122:3 137:4
134:8	83:22	75:18,22 77:6	144:13 145:14	141:15 150:17
days 56:17	denied 57:12	102:2 106:3	146:1,4	divorce 46:9,10,14
DCB 28:2	denominator 59:20	devices 4:19 15:11	discriminatory	DJ 132:21
Deaf 2:17	Department 37.20	15:18,20 16:8	127:13	docket 120:21
deal 29:18 43:19,20	106:13 108:7	24:5,20 33:21,22	discuss 75:2,8	121:22 122:5,7
96:11,16,17 97:3	111:2	40:19 93:19 94:11	84:16 97:2 98:2	135:9,20 159:5
97:11 148:19,21	departments 160:2	98:20 99:11,14	discussed 93:22	dockets 148:18
161:6	depend 161:16	100:11 110:8,10	119:22	document 147:9
dear 55:15	depending 26:14	110:14	discussing 8:14	documentation
decade 149:5	26:20 31:18	devil 63:10	86:19	101:19
decades 15:16	deploy 21:5	DFO 11:14	discussion 5:10 6:2	documented
December 162:16	deployment 75:22	dialogue 107:10	71:8 87:14,22,22	102:12
162:16 163:4	77:5	120:3 124:3	97:4 100:8,18	doing 23:19 30:3
decide 43:11 57:1	depository 91:20	137:14 141:9,20	101:19	30:20 38:13 47:21
58:5 116:16	deprives 159:5	152:18 153:22	discussions 89:13	48:21 50:18 52:16
122:11 124:5	Deputy 2:4,5	Diane 2:21 4:18	89:14	54:6 80:7,10,16
145:16	132:19	92:9 93:5 142:1	disparity 117:4	80:18 92:18 116:6
decided 57:19	descending 31:14	Dianne 15:3	disrespectful 156:3	127:9 131:3,19
deciding 58:9	describe 80:5 132:7	differ 87:9	dissent 59:12 62:1	138:13 145:4
decision 33:14 43:8	described 115:19	difference 7:20	62:12 63:21	150:4 154:15
60:19 63:12	design 19:12,21	different 8:5 32:19	dissented 66:2	161:1
decisions 32:13	20:3,9,22 29:7	62:11 64:11 107:5	dissenting 57:22	dollars 75:21 79:9
declining 134:4	31:13 36:12 73:2	116:19 129:10	68:22	door 15:21 65:13
dedication 14:4	74:4	131:6,7,13 150:22	distinction 132:5	dotted 85:2
deeds 38:8	designated 2:2 8:3	151:4 152:1,2	distribute 6:17	downstream 45:14
deeper 126:8	14:6 36:11 105:2	155:12	37:14	Dozier 2:10 11:4,4
137:16	113:14	difficult 76:14	distributing 27:6	120:14
defenders 64:11	detailed 19:7	148:12	36:9	Dr 15:4
defending 65:17	details 60:5 63:10	digging 19:14	distributors 76:4	dramatic 25:2
		~		
	-	-	•	-

dramatically 134:4	EEO 4:21 84:4	enacted 113:10	79:16	examined 128:7
drive 106:8	112:4 120:11,20	encompass 125:22	environmental	example 47:8,11,17
drive 100.8 driven 114:20	120:22 125:1,14	encourage 102:15	159:19,20	82:9 96:8 98:21
drop 31:16,20	128:20 135:5	140:22	Epstein 50:4	102:18 107:3
drops 31:17	136:22 137:7		equal 24:11 112:17	111:4 130:17,21
DTB 49:22	147:4 148:10,10	encouragement 17:15 18:8	113:2 139:10,17	159:7
DTV 52:2	EEOC 145:7 146:2		140:3	
due 15:21	146:3	encouraging 23:1 endeavors 14:9	equally 65:19	examples 122:14 exceed 27:17
	effect 113:13	endeavors 14.9 endorsed 60:21		Excellent 110:1
duplex 33:22 40:4		61:11 122:3	equation 27:3 37:11 38:21	excessive 126:21
40:8,17	effective 7:8 42:22			127:17
dying 44:1	74:22,22 136:18	enforced 113:13	equipment 87:10	
dynamic 31:15	153:16,20	enforcement 4:21	eradicate 73:3	exchange 23:5
44:14,16 45:4,6	effectively 59:19	113:20 124:20	Eric 2:9 13:1	excited 14:21 20:10
dynamically 26:14	67:6	125:5,14,18,19	Erin 2:10 11:1,4	executives 87:20
D.C 1:21 117:10	effectiveness	126:1 128:21	121:21 124:14	exercise 55:18
	125:13 128:18	135:6 137:1 138:1	especially 37:6	exist 76:3
EA 32:12	effects 120:2	140:7,17 143:18	40:7 50:22 51:20	existing 50:13 66:4
eager 50:8	effectuate 147:13	147:4 148:10	52:6,12 70:21	expand 122:4
S	effectuated 125:2	enforcing 125:9	103:22 105:20	expansion 42:15
early 54:18 163:4	efficiency 29:9,22	engage 74:20 76:4	112:16 153:7	expansive 21:14
easier 86:7 111:13	30:5	79:13 86:5,13	essence 75:13	expect 25:12,15
easy 103:7 162:2	effort 16:20 23:18	87:19	essentially 8:9	54:17
echo 134:18	86:9	engaged 29:17 30:9	74:16 78:22 88:14	expectations 88:7
ecologies 17:10	efforts 14:8 59:2	34:22 75:17 77:4	108:7 138:5	expected 77:8,10
19:3,20	76:5,5	81:17 126:18	establish 86:4	88:5 90:6
ecology 17:11,13	egregious 126:6	engineering 71:2	established 33:10	expecting 52:20
economic 37:1,18	eight 20:20 63:8	105:18	88:20 139:7 158:3	experience 7:12
71:15	either 31:19 72:15	engines 90:3	establishment	32:18 130:12,15
economist 56:9,17	elect 31:19,20	enhance 14:19	77:10	139:16
economy 138:3	elected 72:21	125:12 126:3	estimate 74:11	experiences 86:19
140:20	114:19 116:9	128:20	et 87:11 99:16	87:8 88:6 160:7
ecosystem 110:16	Electronic 2:9	enjoy 56:4	102:10	Expert 2:9 13:1
Ed 108:8	12:22	ensure 90:5 95:15	evacuation 65:12	expertise 5:11 6:9
educating 47:16	Electronics 12:22	97:17	evaluation 67:1	6:14 82:12 106:15
education 41:9,12	element 126:16,20	ensuring 95:19	evenly 43:5	121:6,17 122:13
47:14 49:19,21	email 158:6 163:8	144:15	everybody 18:12	129:7,20 130:15
61:5,10,14 64:13	emerging 137:7	entire 158:19	everybody's 21:19	131:12,17 132:2
65:10,14 96:9	Emma 2:1	entities 87:3 89:21	evidence 113:16	135:3 136:6
98:22 103:11,14	emphasis 82:11	entity 36:11	evolve 119:1	139:10 140:21
103:22 106:13	emphasize 82:11	Entravision 2:23	ex 22:13 34:9 48:15	147:15 149:19
107:17 108:15	employer 126:14	entrepreneurs	exactly 42:12 82:1	151:19 152:1
109:3 111:2	employers 142:18	75:16 86:5 94:12	109:14 111:5	153:17 154:20
educational 58:11	employment 75:17	entrepreneurship	121:4 135:22	155:13 160:19
65:15 101:21	113:2,6,17 117:20		examination	expertises 147:22
102:8 105:14,20	128:5 139:11,17	entry 4:18 73:4	114:15	experts 19:10
Edward 3:5 4:9	140:3,18	88:2 92:11 161:7	examine 14:18 17:2	139:17 159:15,16
11:16 21:17 35:8	enable 99:18	environment 29:1	77:1 126:13	explain 62:10
	1	1	1	1

86:14	fall 5:3,7 94:4	151:7	flexible 23:7	146:4 153:22
explained 35:11	familiar 39:12 72:6	feeling 137:13	flip 24:14	158:4
explicate 95:3	94:9	146:13	floor 22:4 69:11	Foster 133:1
explicit 111:10	famous 59:6	feels 80:13	93:14	found 108:14
exploration 99:14	far 46:18 48:14	fellow 82:13	focus 5:15 121:5	127:12 141:13
exploration 99.14 explore 51:8	118:15	felt 99:1 101:13	134:22 135:1	Foundation 2:1
154:17,20,21	fascinated 56:9	106:7	134.22 133.1	four 23:22 72:19,20
expressed 29:3	fatal 59:8,8	field 17:7 71:14	focused 83:7 98:19	95:1 118:22
expression 67:21	fault 46:9	figure 100:9	folks 10:21 49:4	Fourteen 113:14
expression 67.21 extended 119:11	favor 85:16 89:1	figuring 54:16 80:7	52:11	fourth 145:6
	91:21 98:11 101:6	114:7	follow 11:2 38:15	framework 79:21
extending 14:12 84:18 120:11		filed 102:17 112:20	158:12	
	104:18 111:15			frankly 135:10
extension 94:3	Faye 2:17 10:11,15	125:1 140:11	following 87:18	free 2:20,22 12:11
extensive 92:21	FCC 3:4,5 4:2,6	159:10 160:18	follow-up 4:12 132:11	12:12 22:11 25:8 132:18
extensively 105:8	12:2 16:6,19	filings 75:20 120:19		
extent 39:12,14	23:12 28:11 29:16		football 44:19	frontally 63:14
79:4,7,11 119:5,6	72:9 73:22 74:3	final 16:6 17:14	45:11	frustrating 157:4
151:7	74:15,19,21 75:4	43:8	footnoted 112:9	frustration 131:20
extract 19:18	75:16 77:13 81:4	finally 28:16	force 4:9 11:17	133:21 157:5
extraordinary	81:9,14,19 82:14	find 30:17 40:11	69:18 70:5 71:19	fulfill 27:10
122:13	82:19 86:10 88:10	43:13 51:8 81:12	73:2,8 76:22	full 23:18 42:22
extremely 129:15	88:16 89:9,14,17	82:13 85:7,8	78:20 84:10	71:10 112:7 119:6
eye 67:3	90:4,10,12,19	115:7,13 162:21	141:13	152:8
e-book 100:12	96:19 100:3	163:1	forces 71:20 72:8	fully 49:1 112:9
e-learning 89:17	106:14 108:10	finding 46:19 80:5	force's 92:16	122:7
E-Rate 100:2	111:1 113:4,4	80:9 136:17	foreclosing 37:18	full-blown 69:8
102:18	131:11 135:2,12	fine 129:20 142:16	form 96:16 127:16	108:2
e-911 28:15	135:19 136:1,5	156:17	formal 121:11	full-power 23:3
F	142:16 143:5,13	first 14:3 24:1 26:2	format 5:9 88:19	51:15
face 67:8	145:6	28:14 35:10 39:10	forth 11:3 69:12	functions 99:18
facility 44:1	FCC's 14:17 89:18	39:18 54:8 56:7	107:11 129:1	100:6
fact 23:20 52:19	109:19	56:11 57:18 59:22	137:4 159:8	fund 28:14
57:8 59:9,11	FCC-regulated	69:17 70:15 72:2	161:21	fundamental 81:15
62:15 84:12	75:20 77:3 86:6	72:13 73:14 74:18	Fortunately 114:10	141:3,4
107:12 111:3	88:8 90:8,20	75:14 79:19 80:15	forum 74:22 75:1	fundamentally
115:20 118:4	fcc.gov/learn 30:17	82:10 84:4 86:16	87:18 111:3	79:15
125:3 135:18	feasible 73:2	95:6 97:16 112:3	129:21 147:21	funding 47:22
140:5 143:12	Federal 1:2 2:2,3,4	113:4,9 119:14	forums 147:18,20	funny 54:13
156:15 159:2	2:4,5,6 7:6 8:3	139:20,21 153:2	forward 16:14,20	further 15:7 51:8
factor 126:10	14:6 113:4 130:10	fiscal 27:10	17:19 26:5 27:16	73:16 89:17
factors 55:5	130:12 142:21	Fisher 4:12 55:22	31:3 32:7,15,16	future 35:20
faddish 65:5	143:19	57:10 63:4 66:6	32:18,20 33:4,6	G
fail 125:4	feeble 59:11	five 113:15	36:9 38:2 70:21	game 102:5
fair 133:15	feel 22:11 39:14	Fleming 2:4 111:1	85:12 91:15 96:5	games 44:19,20
fairly 157:4	82:9,22 94:15	Fleming-Williams	97:12 122:2	games 44.19,20 gap 40:4,8,17
faith 59:2	96:18 100:7	11:21,22 109:15	127:22 139:3	105:14
1a1tii 97.2	102:17 125:7	109:18	142:7 143:16	103.17

gaps 34:1 105:20	154:6 157:11	grade 107:3	guy 45:9	151:9 157:15
garage 15:21	154.0 157.11	graduated 63:7	guy 43.5 guys 54:5	heart 18:9 134:13
Gary 50:4	goal 15:1 25:9	GRAHAM 2:12	guys 54.5	heavy 138:2
gateway 138:6	129:11,12	Grain 96:12 97:6	H	held 42:4
gather 90:18	goals 5:14 29:7	97:22	hairs 66:13	Heller 2:15 10:4,4
130:16	35:16,16 91:10	granular 112:8	half 42:20	help 7:4 8:11 9:2
gathered 19:9	95:20 96:5 97:19	graphic 31:1	Hanson 48:13	17:15 28:13 30:18
gathering 88:15	103:11	gratitude 18:1	happen 35:20 52:3	36:13 50:9 51:7
gender 118:13	goes 28:18 33:15	gravitated 145:19	97:7 159:7	71:6 73:3 96:8
General 58:2	118:22 128:17	great 17:18 45:22	happened 35:20	132:9 133:5
gentleman 94:13	going 8:4 18:13	46:3 55:9 70:18	93:1 103:9 113:7	144:17 148:14
geographic 67:5	20:13,14,15,19	91:18 94:13 101:9	113:19 140:12	149:19 151:19
getting 8:22 21:3	30:21 35:12 37:4	104:21 106:11	152:13	154:21
49:18 81:17	38:16 45:12 46:3	109:2 141:1	happening 23:13	helpful 82:6,18
100:11 117:22	47:6 54:12,21	162:17,22	54:18 133:17	136:20 153:21
118:5 133:21	55:18 56:11,12	greater 73:5	136:1	helping 97:18
134:9 136:7,18	62:18,21 66:16	greatest 79:3	happens 63:9 66:5	Henry 1:21 2:1 4:4
147:12 149:20	67:6,15 68:15	grounds 127:13	happy 18:16 22:5	4:23 7:21 11:15
gigabytes 24:11	70:21 72:12 82:1	group 4:13,15	22:16 49:8,16	14:3 18:11 22:5
Ginsberg 59:12	82:16 83:1,18	18:22 19:9 20:3	67:11	hesitate 126:5
61:22 66:1 67:3	92:17,18 94:21,22	39:3 91:16 112:4	hard 14:14 15:5	heterogenous
Ginsburg 57:21	96:7 108:16	112:11 118:22	53:13 155:22	127:2
give 8:7 22:9 24:2,7	115:10 118:4,5	119:14 154:18	157:21	Hey 38:12
24:12 43:18 44:3	133:11 139:1,2,8	158:20	harder 152:3	hi 41:5 70:11
53:18,18 68:17	140:19 142:7	groups 15:5 19:18	155:22 156:1	high 21:18 22:9
70:9 71:9 78:8	143:17 144:5	75:1	Hardy 2:14 12:4,4	31:16 62:6,11
115:10 130:17,19	148:4,13 156:8,9	grow 74:2 137:18	69:19	higher 61:5,14
133:6 149:16	156:21 158:4	growth 71:15	Harrell 2:14 9:22	65:10,14
158:15 161:21	163:12	Grutter 57:7,16	9:22 69:21	highlight 15:10
given 36:22 37:2	Gonzales 2:13 9:15	58:7 59:20 60:19	hat 123:17	highway 110:19
42:10,16 47:22	9:15,17,17 112:14	60:21 63:14,19,21	hate 157:11	hiring 130:19
84:17	good 9:5 13:5 14:2	66:11	HD 45:10	142:19
gives 32:5	17:17 18:12 22:19	guard 33:22 40:3,7	head 147:7	Hispanic 2:13 9:18
giving 22:19	35:11 37:17 38:9	40:16	health 83:22	132:20
102:20	38:14 48:6 55:9	guess 7:19,20 22:18	healthy 25:12,14	Hispanics 117:1
glad 22:4	55:21 57:7 59:2	53:17 71:12 84:16	hear 5:7 9:11 13:7	history 113:3
go 9:7 18:19 20:8	69:14,15,16 81:8	99:8 136:21	94:13 132:13	hit 132:3,4
20:16 26:4 34:21	96:20 98:8 99:22	146:11 150:16	143:22 150:14	hold 77:18 120:6
41:19 43:11 48:7	104:14 117:21	guest 55:20	162:5	124:2,9
56:2,4 58:4 69:11	122:20 135:17	guidance 154:2	heard 60:2 80:21	home 48:19
74:16 77:21 78:14	138:12 144:18	160:1	99:7 147:6 148:7	homogeneous
78:17 82:2 93:21	goods 31:7	guide 88:17 102:3	150:10 151:12	127:11
94:22 110:11	Google 118:8	103:1 105:19	152:15 159:12	homogenous
124:12,16 133:14	gotten 20:5 36:19	guided 73:18	hearing 16:14	126:22 127:5,20
137:16 138:18	39:16 78:20	Guitano 2:15 10:5	72:22 80:22	honed 126:11
141:17 148:4	government 61:18	Gullia 63:17	113:14 126:7	honestly 148:2
149:15 153:22	87:3 89:21 142:21	Gump 3:3 11:19	127:13 138:16	Honig 2:15 4:21
117.10 100.22	07.5 07.21 172.21	Jump 3.3 11.17		2.13 7.21
	l	l	l	<u> </u>

11:6,6 15:4 83:6	implemented 102:4	151:20	Inspection 93:19	inventory 19:1
112:3 118:20	107:9	industry 74:6,13,19	instance 23:1	investigation
120:9,17 122:1	implications 105:9	75:5,6,20 77:14	instances 125:14	128:17
123:4,8 124:18	import 66:17	79:6,12 81:5,13	Institute 71:3,4	investigative
139:6 144:4,8	importance 105:5	82:13,22 83:22	instructions 71:20	115:13 132:22
158:18	106:15 118:3	86:20 87:9,16,20	160:13	investigator 133:19
honor 147:1	important 15:1,10	88:8 89:10 90:8	insufficient 65:18	invitation 63:13
Hooks 113:11	19:18 21:8 23:8	90:12,20 114:11	65:20	invite 86:17 97:1
hope 16:5 17:22	28:22 33:14 40:6	115:8,9 121:12	integral 16:1	invited 97:16
21:4	74:14 79:17 90:22	134:14 140:5	integration 33:5	involve 126:5
hopeful 46:6 52:6	94:6 99:9 101:13	143:6 144:21	integrators 87:11	involved 58:2 60:4
hopefully 35:2	113:1 115:15,17	159:15	intellectual 65:1	97:3 102:16
68:20 72:10 73:4	116:5,12 119:3	inefficient 127:6	intelligence 91:13	involvement 98:10
161:5	123:18 126:9	inexplicitly 89:16	intend 89:21	involving 95:8
hoping 31:9 162:15	137:2 141:20	influenced 55:3	intentional 126:18	97:21
hospitals 99:16	150:1,21 151:17	information 5:12	144:13	in-depth 19:7
host 89:9	153:13	6:13 7:2,4 17:3,10	interest 5:13 29:11	iPads 110:12
hot 99:4	importantly 90:20	17:12 18:15 19:2	37:19 58:12,20	iPhones 24:19
hotel 48:9	importantly 90.20	19:16,18,19 20:15	61:2 65:7 70:22	irrespective 119:17
hour 22:8	inaccurate 143:12	21:22 48:7 49:12	71:4 75:2 91:8	issue 5:20 6:9 7:10
house 89:19	incentive 4:9,9	74:14 81:5 86:21	144:14	7:11 55:14 113:2
housed 125:16,19	11:16 21:18 22:20	90:9,17 91:20	interested 22:14	122:12,16 123:7
hurts 65:2	35:17 40:18 95:9	,		· ·
nurts 03.2		109:3 115:6,11	25:17,19 29:20	123:11 134:7
T	97:13 98:9 100:2	116:6 118:1	49:4,6 102:5	140:20 147:4
idea 6:11 24:2,13	include 73:10	129:14 130:16,20	149:4 154:9	152:2 156:2
54:10 61:3 62:2	86:21 95:18 122:5	143:11 144:16	interesting 30:18	issued 83:12,14,17
78:5 85:4 153:12	includes 116:21	145:2 151:22	35:13 60:9,16	issues 5:16 79:3
155:2	inclusion 94:19	informed 49:1	61:7	90:13 121:5,17
ideas 8:8 14:22	137:5	infrastructure	Interestingly 84:2	134:21 136:5
16:15 50:20 51:6	income 99:6	75:18,22 77:6	interests 2:2 61:10	140:6 148:3
69:8 107:14 152:5	incoming 141:11	inherently 127:12	interference 52:17	150:11,22 151:17
	incorporated 20:6	inhibit 125:8	internal 59:18	151:18 153:5
153:13	increase 73:4	initially 146:5	International 20:1	iterations 149:4
identified 15:9	increased 25:3 88:5	148:13	internet 90:1,2	i's 85:2
33:17 126:10	113:18	initiate 111:2	109:6	J
identify 88:1	incremental 21:12	initiative 25:12,15	interpreter 10:10	
II 9:22	independent	111:3	10:12,18	James 70:16
illiterate 109:12	123:16	initiatives 15:7,8	interrelated 31:4	Japanese 65:12
illustration 31:2	indicative 126:12	100:3 101:22	106:7 111:7	Jason 2:18 12:6
imagine 72:16	individual 26:15	102:8,22 106:3	interrelationship	47:2 112:12
impact 19:4 51:2,5	41:22 151:1	innovation 28:17	33:3	JAY 2:20
52:5,7 84:7 119:7	individually 157:6	38:4 94:18,20	intervention 107:6	Jefferi 3:4 41:3
impacts 134:7	individuals 17:12	innovative 14:22	159:22	46:22
impediment 84:17	19:17	innovators 102:10	introduce 10:21	Jeffrey 12:17
145:3	industries 6:5 86:6	input 6:8 34:6	99:21 100:1 107:1	Jessica 2:13 9:15
imperative 148:9	86:11 87:8 120:22	inquire 83:20	introduced 95:6	9:17 112:14
implement 72:10	129:14 131:9	insofar 83:21	Introduction 4:3	Jim 2:24 12:14
		•	•	•

50.2 90.2 91.2	V 57.22	49.10.20.21.40.2	50.20 51.21 54.11	111.2
50:2 80:3 81:2	Kagan 57:22	48:19,20,21 49:3	50:20 51:21 54:11	111:3
130:1 132:10	Karen 112:14	49:7 50:14 51:13	55:1 78:12 81:22	leave 16:18 66:15
141:18	Karla 2:6 10:2	51:18,19 52:1,2	82:4 83:4 104:4	69:20
Jo 2:15 10:4	70:11 112:12	52:11 54:15,16,20	104:12 121:2	leaves 65:13
job 55:9 71:14 92:6	keep 22:8 46:2	55:3,14 56:10	122:9 123:11	Lee 3:4 12:17,17
131:3 132:21	85:11	58:15 59:15,19	129:3 130:9	41:4 42:9,13
133:15,16 144:20	Kennedy 57:21	60:1,2,13,15,22	132:12 146:11	43:10 44:5,10,16
jobs 105:12	58:21 61:6	61:16,22 62:2,5,9	147:15 149:18	45:6 46:16 47:2
Jocelyn 70:16	Kennedy's 60:12	62:10 63:20 64:4	151:13,16 152:12	103:16,20 108:12
Joe 117:13	64:5	64:14,18 65:20	152:21 154:16	108:18,22 109:2,8
Johnson 2:17 4:16	Kevin 84:3	66:2,15,19 67:2,4	161:18 163:3	109:14
11:11,11 15:3	key 22:21 23:8,22	67:7 70:17 74:7	Kuo 2:17 10:10,11	left 69:21
69:11,13,16 70:9	29:7,10 30:5 55:1	75:12 78:20 79:6	10:15,15,17	legal 10:11 66:12
70:13 77:20 78:1	kick 20:14 126:4	79:7 80:13,20		70:19 84:17
78:15 80:1 81:1	kicking 63:6	82:18 91:8 92:22		121:10 145:3
83:3 86:1 88:18	kids 100:10	93:3 100:12 102:9	labor 114:18	152:2
89:6 92:7	kind 19:12,15	105:9 108:6,9	Lagria 2:18 12:6,6	length 87:6
join 14:10	20:15 35:13 39:1	114:2 115:15,20	112:12	lesser 119:5
joining 58:3	47:13 58:15 59:18	116:1,18 118:1	Lake 48:12 50:4	let's 13:20 77:21
joint 130:14	62:1,12 87:21	122:18 123:22	landscape 154:12	85:11 116:4 120:6
Joseph 2:22 12:12	93:6 95:3 100:1	125:6 132:7,22	language 37:7	120:7 124:9
132:15	101:14 107:13	133:15 134:22	99:20,22 100:17	130:17 132:10
journalism 18:21	111:7 114:7	136:16 137:6	128:10,11	level 76:15 77:2
128:7,9 129:1	116:10 119:1,12	138:9,15 143:6	laptops 109:5	88:5 95:15 100:5
133:19	121:4,8 125:10	144:11 147:7,10	largely 15:20	125:4 144:12
journalists 3:2 13:4	126:7 127:8	147:16 149:13	larger 45:13	leveling 71:13
114:14 132:20	131:11 142:22	151:9 152:7,14	largest 96:16	leverage 87:7 99:3
134:2	144:2 147:11	154:9,12,16,18	late 34:4	liberty 72:16,17
jumping 8:19	148:19 154:9	156:5,13 157:3,14	latest 100:11	libraries 39:7
June 19:5	157:17	157:21 158:5	laundry 5:16	99:15
jurisdiction 108:4	knew 82:21	160:17 161:16	law 59:22 60:15	license 26:3 29:6
158:22 159:6	knocked 131:22	162:16 163:4,6	66:14 127:1	35:21 41:8,9,10
justice 2:18 12:7	know 10:22 14:16	knowledge 7:12	lawyer 56:8	licensed 15:11
47:3 57:21,21,22	15:19 16:22 17:16	107:19	lawyer-ness 56:18	licensee 26:8 42:2
57:22 58:21 59:12	18:5,18 21:18	knowledgeable	lay 78:22	42:19 126:18
60:11,12,20 61:6	22:10 23:14 24:15	82:7	lays 26:1	licensees 23:1
61:22 63:17 64:3	27:11 28:20 29:4	knows 47:3	lead 145:17	41:13 42:1 75:16
64:5 66:1 67:2	29:4 30:13,16	Korematsu 65:11	leadership 8:18	76:6,8 77:4
159:19	31:6 32:12 33:9	Kreisman 2:2 4:2	14:4 106:9	144:16
justices 60:6	33:19,22 34:9	5:3 9:5,11,14,16	League 2:14 12:5	licenses 23:6 27:19
justifications	35:3,22 36:7,8,11	9:19 10:8,13,16	69:20 97:9	27:21 32:10 42:10
119:17	36:14,14,22 37:8	10:19 11:13,13	learned 68:12	42:14
justified 119:19	37:9,10,15 38:3	13:9,12,15,18	106:22	licensing 23:2
justify 58:13 61:4	39:2,4,21 40:5,10	14:5 18:3 41:16	learning 89:12	lies 159:1
65:18,21	40:13,15,18 41:4	41:20 42:11 43:1	101:21 103:10,15	limit 41:13
	45:7,12,15,18	43:15 44:8 45:20	105:17 106:3	limitations 41:12
K	47:8,21 48:1,3,10	46:11,13 49:10	107:16,19 110:13	limited 104:9
	,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
	I	I	1	ı

line 34:2 53:17 54:7	looking 6:11,22	110:19 131:22	147:8 148:8,18	memorandum
54:16 64:18 111:6	35:15 36:16,17	136:3	154:14 157:12,14	145:7,12,21
159:19	37:22 38:20 40:8	male 115:20	160:16	mention 96:2
lines 73:16 119:13	43:16 44:9 45:19	malfunction	meaning 73:7	104:13
link 110:2	52:20 53:6 73:12	142:17	87:10	mentioned 18:13
list 5:16 21:19	79:3 99:17 126:8	man 31:13 46:17	means 27:7,18	20:8 78:10 128:21
88:16	128:22 135:2	management 96:12	28:18 37:15 74:10	137:22 147:8
listener-ship	136:5 146:15	97:6 116:20	meant 13:11 130:6	151:17
144:19	147:5,21	managers 116:15	measure 75:14	merging 119:12
listening 99:12	looks 38:21 95:21	118:14	77:2,13 80:17,18	message 137:1
literacy 109:20	106:19 116:13	mandate 66:19	measures 58:13	151:4
literally 133:3	117:12,12	manner 30:2	mechanism 90:17	met 1:19 112:4
literature 17:3	Loris 2:22 9:20	mantras 30:4	mechanisms 36:12	147:10 162:18
litigation 63:15	lot 23:16 25:16	manufacturers	media 2:2,13,15,18	method 76:18
little 7:19 8:5 18:14	30:17 36:3 39:13	40:18 87:10	2:21,22 9:18,21	mic 67:10 124:1
23:21 24:13 38:18	44:19 47:5,9 48:5	map 105:18	11:7,9 12:9 16:21	mid 125:6
39:6 51:22 58:8	49:17 55:5 59:15	map 103.18 march 60:3,17	17:9 19:3,11,19	MIGNON 4:5
59:15 78:8 86:7	68:12 106:11	marches 60:13	48:12 125:16	million 24:11 96:18
117:7 133:1 137:9	108:15 118:9	Maria 2:8 10:6	137:19	mind 41:17 85:11
137:16 138:17	130:11 131:20	MARK 2:23	meet 48:19 158:2	99:9
live 59:21	134:15,19 143:4	market 4:18 17:9	158:15 162:16	minds 131:7
lives 134:7	143:16 147:10	19:17 20:12,21,22	meeting 1:7,20 5:4	minorities 14:19
lobby 122:18 153:7	155:1 157:5,21	22:21 28:17 40:17	9:1 13:8 14:6	47:15 65:3 98:10
location 90:10	161:16	52:13 74:10 76:18	22:15 27:11 56:19	128:9 137:5
91:12	Lots 55:11	86:10 92:11 94:16	93:8 97:15,22	minority 2:2,15,18
locations 51:3 52:7	love 114:18 155:17	161:6	124:3,6 161:19	11:7,9 19:18
long 22:8 45:3 46:8	low 51:15 99:5	markets 19:8,14,14	162:7,12,19	35:16 37:5 55:11
54:8 57:1 60:12	lowest 59:19	21:6 53:2	163:12	75:15 76:15 80:8
64:7 113:3 133:17	low-income 105:21	marry 135:1	meetings 34:9,10	83:20 84:5 86:4
143:17	low-power 50:13	martial 21:10	97:2	94:11 113:17
longer 53:12 64:4	51:18	Martin 84:3	meets 158:16	128:5
longest-delayed	low-powered 50:10	mass 63:1	megabyte 45:13	minority-owned
57:4	LPTV 51:1 52:12	matching 95:15	megabytes 24:17	47:4 96:17 128:11
look 6:19 7:10	52:18	Mater 71:9,11	24:21 25:1 26:11	minute 116:1
16:14 17:9,19		matter 52:19 74:8	megahertz 25:9	minutes 22:10 93:6
39:10 49:19 51:21	M	141:14 145:8,9	26:6,13,18,19	misapplied 59:4
73:20 84:5,7 85:5	M 3:3 4:13	159:4 163:15	96:15	misconduct 126:6
90:14 91:15 94:18	Madam 85:3 93:15	matters 75:2,8	member 14:13	missing 62:14
97:12 103:17	main 26:1	128:15	114:17	117:20 151:14
104:3 110:5	maintain 36:6	mature 137:9	members 2:1 69:18	mission 14:16
116:14,15 118:12	major 36:15 53:2	Maurice 133:1	70:1,4,5 73:8	mixing 65:6
120:22 121:16,17	139:12	McGINNIS 2:5	87:16 112:1,4,11	MMTC 97:9
126:6,10 127:18	majority 58:16	12:1,1 14:7	112:13 115:3	102:17
137:3 155:19	62:15 64:5 69:1,2	mean 24:3 25:22	133:4 139:9	mobile 16:2 23:7
156:20 158:4	making 21:9 28:20	29:15 46:9 64:8	142:15,19,20	25:10 27:19 28:17
looked 102:20	29:19 33:9,19	81:9 104:1 108:20	144:15 146:13	29:1 32:7,8,10
125:3	40:2,13 95:10	110:5 133:2 138:9	membership 5:11	34:21
			1	
		ı	ı	ı

model 17:8 20:3,4	names 9:9	25:9 34:19 55:4	number 5:5,6 16:8	89:6 94:7 98:8,13
20:6,9 97:12	NAMIC 138:21	99:14 117:10	21:5 48:4 49:10	100:22 107:12
117:19 138:20	Narasaki 112:15	news 57:7 116:16	74:11 76:2 87:19	111:11 120:10
models 15:15	narrow 87:22	118:14	112:5 134:2 135:7	132:12 146:19
138:20	narrowed 151:8	newspapers 134:1	n/a 4:18	151:15 156:1
moment 14:11	narrower 153:16	134:2,3		157:7 161:22
136:1	Nation 140:18	newsroom 114:15	0	162:4
money 26:5 27:13	national 2:10,13,14	117:8,11	objective 25:11	old 112:20
90:5 109:4	2:24 3:2 9:18	newsrooms 115:14	objectives 15:7	once 34:12 45:21
monitors 15:20	11:5 12:5,15 13:4	115:21 116:14	23:22 25:7 27:10	ones 116:16 126:8
month 24:10,17,21	52:15,21 65:11	118:17 133:4	obligation 46:1,2	one-paragraph
25:1	69:19 97:9 105:19	NFL 81:20	obligations 42:1	63:17
months 20:21	109:19 114:13	nice 5:7 92:5 97:12	obtain 17:12	ongoing 90:21 94:3
56:20,22 83:18	132:19	Nicely 111:21	obvious 93:7	120:20
morning 71:17	Nation's 159:18	Nicol 2:18 4:19	obviously 32:14	online 48:10,11
Motion 98:15	nation-wide 16:1	11:8 15:4 38:11	48:1 66:18 73:22	49:7 53:13 118:7
mouth 126:15,22	40:9	92:19 93:14 98:16	96:20 134:19	on-site 126:8
127:10,18	Native 2:22 9:21	101:5 103:13	158:7	open 22:13 32:13
move 26:17 29:7	116:22	104:21 110:3	OCBO 11:20,22	65:14
68:14 79:1 85:12	NCLR 97:10	111:18 136:11	87:13	openers 15:21
92:19 96:5 97:12	near 55:14	146:21	occurred 98:3	opening 4:2 130:5
143:16	necessarily 43:3	Nicole 2:5 12:1	occurs 90:5	operate 33:7 40:20
moves 28:6	101:11 102:13	14:7	October 34:5 50:6	43:22 130:9 156:9
moving 23:16 28:1	necessary 40:19	Nicol's 157:19,19	OEM 87:10	156:14,21
34:13,19	need 16:10 20:16	158:12	offer 16:13 74:10	operating 156:6,11
MPVDs 28:8	21:2,3 45:12 53:5	nine 140:10 141:13	94:6 96:6,8 103:5	operation 26:4
multiple 23:17	76:17 78:18 80:11	non 24:14 41:7	107:13 138:13	operations 40:16
multi-casting 26:10	80:11,12 101:17	42:3	160:20	opinion 57:20
multi-channel 76:3	109:9 110:13	non-discriminati	offered 72:19 157:7	58:16 60:10,12
muscle 17:16	121:5 124:13	113:5,8 126:2	offering 72:17	61:8 64:20 66:21
mutual 75:2	136:6 154:1	normally 43:21	97:10,21	86:13
MVPDs 84:14	needed 15:15 74:8	notch 126:4	office 4:7 86:11	opportunities 2:6
MWB 77:13	needs 17:4 18:15	note 61:6 98:6	88:20 108:1	4:8 10:3 14:19
MWBEs 73:7	19:2 21:22 22:22	107:22 116:12	112:19	15:13 16:12 36:7
74:20 95:9 97:21	26:15 45:8 132:1	128:3 156:5	Officer 2:2,4,5 8:3	36:13 37:11,19
	142:8 143:1	158:21	105:2	38:4 86:12 87:5,6
<u>N</u>	neighborhoods	notes 145:3	Officers 14:7	138:4 139:2
NAB 48:3 49:16	62:8	notice 5:21 31:11	officially 50:14	opportunity 2:12
92:14	net 28:14 42:22	32:11 40:1 83:12	114:10	33:20 35:14 37:1
NABJ 114:17,20	network 142:16	83:17 121:8	off-channel 135:21	37:3,18 45:22
115:5 117:18	networks 115:8	161:21	OGC 84:17 120:4	73:5,6 112:17
118:9 133:1,4,19	neutral 61:19 62:3	notices 34:14	Oh 120:9	113:3 121:11,12
138:20	63:2 67:1,9 76:18	notification 146:2	okay 13:16 22:18	139:11,17 140:4
NABOC 50:6	neutrality 119:10	notify 145:16	41:1 46:12,20	162:14
nab.org/diversity	never 113:19 128:7	noting 141:6	54:4 56:3 68:11	opposed 40:10
118:8	130:11	NPRM 34:3 36:3	69:13,21 70:6,13	82:14 83:1 85:19
name 70:10	new 4:23 7:16 23:6	nuance 149:22	80:1 82:3 83:4	89:3 92:2 98:14

			I	I
100:12 101:8	owned 2:25 12:15	95:13 99:19	131:2,21 133:12	64:1 66:3 82:8
104:20 111:17	116:19	119:19 123:14	137:20 138:6	96:1 109:19
138:14 140:8	owners 38:6	128:4	143:17 144:20	plane 48:9
147:16 151:5		particularly 8:17	147:22 155:11	planned 35:22
154:21	P	30:8 35:21 50:18	157:4	planning 50:5
opt 26:3,8	package 161:13	77:5 82:18 91:11	people's 134:7	plans 155:8
opted 34:21	packaged 89:16	94:17 99:16 126:9	perceived 129:12	platform 76:17
optimal 29:22	page 64:14,15	128:5 160:6	percent 62:5,6 64:5	99:17 119:10
option 27:1 47:7	pages 60:12	parties 57:8 62:18	113:18 116:21,21	137:18
options 25:19,22	pains 61:6	63:9,16,22 159:5	117:3 118:15,15	platforms 84:19
27:4 39:11 47:16	pander 65:5	159:18	125:5	119:12 120:12
oral 57:9,15	panel 50:5 87:14	partitioning 39:5	percentage 45:13	126:3
order 19:13 30:7	89:13	partner 35:18	perfect 85:1	play 13:17 41:9
34:12,13 45:21	panels 89:19	43:12 44:5,6,21	period 34:6,17,18	96:4,21
Ordering 109:19	panning 103:3	45:16,17 117:18	43:11 45:21	players 36:15
orders 34:15	paper 6:17,21,22	partnering 26:10	113:15	playing 71:14
ordinarily 6:15	par 110:20	partners 2:12 98:1	periodic 75:7	pleadings 123:15
organization	part 16:1 25:3	98:1 133:7	person 14:11 48:8	please 39:16 41:2
131:14 143:2	38:16 41:14 42:18	partnership 96:13	persons 73:10	70:10 85:21 156:3
organizations	44:12 51:4 55:22	partnerships	perspective 44:6	163:6
49:14 89:20	60:16 61:7 73:11	101:20 102:3	46:19 55:12 61:13	pleasure 68:8
115:22 140:11	80:15,18 106:5	103:2,22 109:21	79:4 81:2,11,16	plug 106:21
160:5	110:15 143:9	party 159:9 160:4	86:9 129:13 157:3	point 13:8 31:21
organize 14:6	154:7	pass 14:12 67:10	petition 112:18	33:16 43:5 52:10
original 60:18	parte 34:9 48:15	path 82:17 83:6	159:3,10 160:18	61:12 78:16 79:3
originally 113:7	partes 22:13	139:14,19	petitioner 63:3	81:2,7,12 100:8
ought 98:6 158:4	partially 136:8	paths 147:13	phone 5:5 9:4,7,8	104:15 111:8,10
158:11 159:12	participant 104:8	pay 27:20 48:8	10:22 24:14,15,18	117:2,15 123:1
outcome 77:8,10,15	participants 23:11	94:17	70:5,12 92:10	134:5 135:7
88:4,5 90:6	82:13	paying 28:4	112:13	142:10 144:7
outcomes 30:1	participate 26:2	payment 27:17	picked 130:22	148:11 150:8
outlets 16:21	27:5 29:14 30:9	payola 128:15	picture 110:5	155:6 161:4
outline 96:1	31:9 37:12 49:15	PBS 49:12,17	piece 49:21 65:3	pointed 8:10 84:12
outlined 101:5	50:5 51:10 70:3	pedabyte 24:11	149:20 151:13,18	84:22 85:9 135:13
outreach 30:12	Participated 3:22	pedabytes 24:10	151:21	pointing 124:14
47:13,22 48:14,22	participating 25:20	pending 123:15	piecemeal 40:11	points 91:6 121:21
75:15 76:4,10	29:21 31:20 79:5	135:9,10,12,19	pieces 6:20	poised 17:7
80:19 95:14 113:6	79:8	150:11 153:8	piggy-back 110:22	policies 14:18
outside 65:10,14	participation 29:12	159:3	pilot 17:8 20:18	57:14 66:10
123:12 143:2	51:14 76:15,19	people 5:5,6 9:8	43:17 44:2 56:11	policy 17:14 20:17
overall 24:8 73:1	77:2,13 83:21	14:15 30:13 31:7	pilots 98:21	99:20 100:17
overcome 65:12	84:6 95:16 104:12	36:14 48:6,22	place 79:17 102:13	143:13
overruled 57:8	144:19 159:22	54:14,20 94:19	109:22 117:6,9	politely 121:3
overturn 57:16	particular 5:20	99:6 102:5 105:21	places 126:15	political 19:10
overturned 63:20	6:16 7:5 19:14,16	107:2 115:21	159:2	popular 137:6
overview 4:3 18:20	31:12 36:21 37:20	116:16 117:12,13	plan 34:1 52:9,13	population 26:21
22:9	45:8 60:11 95:5	118:16 121:12	58:5 59:13 62:5	26:22
	•	-	-	

populations 32:2	38:16 45:3 49:7	24:16,18 35:10	promise 22:8	provides 26:12
posed 85:6	56:10 66:22 68:1	62:20 78:18 84:16	promote 15:17	51:14
position 65:22	78:11 95:10 114:3	86:7 92:10 101:17	36:4 119:21	providing 16:3
116:3 122:13	presentations 6:7	137:8,9 142:4	promotes 99:4	40:8 74:21 76:1
possibility 36:22	30:21 48:10	problem 117:9	promoting 28:16	86:19 150:10
37:4 99:13	presented 39:11	135:6	119:2	154:2
possible 15:6 20:14	83:11 112:7,9	problematic 62:3	proper 128:12	provision 43:12
29:13 30:2,11	presently 125:16	problems 146:17	proponents 64:10	provisions 109:20
102:19 145:22	126:13 145:10	procedure 145:20	proposal 41:11	public 2:22 5:13
possibly 105:1	preserve 37:20	proceed 85:21	43:10 82:5 120:16	6:4 9:21 12:2,17
post 34:16	50:12,19	93:12	121:8,8 122:2	17:4 20:5 38:20
poster 46:4	preserving 25:20	proceeding 120:15	128:20	44:18 62:6 65:6
postpone 92:18	President 3:2 10:11	120:20 151:6	proposals 4:15	66:20 83:12,17
potential 15:12	12:20 13:3 114:19	152:2 153:8	43:7 128:1 129:4	88:10,16 90:4,7
Powell 60:20	116:10 133:20,20	proceeds 23:5	131:16 132:3,4,6	103:17,18 108:14
power 51:16	President's 25:9	27:16,19	135:8,11,19	109:21 143:9
practical 74:8	presiding 1:22	process 20:11,19	136:22 137:3,13	144:16 145:2
77:12	Press 2:20,22 12:11	23:10,15 29:17	160:3	public/private
practice 133:12	12:13 132:18	30:10 31:10 32:21	propose 52:21	95:14 101:20
144:12 147:9	pretty 54:19 66:3	32:22 71:7 74:16	141:7	103:2,21
practices 5:12 7:5	71:20	74:20 86:8,13,14	proposed 5:21	publishable 88:9
7:15,15 73:21	prevent 119:22	143:16 145:19	31:11,12,13 32:10	pull 19:13 20:21
87:21 88:10,17	preventing 114:2	160:21	32:11 40:1,1	pulled 18:22 19:8
89:10,15 95:8	previous 89:14	processes 35:1	52:13 84:5 113:9	pulling 91:12
96:19,21 97:20	pre-nup 46:14,16	107:17	143:1	purchase 96:14
98:2 101:19	46:18	procurement 73:6	propounded 160:4	purely 36:14
102:15 103:14	price 31:15,17	73:21 84:13 87:20	prospectors 47:10	purpose 73:1
106:1,18 107:8,16	primarily 127:3,10	88:9 89:10,15,18	protect 43:6	purposes 28:21
131:8 133:9	primary 114:1	90:13 126:2	protected 50:15	139:12 140:7
134:15 139:19	prime 25:6	produce 155:5	51:11 67:8	pursue 63:4 107:4
155:14	principle 60:21	product 129:15	protection 51:14	pursuing 66:9,10
pre 34:13	119:9	143:7	52:18	pursuit 25:8
precedence 65:9	principles 73:18	productive 17:18	protections 32:1,2	purview 94:4
precedent 58:10	96:20 105:5,16,18	professional 17:16	159:21	160:15
precedential 60:22	106:1,10,17 107:8	138:7	protocol 161:11	put 7:2 8:8 34:3,12
precedents 60:14	107:18 110:9	proffer 88:13	prove 61:18	100:14 107:11
preceding 138:16	prior 58:3 60:14	program 60:8 74:4	provide 5:11 6:3,7	114:16 115:1
predicted 52:1	priorities 28:14	programming 76:4	6:15 7:3,14 16:9	122:2 127:22
prefer 124:8	49:2	programs 61:5	17:4 25:11,18	131:1 133:15
premise 119:2	priority 33:18	125:1	71:5 74:22 76:8	135:4 138:9 140:1
prerogative 55:19	private 73:20 74:1	progressive 107:7	77:11 81:13 83:9 151:21	142:8 155:7
prerogatives 141:2	75:5,6 87:3,5	= '		157:21 158:6 159:8 163:2
present 2:1 3:1 72:21 114:22	102:7,21 109:21 110:11 159:15	project 6:10,16 18:16 115:13	provided 19:16 86:22 87:1,2	putting 106:16
120:1 152:10	pro 71:5	132:22	providers 23:7	131:7 136:22
presentation 4:10	pro 71.3 proactive 138:17	projects 6:20 24:8	29:6 32:7,8 34:22	131.7 130.22
4:12 22:7,12 35:9	probably 20:19	104:8	87:11	145.7,11 151.22
7.14 44.1,14 33.9	PIUDADIY 20.17	104.0	0/.11	133.11
		I	l	l

PWDs 73:11	races 65:17	reasonable 28:7	95:13 129:8	reiteration 138:16
P-R-O-C-E-E-D	race-based 58:13	reasons 55:12	recommends	reject 141:9
5:1	racial 62:7 65:19	59:16 108:12	119:14	relates 33:12 83:21
p.m 1:21 5:2	65:21 67:6	110:17	record 39:13 59:13	124:19 127:16
163:15	radio 10:5 92:14	reassignments 28:5	66:5 84:20 95:18	145:6
103.13	128:6,9,22 155:10	Rebecca 48:13	163:15	relating 128:1
0	163:5	receive 26:5,6 27:8	recorded 13:14	relationships 74:5
quarter 54:9,9,9	raise 153:5	31:21,22 37:12	recover 33:11	87:7
question 26:20	raised 153:6,12	145:14 149:6	recruit 74:1 133:12	released 19:5 20:4
36:19 38:9 50:10	159:4	received 29:5 34:7	recruited 139:9	34:5 116:7
67:21 83:18 85:14	ramifications	160:13	recruiting 133:9	relevant 159:11
103:16 114:8	70:19	receives 146:3	recruitment 124:22	Reliability 155:7
120:14 144:9	range 25:18,22	receiving 26:19	126:22 127:4,10	reliable 39:6
154:5 158:22	rappateur 70:16	recitation 151:14	127:18 130:18	relied 51:1
160:8	rate 94:18	reclaim 52:21,22	140:8 144:12	relies 143:2
questioned 58:15	rationale 119:20	53:4	recruits 126:14	relieve 24:1
questioning 58:10	reach 26:21,22	reclaiming 52:14	recused 58:1	relinquish 23:4
questionnaire	59:18 80:8	recognize 15:2	red 159:19	26:3
83:13	reaching 25:8	29:10 125:15	reduction 28:15	reluctant 92:15
questions 17:6	79:12	recognized 7:15	Reed 3:4 4:8 9:1	93:12
19:12,15 21:1,16	reaction 144:2	recommend 6:9	11:20,20 16:22	rely 127:3 155:20
21:21 22:2,11,16	read 39:13 63:9	64:21 76:22 96:22	18:11 91:7 117:17	relying 134:14
30:14 35:4,6 36:4	reading 64:21 99:8	recommendation	134:18	remaining 61:11
36:18 44:11 47:1	ready 8:22 16:16	77:8,22 85:22	Reed's 88:20	remains 52:8
53:8 62:1,12 63:8	85:14	89:5,8 97:17	reflected 49:21	remand 63:10 66:5
67:7,11,17 74:17	real 46:15,16 51:2	98:16,18 105:15	regard 39:19	remanded 62:17
78:4 85:5,13	71:4 134:7	108:2 119:15	regarded 114:5	remands 62:15
88:21,22 91:19	realistic 72:3	120:5,8,18 124:17	regarding 83:12	remarks 4:5 18:2
95:3 98:9 101:4	realize 113:2	124:19 127:15,22	regards 96:1	67:15 71:12
103:13 120:11	really 7:7,8 23:8	138:14 144:6,8,22	102:10	remedy 120:1
143:4	41:16 43:16 46:3	145:6 159:8	regional 16:1	remedying 61:3,12
quick 22:19 30:2	46:6 51:5 52:5	recommendations	Regretfully 14:10	reminders 115:17
75:19 98:18 103:6		5:16 19:6 67:16	regulated 74:6,13	remote 98:21
142:16	61:17,17 63:3	68:14,18 69:5,6,9	74:19 75:6 77:14	repackage 158:13
quickly 8:19 29:8	67:4 71:14 82:4,6	72:11 73:20 92:16	79:11 81:4 86:11	161:17
30:4 73:19 75:12	84:4 101:13 103:8	112:7 118:21	90:11 119:11	repackaged 158:2
137:18	106:16 122:8,15	129:18 131:21	regulatee 146:4	161:5
quietly 83:7	129:6,15 130:10	132:1 138:12	regulatees 113:6	repackaging 148:7
quite 65:3 78:9	134:7 137:1,16	140:3,10 142:2	regulating 143:5	repacked 34:20
84:9	138:22 144:14	143:22 144:3	regulations 76:2	repacking 51:3
quote 64:19	159:1 163:11	146:18 156:16	159:20	52:9 53:5
quotes 65:11	realm 138:7,8	158:1 159:13,17	regulators 143:19	repeat 10:13 71:22
quoting 64:15	real-time 90:21	161:3,7	regulatory 14:18	146:12 151:2
	rearranging 55:19	recommended	81:11 142:22	153:7
R	reason 18:3 55:16	95:12 119:9	reimbursement	replicate 87:14
race 61:19 62:3	64:6 93:12 135:4	137:15	28:1,4	127:4
63:2 65:6 67:1,9	144:10 155:21	recommending	reiterate 63:21	report 18:17 34:11
114:6 118:13		8		
	ı		ı	I

			I	I
34:12 45:21 68:17	141:1	81:2 82:19 84:13	139:4 141:16,21	42:1,5,6 43:9
76:11 81:5 83:10	respectfully 121:2	85:16,20 91:21	142:10 143:20	49:22 55:2 84:4
83:14,19 84:10	121:14 122:21	92:5 93:10 94:22	144:5 146:7,19	102:19 113:9,12
93:1 116:6,8,13	respond 121:13	98:5,10 101:3	148:11 149:9,12	113:20 114:1
116:18 118:3,5,7	respondents 87:19	103:12 104:11	149:14,21 150:3	119:1,11,18,21
118:11,12 128:4	response 37:8	106:11,17 108:17	150:13 156:4	120:11 125:7,9
reporters 116:14	restate 78:7	109:7,13,13 110:6	160:12 161:15,20	128:18 140:4
117:22	restore 145:1	111:14 118:18	162:1,6,13 163:7	159:18
reporting 84:13	restrictions 48:1	124:11,13 139:4	Roberts 2:19,19	run 17:8 100:12
115:13 132:22	76:21	139:20 141:20	12:19,19,20 53:10	110:14 117:11
reports 83:9	result 52:14 64:1	142:10 145:12	53:10,11,20 78:7	rural 50:22 52:6,15
repository 90:9	77:15 88:15	146:7 147:16	79:20 81:19 82:3	53:1,3 99:6
represent 5:19 6:12	113:20	149:18 150:13	92:20 93:10	Ruthanne 3:3 4:13
93:18 118:17	resulted 25:3	160:15,22 161:2	162:11	11:18 55:20 56:3
133:16 150:18	results 133:22	161:15 162:6	robust 93:7	67:18 68:5
151:20	retain 74:2	rightfully 39:2	rock 147:3	<u> </u>
Representative	retention 140:8	rights 23:4 125:20	rocks 147:13	safe 54:19
12:18	retreat 140:15	125:22 159:14	role 9:3 78:13,13	Safety 12:2
represented 7:1	141:2	rises 144:12	96:4 97:18 142:7	satisfied 58:20 65:9
49:15	retrogression	Rivera 1:22 2:1 4:4	142:22 143:5	satisfies 58:6
representing 131:7	114:9	4:23 7:22 10:20	152:22 153:2,4,9	satisfy 59:14 60:8
represents 33:8	return 46:2	11:15,15 13:5,10	153:14	66:4
request 81:10	revenues 33:12	13:13,16,19 14:4	roll 13:20	save 98:19
121:9 122:21	37:13 39:2	17:21 18:5 22:1	Ron 2:17 15:3	saw 94:2
requests 48:15	reverse 27:17,22	35:5 38:9 41:2	69:11 78:5 84:12	saw 94.2 saying 24:4 54:21
require 76:3 81:4	31:3,10,17 32:5	46:21 50:2 53:7	85:21 89:5 91:8	63:19 64:15 71:13
113:5	33:3,7 36:6,20	54:1,5 55:6,7	91:16,19 92:5	72:13 85:3 115:22
required 32:1 76:6	review 60:16	56:20 67:14 68:2	101:16 106:6	116:2 133:8
requirements	124:21 126:8	68:9,13 69:15	137:15	134:12,12,19
27:12 76:11,14	revisit 138:19	70:7 71:18 77:18	Ronald 4:16 11:11	135:5 142:6
requires 83:8 145:13	144:1 161:4	77:21 78:3 80:2	room 1:20 24:19	147:17 150:15
	revisiting 138:12	83:5 84:21 85:19	131:2 135:3	151:2,10 152:15
resale 39:1	154:9	88:14,21 89:3	139:15,18 155:11 162:21	152:19 156:1
research 15:6 17:5 18:15 19:12,21	re-packaged 32:9	91:5,18 92:2,4,9		says 54:11 58:4
20:3,3,9,22 71:3,3	re-purposed 23:6 32:9	93:5,11 94:7 98:5 98:13 100:22	Rooney 81:21 round 62:19 96:9	59:6,10 61:16
116:11 117:19	re-purposing 22:22	101:3,8 103:12	routine 60:3	62:5 65:4 67:3
researched 105:9	rhetoric 64:20	101:5,8 103:12	Rudy 112:15	127:1 133:5
residents 99:6	right 10:20 13:19	104.11,14,20	rule 69:1 81:21	152:17
resources 21:10	18:5 22:18 23:15	107.21 108.0,21	84:13 112:17	scenes 116:13
30:18 102:4	23:16 24:8 30:3,5	110:1,21 111:5,9	131:16	schedule 62:18
122:20	31:7 33:11 36:1	111:12,17,21	rulemaking 5:21	schedules 8:2
respect 6:15 27:13	42:11,12 46:11,17	112:2 120:6,10	23:15 31:12 32:11	scholars 18:22
36:10,20 37:6	48:1,2,19 50:16	121:19 122:22	40:1 112:18 121:9	scholarships 19:1
38:3,6,7 39:9,15	52:20 54:15 56:5	123:6,9,19 124:7	121:9 143:1 151:6	school 18:21 62:6
40:7 42:3 52:12	56:16 58:4 68:13	128:19 129:22	159:4,10	71:2
88:3 104:6 123:17	72:1 75:12 78:1	132:10,15 136:10	rules 15:17 16:7	schools 39:7 62:11
55.5 101.6 125.17	, 2.1 , 3.12 , 0.1	152.10,15 150.10	10.17	
	I	I	I	ı

00 15 100 10	542106121076	56 11 00 0 105 16	1.91. 122.10	16 4 20 21
99:15 100:10	54:2 106:13 107:6	56:11 88:9 105:16	skills 133:19	spaces 16:4 39:21
110:8,11,20	129:5 130:13	106:1 107:7 136:4	small 14:20 15:13	40:12 137:10
Schwartzman 2:20	135:14 137:17	seven 58:22 60:6	16:10 38:4,5	Spanish 128:10
12:10,10 67:20	138:1 140:16	share 23:5 26:9,11	Smart 24:15,18	speak 71:19 146:9
112:15 123:22	segregated 62:9	26:14 41:10 44:15	Smith 3:5 4:9 11:16	148:8 158:19
science 105:17	segregation 64:12	75:11 93:6 101:16	11:16 21:17 22:5	speaking 10:12,17
scientists 19:10,11	65:18,19	shared 88:7 157:5	35:9 36:2 38:13	45:2
scope 122:5 146:16	select 20:12,21	shares 130:15	39:9,18 41:19	speaks 144:9
scrutiny 58:6 59:4	87:18	sharing 41:8,17,20	44:14 45:2,7 46:8	special 129:16
59:7,14 60:4,8	self-measurement	41:21 42:8 43:12	46:12 47:20 50:16	146:5
61:16 64:2 65:8	86:4	44:16 45:5,6,16	51:12 52:10 53:15	specialist 19:11
66:4 119:18	sell 47:6	45:17 47:16 82:9	53:22 54:4,13	specific 47:15
search 90:3	selling 47:18,18,19	121:6 131:3,16	Smitty 21:17 22:3	128:1 140:2
searches 90:1	send 53:21,22 69:2	shift 45:15	35:7,9 38:12 41:4	specifically 122:5
SEC 75:20	70:2 156:21 157:9	shifting 44:13	41:5 55:9	128:22 159:17
second 25:11 39:19	157:13,18 163:7	Shooting 2:21	social 19:10 20:1	spectrum 15:14
45:14 54:9 55:22	sending 123:1	short 22:9 35:2	99:18	16:5,12 22:22
77:17,19 80:7,17	156:15	shortly 153:22	socioeconomic	23:4 24:2,3,6 25:5
80:18 88:13 101:2	sends 137:1	shots 115:14,16	62:10 67:4	25:8,10 26:7,18
120:5 124:18	Senior 4:13	118:17	sold 47:10	28:20 31:8 32:22
127:18 144:6	seniors 99:5	shovel 147:12	Solicitor 58:2	33:11,20 35:21
secondly 72:3	sense 9:6 24:7 58:8	show 48:3 92:14	solidified 96:12	38:17,19,22 39:5
87:13 90:11	70:18 83:2 142:20	128:8 163:5	Solutions 11:12	40:9,14,20 41:14
sector 73:21 74:1	142:20	shrinking 140:6	20:1	41:22 42:8,16,18
87:3,5 95:15	sensitive 37:16	side 32:4,6 36:6,10	Solutions4Change	42:20,22 43:20
101:20 102:7,21	39:22 51:17	38:2,17 41:7	2:17	44:14,16 45:1,4,6
103:2 159:16	sensitivity 117:14	102:8	somebody 48:8	46:2 52:14 53:1,1
sectors 86:20,21	separate 42:10,14	signals 28:9	70:8	53:4 94:10 95:9
87:9	120:21	significant 29:5	somewhat 71:17	96:14 97:13 98:20
security 65:11	separately 151:1	114:12 141:14	160:2	99:3,10 100:2
155:6	September 1:14	significantly 51:1	soon 161:8 162:20	101:4 110:14
see 7:6 25:2 27:2	19:9 34:4,4 96:11	similar 26:9 32:16	163:1	spectrums 15:19
31:5 32:4 33:4	112:5	76:5,9 89:19	sorry 47:19 120:14	spend 90:4
35:11,19 37:4	serious 67:1 146:3	120:18 125:22	141:22	spent 75:21
46:1,5 48:8 51:4	serve 16:21 37:5	simple 29:13	sort 30:3 33:8 36:8	split 43:4 101:15
54:17 59:13 63:9	105:19 144:17	simplicity 29:8,9	37:20 38:22 47:21	sponsor 89:22
66:5 90:19 91:4	served 32:2 87:17	29:16	47:22 53:2 60:15	sponsored 89:21
102:7,8,9 106:11	113:12	simply 79:6 80:10	60:20 61:6,11	spot 95:22
107:14 110:18	service 16:3 25:21	125:15 144:22	64:14,19,21 82:17	spots 51:8 99:4
124:9 132:5	32:3 51:22 87:11	sincere 14:12	87:21 94:2 95:17	spring 83:15
138:13,22 144:1	services 2:17 15:11	single 17:8,11	96:4,8 106:7	squeeze 52:16
153:14 162:22	15:18,22 16:9	126:9	110:18 134:18	SSI 20:7,12
seeing 16:7 22:3	37:21 71:6 76:2,9	sit 43:21	147:1,12 154:11	STA 43:22
135:15 138:3,4	79:13 86:20,22	situation 27:3	sound 20:16	stability 39:19
140:17	87:2 99:5 119:4	134:1	sounds 80:4,20	stable 39:10
seek 52:22	set 8:20 13:18	six 26:6 56:20,22	space 33:21 39:7	staff 47:3 124:4
seen 52:8 53:14	21:13 27:12 42:6	skeptical 59:15	138:5	125:18 126:16
	-	-	-	-

127:1,2,3,5,11	25:2 82:10 127:19	8:17 69:7 135:4	79:21 102:2 129:4	118:6 121:16
stage 8:20 18:17	139:20	135:14 154:1	supported 110:18	124:8 126:5 139:1
21:13 34:3	STEPHENS 2:12	158:9	supported 110.18 suppose 71:19	140:4 141:11
stages 34:14	Steve 2:19 12:19	subcontractors	122:18	143:18 145:17
stages 34.14 stakeholder 34:6	53:9,10 78:6 79:2	76:20	supposed 27:13,14	147:3 159:11
stakeholders 30:8	162:10	subgroup's 67:16	143:8 161:1	161:8
114:11	sticks 153:16,17	subject 83:13	sure 21:2,10 28:20	taken 14:21 16:19
stalled 114:7	stimulate 74:1	112:18 120:19	29:19 30:7,13	21:11 140:9
stand 16:15	stimulating 74:5	128:12	33:6,9,19 35:14	142:11 145:9
stand 10.13 standard 58:4 59:5	stop 95:3 98:4	subjects 149:8	36:13 37:17 40:2	148:11
60:4 66:12	116:4 158:6	submits 48:16	40:13 44:8 48:22	talent 103:7
standardized 76:10	story 66:7	subsequently 93:9	51:2 55:6 62:13	talk 17:1 18:13
standardized 70.10	strategies 95:8	substantial 37:13	78:9,19 81:7	21:17 22:14,15
standing 05.4 standpoint 136:17	97:20 107:17	sub-recommend	97:14 110:19	23:21 39:3 47:13
Star 2:21	straw 31:13	125:11	118:16 120:9	48:18 49:5 66:16
start 9:12 11:1	stream 26:12	success 29:11	136:3 144:4 160:9	66:17 94:14
22:19 56:15 71:12	Street 1:20	134:17	survey 86:18 87:19	109:20 118:2
109:22	strength 125:12	successes 102:7	suspect 78:16	162:14
started 41:6 115:5	strength 123:12	successful 87:18	115:19	talked 28:19 38:18
116:6	strict 58:6 59:4,7,7	131:4,19 155:4	sustaining 75:5	61:1 71:16 91:8
state 9:8 58:12 61:2	59:14 60:4,8	sudden 131:5	Sutter 2:21 15:4	105:8 106:6
71:1,8 145:5	61:15 65:8 66:4	sufficient 40:14	142:1	talking 23:2,9
stated 144:11	119:17	suggest 75:3,4	swap 21:6	24:22 25:4 31:3
statement 84:4	Strobel 2:21 12:8,8	92:17 99:2 143:21	sweat 157:22	33:16 35:21 36:5
113:8 130:5,7	112:13	145:21 160:14	Sweatt 64:12	45:4 61:9 91:15
states 1:1 51:20	strong 29:3 65:3	suggested 8:4 15:6	Sylvia 2:21 12:8	117:17 133:10
station 28:5 42:4	strongest 64:22	66:22 73:9 121:18	112:13	157:15
47:18	structure 104:5,10	125:20 149:6	sync 33:7	talks 61:15
stations 23:3 31:19	156:6	suggesting 130:22	syncing 74:20	tangible 24:14
47:6,10 51:15	structured 25:18	suggestion 73:9	systems 2:9 12:22	targeting 23:14
52:17,18 113:14	student 63:1	98:7 104:2 135:17	87:11	task 4:9 11:17
115:8 116:19	students 60:1	148:22 158:12	S.W 1:21	14:22 69:18 70:5
118:12 125:4	105:21	suggestions 131:15		71:18,19 72:7
128:11 143:10	studies 19:2	149:7 150:6	T	73:1,8 76:22
155:10	study 17:1,9 18:20	sum 27:3 37:11	table 4:1 106:15	78:20 84:10 92:16
status 36:11	19:5,7,13 21:14	summarize 112:10	124:12 134:15,20	141:12
statute 26:1 32:1	53:6 114:12,16,22	summarized 114:3	136:3,22 158:13	Taylor 2:22 9:20
51:13 128:16	117:18	summed 24:4	159:11 161:3	9:20
statutory 27:10	stuff 21:12 106:13	Super 142:17	tablet 24:22	TDY 16:4
51:12 66:19	108:18 156:22	supplier 4:16 91:13	tactic 63:15	tears 157:22
stay 47:17 56:4	157:10,13	137:4	take 6:9 7:18 9:3	technical 95:14
steady 39:6	subcommittee 8:18	suppliers 76:16	16:11 18:8 20:20	technically 26:9
STEM 102:10	15:3 68:16 78:5	86:10,17,22 87:1	21:5 22:7 61:20	technologies 137:7
105:5,7,8,11,12	92:12,22 93:19	supply 32:6 71:13	72:4,4,16,17	technology 42:17
105:18 107:1,18	94:2,5,9 111:19	74:3,4,9 75:8	79:16 82:19,21	42:21 44:12 71:2
109:3	152:5,8 154:8	support 6:3 14:8	92:15 94:21 95:3	76:7 105:17 109:9
step 16:20 21:8	subcommittees	23:17 29:3,5	98:6 102:14 117:7	teeny 65:14

Telecommunicat	101:9 107:21	116:5,12 121:5	111:4	Torres 2:22 12:12
2:8,15,19 10:7	111:18,20,22	122:19,22 123:9	tied 106:5	12:12 132:17
11:7,10	112:1,3,22 115:2	122:19,22 123:9	ties 44:11	total 62:2
teleconference 3:22	115:3 118:19,20	125:17 126:10	tightened 48:2	town 50:7
49:8	124:14 136:10	130:3 131:17,18	tightening 138:3,4	traction 147:10
telehealth 98:21	142:13 143:20	133:20 134:11,13	time 8:1 10:14 18:1	traditional 137:19
television 12:18	142.13 143.20	134:14,22 135:8	21:11,16 26:16	traditionally
23:2 50:11,13	163:10,13	135:13,17 136:12	34:2 35:4,10,13	131:13
103:17,18 108:14	thanks 9:2 14:12	136:13 137:2,11	54:7,8,16 56:2	transaction 98:3
155:10	18:7 80:1 104:15	137:15 138:10,11	57:2 74:15 75:12	transaction 76.3
televisions 44:18	115:9,10 163:9	138:15 139:1	79:10 87:16 91:8	transition 28:2
tell 18:7 71:22	theories 65:5	141:3,19 142:8	94:22 98:19 110:4	34:17 50:1 52:2
73:19 80:12,15,21	theory 59:8 64:9	145:9 146:16	111:8 114:22	translator 52:18
118:13 152:22	thick 112:8	147:11 148:2,6,8	121:15 127:5	translators 51:16
156:18 157:8	thin 111:6	148:12 149:22	133:17 135:11	51:19
telling 52:4 146:14	thing 23:9 44:12	150:9 151:3	138:2 140:12,18	transparency 29:9
147:19	58:14 60:9 81:9	150:7131.3	160:1 162:16,17	30:6 144:9,15
ten 20:21 22:10	96:7 113:1 121:4	153:4,9,9,12,15	timely 95:10	transparent 30:10
tend 107:3 127:4	135:6 141:12	153:18,22 154:14	117:17	travel 18:4
term 57:5,18 63:19	157:17	154:16,17 155:4,6	times 107:6	treats 127:9
terms 50:12 63:11	things 8:10 38:7	156:4 157:14,19	timing 55:2 122:11	tremendous 24:12
65:15 79:8 84:1,6	40:16 45:11 48:2	157:20 158:1,11	Title 119:4	tried 59:2 63:3
84:7 102:20	59:3 80:5 103:21	160:19 162:11	today 5:9 6:2,6 8:2	115:7
135:22 144:18	106:6,22 107:8	thinking 6:21 37:9	8:15 17:1 33:16	trigger 146:1
148:6 158:3	108:15 117:19	40:21 54:19 95:4	42:20 58:9,10	trouble 117:5
terrible 163:3	125:11 136:2	106:9	65:1 69:19 70:2	troubled 130:2
test 17:7 20:8,18	138:21 143:15	third 54:9 101:18	71:21 72:12 92:13	troubles 151:3
43:11,19	154:10 156:7	105:2 144:8 159:5	95:10 99:7 112:10	troubling 152:16
testing 45:21	think 6:8 7:11,13	159:9,18 160:4	114:21 122:14	try 7:17 9:16 50:9
Texas 4:12 56:1	7:17 8:10 15:12	thirdly 75:3	130:5 136:13	72:10 73:2 98:7
57:13 58:5,19	18:18 20:13,19,20	Thomas 3:4 4:8	137:4 139:18	158:13,14
62:6	35:12,19 40:6	60:11 64:3	142:2 147:6	trying 26:21 30:12
text 100:13	46:10 48:5 50:22	thought 8:7 94:5	152:13 154:2	33:6 36:6 37:16
thank 5:7 8:1,16,21	51:4 53:15,16	95:22 102:1,11	today's 15:9 64:9	37:20 48:21 50:12
9:14,19 10:8,16	54:14,18 59:16	103:4 104:13	told 20:20 156:8,20	50:19 54:2 59:17
10:19 13:5,21	61:7 64:22 66:16	105:22 156:9,14	157:1	100:9 133:14
14:3 18:11 21:9	66:21 67:14 69:20	156:17	Tom 9:1 11:20	134:11,16
22:1,5,6 35:8	70:21 73:15 74:14	thoughts 149:2	16:22 17:21 18:10	TUESDAY 1:12
38:10 41:1 46:20	74:15 78:15,18	150:11	22:1,2 88:20 91:5	Tuesdays 44:22
46:21 55:6,10	79:2,15 81:1,22	threat 65:10	98:8 136:10	tunnel 110:6
56:6,14 67:13	82:5,20 83:11	three 26:1 72:14,15	162:15 163:10	turf 48:19
68:2,5,7,12 69:13	86:8 89:16 90:22	72:18,20,21 73:15	tone 64:19	turn 7:21 22:17
70:6,13,14,15,21	91:7 92:14,17	75:10 139:12	tool 21:5 77:11	69:10
71:10 78:1,3	96:3,22 97:11	Thursdays 45:1	80:11 89:12	turned 116:2
84:21 85:20 86:1	99:10,22 102:14	ticket 48:9	tools 78:9,14	Turner-Lee 2:18
89:4,6 91:18 92:4	103:8 108:2,8	tie 94:1 105:1 108:3	108:21,22 109:9	4:19 11:8,8 15:4
92:5,7 93:16 98:5	110:16 115:15	108:13 110:6	top 33:18 62:4,5	38:12,14 39:17
,			. ,-	,

41.1.02.16.04.0	71.11		146.2	02.2.05.17.107.4
41:1 93:16 94:8	71:11	up-and-coming	versa 146:2	93:3 95:17 107:4
98:17 101:1,10	underlying 112:17	137:6	version 35:3 45:3	108:1 110:7
103:18 104:22	understand 7:4	Urban 2:14 12:5	53:12 112:8	118:15 124:9
108:5,11,17	16:11,20 30:14,19	69:20 97:9	versus 47:17	132:17 133:6
109:13 110:4	41:11 79:20 123:1	urge 121:3 129:3	vexed 160:2	143:14 146:9,12
111:11,20,22	136:19 142:6	129:17	VHF 26:19	148:14,15 150:7
136:12 146:22	143:14 146:12	usage 23:4	viable 77:11	152:10,17 154:19
148:2 154:4	150:16 158:14	USC 18:21	vibrant 25:14	154:22 156:18
161:10,22 162:4	160:9,14 161:1	use 23:7 24:5,16,20	28:17	157:8,18 158:19
turning 127:21	understanding	25:10 38:20 39:1	vice 133:19 146:2	wanted 21:16 43:5
TV 33:20 39:20	70:18 135:22	39:8 40:3,4 42:16	video 13:9,10 14:1	50:3 55:13,16
51:16,18 114:15	145:7,13	46:4 94:10 98:19	76:3 83:10	78:22 104:4
115:8	under-represented	101:4 109:4,9	view 24:8 65:8	112:16 117:15
tweak 59:5	137:20	110:8 121:15	viewed 134:10	118:2 130:18,19
tweaked 140:4	under-served	122:13,20 127:17	viewer-ship 144:18	136:9 140:22
twice 162:18	104:1 108:16	135:10 153:5	viewpoints 150:18	141:18 142:5
two 15:16 26:8 33:6	unfortunately	useful 68:1 135:20	views 68:22	157:1
42:9,13 72:15,18	29:15 114:8 127:8	159:1 160:11	violating 143:13	wants 44:7,10 48:17 82:19 130:8
72:19,20 73:14	140:9	useless 108:19	Virginia 71:1,8	
79:17 80:5 87:16	uniform 40:9 76:13	user 24:14,15,18	visited 114:20	wardrobe 142:17
90:7,18 101:11	unique 122:12	users 24:4,20,22	vital 141:15	Washington 1:21
121:18 143:22	129:13 131:17	uses 101:5	vitally 119:3	48:2 117:10
144:2 158:8	United 1:1 112:19	usually 82:17	voice 151:8,11	wasn't 35:14 66:7
two-step 86:13,14	units 104:1	U.S 24:9	voices 64:22	142:1
type 16:4 31:15 35:17 81:13 96:1	universities 66:8 66:20	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	voluntarily 23:3 86:18	way 7:8 11:2 25:18
100:19 102:22	university 4:12	v 4:12 55:22 64:13	voluntary 22:21	41:5,17,20 48:6 54:12 63:5 68:15
121:17 161:13	55:22 57:12 58:19	vacuum 17:15	23:10,11	73:2 75:15 76:10
types 17:10 36:12	59:1 61:18 62:22	valuable 129:16	volunteered 100:16	77:12 81:12 87:17
39:8 66:9 86:22	64:10 71:1	136:14 153:19	vote 68:18 69:1,1	99:22 105:13
100:5 105:12	university's 60:7	value 31:18 42:22	120:7 124:13	107:14 116:11
t's 85:2	62:4 66:3	74:9 106:12 129:6	144:6 152:9	121:10 122:17
1803.2	unlawful 127:7	136:20 154:14	158:12	127:14 130:16,21
$\overline{\mathbf{U}}$	unlicensed 4:19	valued 96:17	voted 120:18	131:10,12 137:11
UHF 26:17	15:14,19 16:5,12	values 105:10	Voicu 120.10	142:9 150:3 153:7
Ulloa 2:23 9:10,10	28:21 33:21 38:6	106:16	$\overline{\mathbf{W}}$	156:10,21 157:7
9:13,13	38:17 40:3,4,9,15	variable 52:13	wait 57:17,17,17,17	161:16
ultimately 134:8	93:18 94:10 98:20	variety 150:18	115:22 116:4	ways 5:18 6:2 26:1
unable 14:10	99:3,10,11 101:4	various 19:3,19	walk 137:13	51:7 58:16 99:2
unanimity 68:21	110:8,13	83:9 87:9 90:2	WALLACE 2:23	101:14 102:14
unanimous 57:20	unresolved 148:6	131:9	Walter 2:23 9:10	108:13 136:17
unbiased 143:8	un-license 28:22	vehicle 121:7	9:13	138:10
unbusinesslike	upcoming 95:9,16	vehicles 5:22	want 5:17 8:7,16,21	wealth 109:2
127:6	95:21	123:12	9:3 11:1 29:13,22	weather 56:5
uncovers 145:22	update 17:5	vendors 79:16	30:1 35:19 38:14	webinars 48:5,6,11
undercurrent 62:8	updated 53:17	venue 75:5	45:1 49:15 53:19	49:12
Undergraduate	upset 147:19	Verizon 96:13,15	56:1,10 82:1 91:6	website 30:16 89:9
		ĺ		
	I	I	I	I

90.17.10.00.2	12.14.14.50.2.17	127.10	1 700 24:10	l ————
89:17,19 90:2	12:14,14 50:3,17	workforce 127:19	1,700 24:10	3
140:2 155:20	80:4 130:2 132:13	working 4:15 14:5	1:00 1:21	3 31:11 89:8 90:16
weight 150:22	141:19,22 149:3	20:12 34:11,15	10 62:4,5	90:22 91:3 106:5
welcome 5:3 7:22	149:10,13 150:2,9	43:14 46:18 49:4	100 139:16	106:17 107:13
22:4 68:10 71:8	150:14 151:15	49:6 50:21 87:8	112 4:21	334 84:17
went 34:5 97:3	152:4,14 153:21	93:4 94:10 99:20	12 116:21,21	35 117:3 118:15
139:18 163:15	WIPP 138:21	112:4,11 116:7	118:14 124:21	395 127:16 144:10
weren't 156:16	wireless 16:2 27:18	118:22 119:14	12th 1:20	
Western 51:20	76:1 83:17,19	124:1 154:18	13 4:5 60:12	4
we'll 10:21 11:2	96:13	158:19	15 22:10	4 24:17 107:13
21:12 37:4 43:20	wire-line 76:1	works 30:15 36:1	150 24:21	4th 50:6 96:11
48:18 56:2 63:9	withstand 64:2	41:17,21 46:1,5	162 4:23	112:5
66:5 68:14,22	WMBEs 74:10	91:1 131:3	17 1:14	4:27 163:15
69:1,3 97:14	woman 57:11 92:13	workshops 30:20	18 4:7	400 34:7
100:9 124:12	women 2:8,21 10:6	89:20	19 116:19	403 128:13
148:3 161:3,8	12:9 14:19 75:15	worry 47:5	19.4 26:11 45:13	445 1:20
162:22	80:8 113:17	writes 133:2	1968 113:7	5
we're 51:6 144:5	women-owned	writing 58:21	1971 113:10	
156:20	76:16 83:20 86:5	written 112:21	1978 145:7	54:2
we've 20:5,7,20	wonderful 108:8	wrong 116:2	1990s 125:6	5th 58:17 62:15
23:16 32:17 34:9	130:13	wrongly 58:4	1993 32:19	50 64:4 113:18
35:10 43:19 44:1	wonderfully 67:22	wrote 64:3 139:22	2	500 25:9
48:4,10 49:13	wondering 35:16	Y	2 31:10 86:3 91:1,1	517 25:1
53:15 54:2 71:16	47:12 142:15	year 24:9 59:22	125:5	56 4:12
77:7 105:8 106:13	word 49:18 50:9	62:21 87:15 97:14	2nd 34:5 50:6	6
107:6 108:14	59:1 61:21 126:15	114:13 116:7,10	2:02 5:2	6 26:12,18,19 33:5
114:8 125:10,20	126:21 127:10,17	162:18	20-page 64:3	33:8
129:4 131:12,19	163:2	years 60:19 113:15	200 34:8	6th 107:3
131:21 135:14	words 18:8	114:17 120:18	200 34.8 2002 84:3	69 4:16 113:9
138:1 139:14	work 8:12,22 14:14	124:21 133:11	2002 84.3 2003 139:7	07 4 .10 113.7
147:6 148:18,21	15:5 16:16 17:17	134:16 139:16	2004 140:2 147:8	7
153:5 155:20	31:10 45:15 46:6	140:11 141:14	2007 115:6	7 4:3 33:15
160:7 161:5	46:7 59:3 66:18	yield 16:5 114:22	2010 16:7	7:1 57:22
162:17	73:17 78:21 80:6	York 117:10	2010 10.7 2012 17:2 18:20	700 96:15
whimper 57:6	94:1 97:6 100:17	young 107:2,2	19:6,9 118:9	
white 33:21 39:7,20	106:5 108:9 128:9	young 107.2,2	2013 1:14 83:14	9
40:12 57:11	129:15 130:13	$\overline{\mathbf{Z}}$	147:9	93 4:19 84:15
WHUT 12:17 WHUT-TV 3:4	134:3 144:20	zero 27:3 37:10	2014 23:14 34:16	98-204 122:1
	147:2 149:16		54:8,16,18,19	
WiFi 15:22 Wilco 2:9 12:22	150:4,7 154:8	\$	83:15 147:9	
	155:6,14,15,18	\$1.75 28:3,3	2016 24:9	
Wiley 113:11 Williams 2:4 14:7	156:7,19 157:1,8 158:17 163:10,10	\$287 96:17	2010 24.9 2020 25:10	
willing 30:9 81:13	workable 63:2		22 4:9	
150:5	workable 05:2 worked 7:7 112:6	1	25 60:19	
wink 67:2,2	131:9 132:18	1 24:11 31:5 91:1,1	28th 34:4	
Wink 67:2,2 Winston 2:24		119:4	295 116:19	
**************************************	137:12 157:2,21	1,000 48:17		
			<u> </u>	1

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Diversity for Communications in the

Digital Age Advisor Committee

Before: FCC

Date: 09-17-13

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &