FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
DIVERSITY FOR COMMUNICATION
IN A DIGITAL AGE

Monday, December 10, 2007

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

This meeting was convened, pursuant to notice at 10:00 a.m., in the FCC Meeting Room, at the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, D.C., Henry Rivera, Chairman, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chairman Henry Rivera Barbara Kreisman Andrew Schwartzman Rodney Hood Charlton Hoskins James Winston Susan Fox Anne Lucey Jonathan Adelstein Sheba Chacko (via telephone) Rebecca Klein (via telephone) Marie Long (via telephone) Vonya McCann Maria Brennan (via telephone) Robert Mendez (via telephone) Ray Gutierrez (via telephone) David Honiq Tara Sweeney (via telephone) Connie Simon (via telephone) Max Navarro (via telephone) Margarita Wilder (via telephone)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Opening4
Introduction and Agenda Review5
Working Group Interim Reports
Member Hood6Member Honig12Member Navarro24Member Klein69
Access to Capital Member Hood6
New Technologies Member Navarro27
Outreach Member Klein
Adjournment

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	10:04 a.m.
3	MEMBER KREISMAN: Is there anybody
4	out there?
5	MEMBER NAVARRO: This is Max
6	Navarro on the line.
7	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Hi, Max.
8	Welcome.
9	MEMBER NAVARRO: Anybody out there?
10	MEMBER KLEIN: Hey, Max, it's Becky
11	Klein.
12	MEMBER NAVARRO: Hi, Becky. How
13	are you?
14	MEMBER KLEIN: Doing good. Thanks.
15	MEMBER NAVARRO: Are you in San
16	Antonio?
17	MEMBER KLEIN: As a matter of fact,
18	I am.
19	MEMBER NAVARRO: Yes. Yes. It's a
20	cool day here.
21	MEMBER KLEIN: Yes.
22	MEMBER KREISMAN: Max, Becky, can
23	you hear us?
24	MEMBER NAVARRO: Yes.

1	MEMBER KREISMAN: Good. Anybody
2	else there?
3	MEMBER MENDEZ: Bob Mendez.
4	MEMBER SIMON: Connie Simon.
5	MEMBER CHACKO: Sheba Chacko, BT.
6	MEMBER SWEENEY: Tara Sweeney.
7	MEMBER BRENNAN: Maria Brennan with
8	AWRT.
9	MEMBER LONG: Marie Long with AT&T.
10	MEMBER KREISMAN: Great. Anybody
11	else on the phone?
12	Maybe we should go around and
13	introduce who's here around the table, maybe
14	starting with Rodney.
15	MEMBER HOOD: Yes. Good morning.
16	Rodney Hood is here from the National Credit
17	Union Administration.
18	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Andy.
19	MEMBER SCHWARTZMAN: Andy
20	Schwartzman, Media Access Project.
21	MEMBER HONIG: David Honig, MMTC.
22	MEMBER McCANN: Vonya McCann,
23	Sprint Nextel Corporation.
24	MEMBER FOY: Sugan Foy Digney

MEMBER LUCEY: Anne Lucey, CBS, 1 2 Showtime. CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Henry Rivera. 3 4 MEMBER KREISMAN: And Ι heard 5 somebody else just get on the phone. MEMBER GUTIERREZ: Yes, this is Ray 6 Gutierrez, Showtime Network. 7 MEMBER KREISMAN: Great. Thanks. 8 Welcome, everybody. Welcome 9 Welcome to the Fourth meeting of the 10 members. 11 Advisory Committee on Diversity Communications in a Digital Age. 12 Under our Charter Number Two, we 13 significant and rather 14 some exciting 15 projects underway. And I look at this meeting as the opportunity for the entire membership 16 to become familiar with what's going on with 17 those projects, and also to be able to make 18 any suggestions or share any ideas. 19 This, I look as more of a working 20 21 meeting than the one of presentation of final I also understand that Chairman 22 reports. Rivera has some additional issues to raise, 23

and with that I turn to Chairman Rivera.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay. 1 Thank you, Barbara. And thank you 2 for your continuing support of the committee. 3 4 We're all deeply indebted to you for all your 5 work. I think that we've got reports from 6 all three of our subcommittees, and then I'll 7 raise something when we finish at the end of 8 those reports, but I think we might as well go 9 10 ahead and get started, jump right in with 11 those reports, and I'll turn to Rodney Hood who chairs our access to capital committee to 12 see -- and get a report from him. 13 Great. 14 MEMBER HOOD: Thank you, 15 Mr. Chairman. And can you all hear me who are joining us on the telephone? 16 MEMBER SCHWARTZMAN: 17 Yes. MEMBER HOOD: Splendid. Splendid. 18 Well, I'm very happy to report that 19 we are making great progress in bringing our 20 whole idea of a Wall Street conference, and 21

We do have a rough draft of an outline, and I dare say that it's exactly

bringing that conference to fruition.

NEAL R. GROSS

22

23

very, very rough, but the important aspect is that we at least have a template for what we can do going forward in terms of putting the providers of capital in direct contact with those individuals hoping to receive funding so they can have minority ownership opportunities.

A great opportunity has come up through Ms. Kreisman's attention, and that is doing it at Barnard College, so we're looking forward to getting more information from the college, but that's a prominent women's college up in New York, so we'll be able to really draw both the Wall Street community, but also work with some of the university officials there at Barnard.

Do all of you on the phone have a copy of the tentative draft that we are planning as a conference? If you don't, I'll just quickly walk through it, in the fact that we are envisioning, beginning with an evening reception leading up to the half-day of activities.

So, the evening reception would be

NEAL R. GROSS

a public meeting of the Advisory Committee on Diversity for Communications in a Digital Age, and then we would follow our advisory meeting with a networking reception.

The second day we will convene at 8:30 in the morning and we -- and again, these are all proposed, but we would look at doing a media and telecommunications market trend and new business opportunities.

That would be a panel where would have folks who would possibly including Kennard, Michael invited, Mr. Powell, Eli Noam. They are from or Columbia Business School.

Another opportunity would be a panel where we would look at where to find capital for the media and telecom transactions, and that focus would be specifically on sources of capital.

We would then also look at, perhaps, doing а session focus on on strategies for securing capital. also like to extend an invitation for the Members of the Commission to attend this event

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

and especially giving Chairman Martin an opportunity to address the group.

Following an address of some sort by Chairman Martin, we would also like to give the other commissioners a chance to talk about some of the things that they have as current issues, and also, perhaps, words of advice that they could leave with those individuals hoping to secure capital.

Then later, we would have a closing address, hoping to invite Cathy Hughes from Radio One where we think it would be a great idea for those individuals seeking capital to hear directly from someone who's been through the process, to hear from, if you will, a very successful person who can say, "This is what I did in Point A and this is how I was able to take that idea to fruition, and really have an enterprise such as Radio One."

And after that we're looking at doing what we would call a beauty pageant of sorts where those individuals could meet with the funders, with their business plans. Of course, we don't expect transactions to be

negotiated at this event, but at least they're making contacts and they're giving those providers of equity and capital at least some contact points.

So, that's the conference in a nutshell. Of course, it's very, very rough, I mind you, but importantly enough, at least we've put pen to paper to come up with some ideas.

I think the next thing that we all need to do from our committee is, once we've gotten your imprimatur in the format, would be to then secure funding sources for the conference itself.

And fortunately, through Becky Klein's help, I have been able to make contact with a gentleman by the name of Robert Stuart who works with the Private Equity Council. That is a consortium of private equity firms where they have now a point person who can help them with day-to-day logistics, helping them look at opportunities similar to this.

So, rather than having to all individually go to Black Rock or Carlyle, he

NEAL R. GROSS

is the one, he is the one who would help us not only partner with those groups in terms of getting them invited to the conference, but also the Private Equity Council has expressed an interest in helping fund this particular conference.

What I envision as a next step now is, once again, we've gotten clarity around the program, going back to the Private Equity Council and asking them for direct funding.

And what I would like to do with working with our committee, is come up with a smorgasbord, if you will, rather than saying to someone, "Would you underwrite the entire conference," let's have perhaps a sponsor underwrite the first evening reception.

The committee had thought about maybe having that done at a Goldman, Sachs or a Bear, Sturge or something like that, then the next morning we would have the breakfast, again, trying to pick, if you will, all of the various events that require funding throughout the day, and maybe have unique sponsors aligned with them.

So, with that being said, that is my report and I'm open to any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank you very much, Rodney. Yes.

MEMBER SCHWARTZMAN: I just had a technical question relating to problems we had in a slightly analogous some years ago And this is for Barbara: Can the situation. funding Commission accept travel for Commission staff for an event like this, and is private sponsorship of the event itself problematic in any way?

MEMBER KREISMAN: I have to -- I haven't been to the General Counsel's office there. We have some representatives sitting there, because I wasn't sure at this point exactly what our role is.

Whether -- one of the things that was not subbed yet, whether this is going to be something that was being sponsored by the trade associations and some of the investment houses. or whether the FCC was going to have a co-sponsorship role, that was one of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	issues in play, and I thought I had to have
2	the answer to that before I went to the
3	general counsel, quite frankly.
4	The other issue that's in play is
5	the timing. And maybe you want to speak a
6	little bit to that, David, because you had an
7	idea that you floated pretty recently in an
8	email with respect to the Kagen Financial
9	Conference.
10	MEMBER HONIG: Yes. In March,
11	Kagen Research does an annual conference in
12	New York on broadcast finance.
13	MEMBER KREISMAN: You came up with
14	an April date in your letter.
15	MEMBER HONIG: Was it April? They
16	haven't changed the date.
17	MEMBER KREISMAN: Yes. You said
18	April.
19	MEMBER HONIG: Yes.
20	MEMBER KREISMAN: Beginning of
21	April was your last email.
22	MEMBER HONIG: I think that's
23	right. Yes. I think they moved it this year.
24	They are usually about 150 to 200 people

1	there, and the target group of private equity
2	houses that we're looking to attend are all
3	of them always attend. And large banks all
4	attend.
5	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: So we would piggy
6	back
7	MEMBER HONIG: Yes. It could be
8	done
9	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: basically off
10	of their
11	MEMBER HONIG: The day before or
12	the day after.
13	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes. Right.
14	MEMBER LUCEY: I just have one
15	other question.
16	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes.
17	MEMBER LUCEY: David, I assume that
18	you've been part of this. My question was:
19	Given the fact that, David, your conference in
20	the summers become so successful that to make
21	sure that the lessons you've learned from your
22	summer conference from being shared with
23	Rodney who put together this conference, and

as we can drill down to get as specific as we

can. I just raised that --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MEMBER HOOD: That's a splendid point, Susan, and, yes, David has been a part of our working group that helped us with the draft. He has been the great institutional memory, I think, of things of this nature.

So, not only has been involved along with the Chairman, Ms. Kreisman and also one of the former committee members, Mr. Ari Fitzgerald. So, those have been the informal folks working on this to date.

MEMBER KREISMAN: Yes. There was an informal get-together where some of these together, but this ideas came is an opportunity for everyone here that, if you have any thoughts about it, please speak up or if you have any thoughts after this meeting, including all of those on the phone there, all these documents were sent as part email, so you should be able to see, at least a rough draft of what we had in mind.

And the purpose, of course, is to bring people who need the financing to the place where the investors are and that makes

1	an easy it easy for them to attend the
2	conference, and so that's one of the goals,
3	educational, as to what's available,
4	opportunities that are available, but also put
5	people in a place where they're close to the
6	source of capital
7	MEMBER LUCEY: Well, the question I
8	have is
9	MEMBER SCHWARTZMAN: Hi. I'm sorry
10	to interrupt
11	MEMBER KREISMAN: in the more
12	traditional medias.
13	MEMBER BRENNAN: This is Maria
14	Brennan. I'm on the phone. I don't know if
15	anyone else on the phone is hearing static and
16	feedback.
17	MEMBER ON PHONE: Yes.
18	MEMBER ON PHONE: A little static,
19	yes.
20	MEMBER BRENNAN: I'm having trouble
21	hearing the speakers when they are at the FCC.
22	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. We'll
23	try to speak louder and into the mics. I'm
24	sorry about the static. I'm not sure what we

can do about that. 1 MEMBER BRENNAN: Thanks, Henry. 2 MEMBER KREISMAN: Do you know what 3 4 helps sometimes on the -- people in the phone, 5 if you would mute your phone unless you're speaking, sometimes some of that is coming 6 from your phones, themselves. 7 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: And also, if 8 any blackberries 9 you've got around speakers, move your blackberries away from the 10 11 speakers. That helps sometimes, too. So, Anne, do you have a point? 12 MEMBER LUCEY: 13 Yes. I was wondering. Ιf draft off 14 you that Kaqen 15 conference, are you sort of limiting it, again, to traditional media, because those are 16 the people who might be participating there, 17 as opposed to the sort of new media out there? 18 That's always my concern, is that 19 it always seem to drift back to just the 20 traditional media when maybe it's -- we want 21 22 to open it up to --CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes. 23

NEAL R. GROSS

MEMBER KREISMAN:

24

Certainly,

panels were directed to opening it up to other 1 2 opportunities, other than your traditional, to look for other ways to get -- this is part of 3 our discussion, other ways to 4 get chain--5 MEMBER LUCEY: Yes. 6 7 MEMBER KREISMAN: and not traditionally, because times the 8 many opportunities are not in what 9 people about today, but it's the future and emerging 10 11 technologies. That was at least the goals of our panels. 12 if the associating it 13 Kagen takes us away from that goal, 14 15 that's a thought. MEMBER HONIG: In the last two or 16 17 three years Kagen has actually opened its own conference up and broadened the definition of 18 its target group as well. 19 To what? MEMBER LUCEY: 20 MEMBER HONIG: To include new media 21 that interact with -- with traditional media. 22 LUCEY: Does it include 23 MEMBER

NEAL R. GROSS

that?

I

mean,

all

and

telepony

24

it's

everything? I mean, are we excluded by just 1 2 grabbing onto -- I'm just curious. I'm just -- because --3 4 MEMBER HONIG: They now include 5 substantial participation, for example, from internet companies that are distributors of 6 media. 7 MEMBER LUCEY: So, it's just media? 8 9 MEMBER HONIG: That's right. MEMBER LUCEY: Is that -- we're 10 11 focusing on media, it's not on all telecom then, is that the goal, is to --12 MEMBER HONIG: No. There isn't a 13 conference to be bootstrapped off that focuses 14 15 on both, but the one that probably, if we were to bootstrap off someone, it probably has --16 most of the players there is Kagen's. 17 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: 18 Yes. I don't think that the -- there's no intent to limit 19 this. And, in fact --20 MEMBER LUCEY: I know, I know, but 21 22 just wondered if you're drafting off conferences kind of geared toward one sector 23 24 of service --

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: It was just a matter of convenience. Some of those folks will be there who might want to come, and we thought it was a good idea to piggy back, but there -- again, as Barbara suggested, the panel -- the panel's themselves are intended to broaden the reach. MEMBER KREISMAN: Also, the timing, has that been established? I remember early

criticisms of April because there's a lot of conventions right along that line. That may not be the best timing.

I know that, you know, we certainly would like to have this conference somewhere in the first half of 2008, but that was one of the issues that had not been nailed down yet.

> CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Jim.

MEMBER WINSTON: And I share your concern, but I don't -- I can't think of a conference that exists now that's broad enough to cover all -- to cover the entire telecom industry.

But I think you're right. It would be unfortunate if we weren't able to broaden

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	the scope of our inquiry.
2	MEMBER LUCEY: Because I just
3	wonder about the venue, even. New York. I
4	mean, should what about Silicon Valley? I
5	mean, is that a better I don't know. I'm
6	just throwing it open
7	MEMBER HOOD: We were actually
8	thinking that New York, just because of the
9	proximity to Wall Street and
10	MEMBER LUCEY: Yes.
11	MEMBER HOOD: the banking
12	institutions there and the private equity
13	firms. There's no reason why
14	MEMBER LUCEY: There's a lot of
15	venture capitalists on the West Coast, too. I
16	was just curious about it.
17	MEMBER HOOD: It's a good point,
18	but I think initially we thought we'd do that
19	who knows. If this is such a success,
20	maybe we can take to the West Coast.
21	MEMBER LUCEY: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: David, Susan
23	raised a very good point that we discussed in
24	our working group in terms of the difference

between this conference and the MMTC 1 2 conference. Can you hold forth on that one? MEMBER HONIG: The MMTC conference 3 4 has tended to be for new entrants and small companies, although it includes 5 media and telecom, mostly media. 6 And the equity providers and debt 7 houses that come tend to be in the \$20 million 8 and under range. We'd like that to change, 9 but that tends to be MMTC's constituency. 10 11 idea of doing this in New York is to really focus on much larger companies and 12 larger transactions, which we hope could also be 13 inspired to set up or invest in smaller funds 14 15 as well. MEMBER FOX: It's helpful to know 16 that they're complimentary. 17 MEMBER HONIG: Yes. 18 MEMBER FOX: There's one --19 MEMBER KLEIN: I think Rainbow/PUSH 20 does one, right?. Wall Street one that's 21 22 coming up in --23 MEMBER FOX: In January. 24 In January, 5th through MEMBER:

8th.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MEMBER KLEIN: -- so that won't -- okay.

MEMBER HOOD: Becky, do you have anything to add to this conversation?

I don't. MEMBER KLEIN: I think the questions Ι had are being asked answered, other that just getting direction at some point when we can decide the funding sources and the profile of those sources.

if we do get it funded, or various aspects of it funded from underwriters Wall Street firms, is there are opportunity to solicit funders that are other Wall firms t.han Street that might be interested stakeholders in this?

MEMBER HOOD: I think that's a great point, Becky, and when I come up with our committee's help in terms of what the sponsorship opportunities should be, I have no problem at all in having anyone who wants to participate, participate in terms of being a funder, so it wouldn't be limited to them

exclusively.

MEMBER KLEIN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. The indications I'm getting from the chairman's office is that they're very interested in our pursuing this initiative, and the chairman, himself, is very interested in participating, so that's all very good news.

And so, if we're interested in moving forward, I think we should do that.

All right. Well, that's good. Let's do that.

And, Rodney, you've got the ball here, so we'll look to you for some leadership in terms of next steps and --

MEMBER HOOD: Very well.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: -- what kind of help you need from us to move forward with this.

As Rodney mentioned, the next meeting of this committee would be in conjunction with that conference, so it would be -- early next year would be our next meeting, and it would be there the afternoon before.

So hopefully you all can make your 1 2 way up there and, of course, we'll give you all the details and so forth of where that's 3 4 going to be, followed by the reception and so forth. So, it should be a very nice event, I 5 think, if we can it pulled off. 6 Yes, somebody on the phone? 7 MEMBER CHACKO: Yes. It's Sheba 8 Chacko. The static is still --9 MEMBER KREISMAN: I'm not sure what 10 to do about it. 11 Our telecommunications office, is 12 there anything that we can do about this 13 static? 14 15 MEMBER CHACKO: Can we reopen the bridge again? 16 MEMBER KREISMAN: Can we reopen the 17 bridge again? 18 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: 19 Okay. Hang on 20 just a minute. Is it just one person, or is everybody experiencing this awful static? All 21 22 right. If you all will hang up, we'll hang up here and reopen the bridge, and then, you 23

know, give us a minute or so and then call.

1	(Whereupon, the meeting went off
2	the record at 10:23 a.m. and reconvened at
3	10:24 a.m.)
4	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Hello?
5	FEMALE SPEAKER: This is better.
6	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Great. That seems
7	to be the consensus so far.
8	MEMBER GUTIERREZ: Hello? This is
9	Ray Gutierrez from Showtime Network.
10	CHAIRMAN RIVERA; Hey, Ray.
11	MEMBER GUTIERREZ: Much better. My
12	goodness.
13	MEMBER HONIG: Mr. Chairman, that
14	concluded my remarks.
14 15	concluded my remarks. CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Well,
15	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Well,
15 16	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Well, thanks much. As soon as Max gets on
15 16 17	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Well, thanks much. As soon as Max gets on Hello?
15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Well, thanks much. As soon as Max gets on Hello? MEMBER SWEENEY: Hello. This is
15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Well, thanks much. As soon as Max gets on Hello? MEMBER SWEENEY: Hello. This is Tara Sweeney.
15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Well, thanks much. As soon as Max gets on Hello? MEMBER SWEENEY: Hello. This is Tara Sweeney. CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Hi.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Well, thanks much. As soon as Max gets on Hello? MEMBER SWEENEY: Hello. This is Tara Sweeney. CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Hi. MEMBER WILDER: Margarita Wilder.

1	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Great.
2	Max or Becky, are you on yet?
3	MEMBER KLEIN: I'm on.
4	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay.
5	MEMBER NAVARRO: Okay. This is
6	Max.
7	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Hey, great, Max.
8	Okay, Max, since you're back, we're
9	going to go ahead and let you give your
10	report.
11	MEMBER NAVARRO: Okay. David, I'm
12	sorry, Henry.
13	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay. Can you
14	hear me?
15	MEMBER MENDEZ: Yes. This is Bob
16	Mendez. I can hear you clearly.
17	MEMBER NAVARRO: Okay. Henry, as
18	you know, the subcommittee on emerging
19	technology submitted a recommendation back on
20	September 27th and that had to do with DTV
21	subchannels. After that recommendation that
22	we did have David come back to the
23	subcommittee and ask us to consider three more
24	recommendations, and so we did.

We did have our conference call November the 9th. I think there were like four members of the committee on the conference call and two or three people that subject expects, and I believe two of them were part of the FCC Media Build Bureau.

Unless the committee members have a copy of the Congressional Federal Register or a booklet in front of them it's going to be a little difficult to explain what the subcommittee was trying to do.

At the three different recommendations that David proposed, David, to explain those recommendations and why the purpose of those recommendations were submitted again to the subcommittee.

Of the three recommendations we only looked at two, and basically they were endorsements, not necessarily changing any of the legislation that the FCC had already committed to.

But, David, do you want to just talk a little bit about the two recommendations and tell the committee why you

NEAL R. GROSS

1	decided to come back and recommend
2	particularly the recommendation one and two,
3	David.
4	MEMBER HONIG: These actually are
5	the only matters that
6	MEMBER KREISMAN: Hold one second.
7	This is like really weird, but whoever was
8	the last person to call in, you're the guy or
9	girl who's causing the static. The problem
10	is, I don't know who that is.
11	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: I don't, either.
12	MEMBER KREISMAN: Wow, I don't know
13	what to do. Does anyone think they might be
14	the last person who called in, because I'm
15	going to ask you to hang up and see if you
16	change, you make things better.
17	MEMBER MENDEZ: It could have been
18	me. Bob Mendez, was I the last one to sign
19	on?
20	MEMBER NAVARRO: This is Max
21	MEMBER KREISMAN: Bob, do me a
22	favor. Hang up and then call back again.
23	We'll see if it changes.
24	MEMBER NAVARRO: Okay. But the

static is not that bad on my end, anyway. 1 MEMBER KREISMAN: It is? Okay. 2 Why don't you proceed with the report and then 3 4 you can hang up and call back, Bob. 5 MEMBER MENDEZ: Okay. I'll do that. 6 David. CHAIRMAN RIVERA: 7 MEMBER HONIG: Do you want me to go 8 ahead? 9 10 MEMBER KREISMAN: Sorry. 11 MEMBER HONIG: These FΜ recommendations were really the only matter 12 that the diversity committee was charged with 13 reviewing that had been considered by the 14 15 previous diversity committee in 2004. We drilled down a little deeper and 16 really were trying here to accomplish three 17 things at once. First, to find some way to 18 Commission to address 19 encourage the the consequences of years and years of minorities 20 21 getting inferior frequencies, inferior, 22 particularly FM allotments, as well as allotments, lower power, farther 23 from the

community of light -- from the center of the

community where their audiences primarily reside.

And, finding a way, therefore, to help them to the extent possible consistent with other policies, relocate closer to their audiences. This would then effect have salutary on their creditworthiness and their ability to compete.

Another policy that we were trying to harmonize this with is the Commission's development of low-power FM, both as training facilities and as facilities that serve unmet needs in local communities.

And third was the longstanding policy that the Commission has had derived from the way it interprets Section 307(b) of the Communications Act, under which it's preferred that each local community that gets a station located -- a license to it should be presumed to be able to keep that allotment rather than having it moved somewhere else.

These are difficult goals to harmonize and I think the subcommittee has done a good job at finding a way to do it.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The first recommendation is fairly straightforward simply to endorse the Commission's recommendation to Congress for legislation that would eliminate third adjacent FM spacing restrictions found in the rules now for low power FM.

The second one recommends that essentially, to put this in lay language, if a licensee wants to move from a community that has only one station licensed to it, let's say it's East Manassas, and they want to move to East Arlington to be closer to downtown, they could do that provided that they -- that the licensee underwrites the cost of licensing construction in a full year of operation of a LPFM service that would be in new East Manassas and thereby leave that community with a service, perhaps even more locally focused on the needs of that community than original station would have been trying to serve the whole -- the whole market.

This would, thus, satisfy the 307(b) goal of local service. It would satisfy the goal of promoting low LPFM as a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

local -- as a local service, and it would also 1 enable stations to move closer to the markets 2 they're trying to serve. 3 4 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. 5 David, the recommendation --MEMBER NAVARRO: Okay. Henry, 6 7 those two recommendations are really doesn't conflict with any of the -- in any of 8 legislation that that's already 9 the proposed by the FCC, with consultations with 10 the Media Bureau, folks that were there. 11 These recommendations are basically 12 a refinement and an enhancement probably, to 13 legislation already proposed so, many members 14 15 felt pretty good about that and therefore we had majority of the folks 16 the on the subcommittee adopt these two recommendations 17 back to the Diversity Committee. 18 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. 19 Ι want to thank you, Max. 20 Jim, did you have a question? 21 22 MEMBER WINSTON: Yes, I do. Is the recommendation for all move-ins, or only move-23

ins where there's no remaining local service?

MEMBER HONIG: Well, right now, a move-in where there is remaining local service wouldn't need this, so this would really be aimed at move-ins where it would leave no remaining local service.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Any other questions?

MEMBER FOX: Yes, I have one. And this is an issue that we've actually talked a lot -- had a lot of policy discussions just internally. And disclosure would actually help us. And we just haven't weighed in in favor of these because we've always been cognizant of the policy issues around it.

Have you given thought to a back story or analysis if there is a large degree of -- urban migration has always been the thought that stations could eventually just slowly move into the city areas and we would end up losing service in the outlying areas.

Was there thought given in your discussions whether you take a look in two years or five years at that issue or, where do you go?

1	MEMBER HONIG: The thought, I
2	think, was that, first, when you have
3	relocations toward the center of a market you
4	have an opportunity for backfilling, but the
5	issue of remaining service to the outlying
6	areas is really addressed by this idea of
7	having a low power FM station
8	MEMBER FOX: It's creative. It
9	really is.
10	MEMBER HONIG: through the air.
11	And the idea is, it wouldn't just
12	be a repeater or translator, it would be one
13	that actually provides kind of the equivalent
14	of what a
15	MEMBER FOX: A real nickel.
16	MEMBER HONIG: class a LPTV
17	would do.
18	MEMBER FOX: Okay.
19	MEMBER WINSTON: Well, the question
20	of move-ins, in general, I think the
21	Commission has been relaxing the move-in
22	standards that allow people to do move-ins.
23	The concern NABOB has had is that
24	they've been mostly large companies. I mean,

you know, they are companies who have engineers on staff every day looking for new ways to move in stations, so that I haven't seen minorities taking advantage of the moveins. It's mostly been the big companies who are taking advantage of the move-ins.

MEMBER FOX: It's not cheap to go through the process.

MEMBER HONIG: Yes.

MEMBER FOX: Is it not?

MEMBER HONIG: Yes.

MEMBER FOX: It takes money.

MEMBER HONIG: Yes, it takes money just to have the engineers on staff to do be doing all the studies to see what can be moved in and how it can happen, so that I have -- you know, my experience has been that move-ins have been good for consolidated, but not good for small businesses and minorities.

So, I don't know that a recommendation that facilitates move-ins is a positive for our committee unless it's thought that the Commission is already going to allow these move-ins and this is sort of a back-

NEAL R. GROSS

filling to help the communities that losing service because the move-ins, themselves, Ι think have been very questionable.

Well, MEMBER HONIG: we've experiences with minority-owned companies that are going to be doing more move-ins in the future and would like to. The cost of doing so has always been an impediment and one of difficulties the imposed by the regulatory regime that discourages certain types of move-ins, is that no wants to invest the cost for -- unless there's going to be a result.

Where a station can be moved in, of enormous benefit. course, there's an As crafted, of course, it implies across board, and I'd agree with Jim that much more needs to be done to both relax the rules and take also minorities encourage more to advantage of them, and to reduce the cost of doing so, which may be the subject of another recommendation that we ought to focus on.

MEMBER NAVARRO: David, we did

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	agree, I think, that perhaps over the next
2	couple of weeks, months, the subcommittee
3	would meet again and, based on some of your
4	comments, we would agree to look at other
5	types of recommendations, right? Hello.
6	MEMBER HONIG: I'm sorry. I
7	couldn't understand the question.
8	MEMBER NAVARRO: David, I think the
9	subcommittee did agree that in the future we
10	would consider some of the other
11	recommendations as well.
12	MEMBER HONIG: Okay.
13	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. Shall
14	we vote on this? The Chair will take these as
15	recommendations, as a motion.
16	We take your point, Jim, that
17	perhaps this is not as focused on minorities
18	as it could be, but maybe we'll get some in
19	there. I mean, why not?
20	But, any other questions or points?
21	All those in favor of these
22	recommendations, say "Aye."
23	(Ayes all.)
24	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right. It

NEAL R. GROSS

sounds to me like the motion carried. Not 1 2 very enthusiastically, but it did carry. We'll forward this --3 4 MEMBER WINSTON: Can I be recorded as an abstention? 5 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, indeed. 6 We'll 7 forward this up the Commission, then, and see where we move from 8 Those of you who are here with me in 9 there. Washington know that we've been honored by the 10 11 presence of Commissioner Adelstein. those of you on the phone, you've just been 12 notified of that. 13 And I'm going to turn the mic over 14 15 to him. I think he's got a few things to say to the committee. 16 So, welcome, Commissioner 17 Adelstein. 18 COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: Well, 19 thank you, Henry. I appreciate all the work 20 you're doing and everybody here is doing on 21 22 this body. We really value your input. know it takes a lot of time from all the busy 23

schedules that you have and I just wanted to

thank you for that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I know we've talked a lot about -each of you, about the issues of diversity and how deeply I feel about it. There's no point in repeating any of that, but I just wanted to say that, and ask you a question subsequently, but my main point is that you're doing great work. It's very helpful to us. This looks fantastic conference on Access to Capital.

I think that kind of idea is great. I've had the concept of trying to get an even broader overview of all the different issues that you were doing and the other Diversity Committee is doing in MMTC and NABOB and all the recommendations and getting a body together which would involve all of you to some extent to talk about that, and I just wanted to make sure that you understood that that does not reflect that I don't value what you're doing.

I think what you're doing is incredibly important, in that there's room for a lot of discussion about all these issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

Now, one question, I really need some advice, because you're an advisory committee. I need advice. As you are probably aware, we have before us pending a lot of different ideas about -- actually, very good ideas that could be very helpful in promoting ownership that could come up as soon as December 18th.

So, I've got to figure some things out very quickly. And one of the fundamental issues I'm struggling with which some of you might have heard came up in the testimony before the House Commerce Committee last week, was the question of how you define eligible entities, whether it is a SDB definition, economically socially socially disadvantaged businesses, or whether it's the Small Business Administration basic definition, which is another proposal that's been made.

My preference is to go to SDB's, but I wanted to get the opinion of anybody here that was willing to share with me just how important that is, because to me that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

seems to be a fundamental issue, that all of the good ideas that we're talking about doing on December 18th would be vastly undermined, if not rendered valueless if we don't do the right definition.

I don't know whether you agree that that's correct or what -- I really wanted your input, just if you don't mind if I ask if anybody has any input on that -- on that question, because I've got to know and I've got to know fast.

So, you're down here, I got the experts, I want to just get a quick sense from you how important this SDB definition is versus a broader definition.

MEMBER HONIG: Well, I think from -

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: If I could just interrupt. I think that, Commissioner, we -- I was going to raise this subsequently at the end of the meeting to see whether the committee was interested in participating in this definitional debate, but the Chairman has asked us -- invited us to participate in the

further notice aspect of the things that you will be raising on the 18th. So -- but we can -- anybody is -- so we would be speaking as a committee at that point.

Now, if anybody has any points they'd like to raise with the Commissioner individually, have at it.

MEMBER WINSTON: On behalf of NABOB

-- not as a member of the committee, NABOB

would think the distinction is critical, that

if you're only talking about a small business

program, you're not going to do anything

significantly to advance minorities or women

because the vast majority of small businesses

are not owned by either minorities or women so

that you're not going to get to the heart of

the problem we're trying to address by an

overbroad definition of who's supposed to be

taking advantage of the programs.

So, I think an SDB definition is a starting point. It should be the minimum standard that the Commission should be looking at.

MEMBER BRENNAN: And, Commissioner,

NEAL R. GROSS

this is Maria Brennan with American Women in Radio and Television. I would concur with NABOB in that respect, to start.

MEMBER HONIG: I'd concur with Jim also. We did the math and for commercial radio, the first 95 percent of stations are owned by -- by SBA defines small businesses, so it's very dilute to begin with.

But among all commercial radio stations, 7.78 percent are minority-owned. Among SBA-defined small businesses, just 5.88 percent are minority-owned, so the -- if you use the SBA's small business definition, you end up with a beneficiary class which is even more dilute than the industry as a whole.

It would not only not be helpful, it would actually be harmful. It would actually be regressive. And the Commission could not possibly, with a straight face, adopt a definition based on small business, saying that it's going to help minorities when, in fact, it's going to exclude minorities more so than if it was just open to the general -- to everybody.

NEAL R. GROSS

Now, the ideal way to do this would be to use an SDB definition. The Commission has sought to develop one since 1996. Unfortunately, the research that it did in -- which got us, I think, from a Constitutional analysis standpoint, three-quarters of the way there.

And published in 2000 has been left stale for years. The underlying databases were about ten years old, and now the clock has been running, and it's, unfortunately, probably necessary to start over.

So the question now, unfortunately, is what can be done in the interim while the Commission concludes, possibly with a restart, the job of coming up with a constitutionally-sustainable SDB definition.

diversity The and competition in the rulemaking proposed supporters interim temporary procedure called Full File Review which would consider for each applicant for one of these programs whether the applicant has overcome disadvantages, the overcoming of which is both predictive, both

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

of their likelihood of success in a competitive environment, and their contribution to diversity, what experiences has the person or company derived which it could share with the public.

There is a good model -- there are models for this. two good One is the admissions policies used by state universities California Michigan in Texas, and after resolutions were passed that required raceneutral procedures in admissions.

And the other being the NAB's and the Emma Bowen Foundation's choice of candidates for their programs. The NAB's program, in particular, which does not just consider grades and test scores, but also considers experiences.

It's actually about half minorities, half women, and it also includes a good many rural broadcasters, small market broadcasters and veterans.

Those are substantial disadvantages that people overcome. So, I think there's a way to do this that would be race-neutral. It

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

would not be the ideal. The Commission should not lose sight of and should continue assertively to move toward an SDB model.

But, in the meantime, there's something that would be much more focused than the regressive SDB definition that has been kicked around.

And your point, Commissioner, that the Commission seems poised to adopt maybe 10 or 12 initiatives, eight or nine of those are contingent upon this definition, so that if the definition isn't solved before the Commission adopts these or at least before the effective date of when these programs go into effect, the Commission will have snatched defeat from the jaws of victory.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Andy, do you have something to add?

MEMBER SCHWARTZMAN: I think, in the interest of time, what I would say would just be to add detail to what's already been said. I just -- for what it's worth, the clients that I've been representing in this proceeding strongly concur with the thrust of

1	what you've already heard, and I could go into
2	detail for you, but I think the point's been
3	made.
4	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Is that what you
5	need?
6	COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: Yes, that
7	was any contrary view or
8	MS. CAREY: Actually, yes. On
9	behalf of the Chairman, I think that it's
LO	important to the committee that sorry.
L1	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: This is
L2	Michelle Carey from the Chairman's office, has
L3	joined us.
L4	MS. CAREY: On behalf of the
L5	Chairman, I think it's important for the
L6	committee to hear some of the legal concerns
L7	that we have with an SDB definition and as
L8	keying off of David's point, I think what
L9	we're looking at is a race-neutral definition.
20	And we've asked Matthew Berry, who
21	is the deputy general counsel, to talk to you
22	just briefly about some of the legal issues
23	about adopting an SDB definition.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes. Why don't

you sit here, Matthew.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BERRY: Thanks for the opportunity to speak this morning. As Michelle indicated the Chairman's Office has asked the Office of General Counsel at these definitional issues and we have done so in what Ι believe is a thorough and careful manner, and I think that these definitional issues that you have been discussing raise, very, very serious legal you know, you know, the committee Commission as a whole needs to take account of.

And we think that the threshold question here is whether or not you adopt a race-neutral definition or one that includes a race-based classification. And to the extent that you adopt a race-neutral definition, you then are in the world of what's known to lawyers as "rational basis or view," very, very lenient review in terms of the courts.

To the extent that you use a racially-based definition and I think it's indisputably clear that the socially and

NEAL R. GROSS

economically disadvantaged business definition, for instance, that's used in SBA programs, is clearly a race-based definition because there's a presumption that if you are -- if a company is controlled by African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian, Pacific, Americans subcontinent, Pacific Americans, and Native Americans, there's a presumption that you quality as an SDB, then you are in the world of strict scrutiny.

And under strict scrutiny, the courts look to see whether or not a program is narrowly tailored for their compelling government interest.

And, as the lawyers among you know, strict scrutiny is the highest level of scrutiny that a court will give a program.

And the Commission and -- this standard was established by the Supreme Court case of Adarand in 1995. Previously the courts had said for federal race-based classifications, you only use intermediate scrutiny. In 1995, the court shifted and said there's going to be strict scrutiny.

NEAL R. GROSS

And the Commission has had experience with review of race-based classifications under strict scrutiny. Twice, in particular in front of the DC Circuit in 1998 and in 2001, the DC Circuit both times struck down race-based classifications that were used by the Commission and said it was unconstitutional under Adarand.

And in these two cases it was a 6/0 rejection for the Commission, both times unanimously the Commission -- the court said that the Commission's race-based classifications were unconstitutional.

looking at the analysis, In couple things that are particularly noteworthy, first with respect to the compelling interest prong, in the Lutheran 1998, Church opinion in the DC Circuit specifically held that the FCC's asserted interest in broadcast diversity was not a compelling interest.

So, that kind of that kind of holding from the DC Circuit is very, very troubling precedent in any bid to try to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

establish a race-based classification passes strict scrutiny and that's something the Commission would be up against if a race-based classification were adopted.

Secondly, with respect to narrowing tailoring, the courts precedent on narrow tailoring demands a very, very, very close fit between the classification that you're using and the interest you're seeking to vindicate.

And it's been very, very difficult with respect to narrow tailoring to have a race-based classification program, а You did have one in a 5/4 passes that. opinion in the Grutter case in front of the Supreme Court, however, with this Supreme Court and the latest round of opinions in the Louisville Schools case and then the Seattle Schools case, the Supreme Court said that narrowing tailoring was not vindicated.

So, I mean, as the Office of General Counsel sees it, we've also looked into the idea of, well, if diversity isn't going to work because of the Lutheran Church opinion what about the idea that we're going

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

to be remedying past discrimination and that's going to be the interest.

we've looked And very, very carefully at the evidence that's been submitted in the record and the like, and the courts have been very clear in terms of a distinction between remedying overall societal discrimination versus specific public discrimination that the Commission may have engaged in.

And, while there's some evidence in the record, when you look at it in light of the type of evidence that the courts have demanded, in particular, let's say, in the transportation context or the like, we are of the opinion that it would be very difficult to convince a court that this was justified in terms of remedying past discrimination.

So, I think what we are left with is a very, very serious concern, by no means are we saying that it would be certain to lose, but a very, very serious concern if you move forward with an SDB definition, for instance, a race-based definition, that what

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

you will end up with is a very, very difficult time defending this in court because, again, you'll be up against strict scrutiny.

Whereas, if you move forward with a race-neutral definition that is much, much easier to defend. And so I think in terms of trying to move forward with something that will actually work in the real world in terms of standing up, the conclusion that we have come to certainly is that moving forward with a race-based classification is much, much riskier than moving forward with a race-neutral classification.

certainly think And we that's something, you know, it's the up to policymakers to decide what to do with that information, but it's certainly something that think needs to be taken into account if do something because you just that's declared to be unconstitutional, that really just doesn't do any good at all and arguably, is counterproductive.

So, that's just the perspective that we wanted to share.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Questions. Why don't we take some questions, Matt.

MR. BERRY Sure.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Would that be all right?

David.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MEMBER HONIG: Thank you. I'd like to suggest that the idea of adopting an interim race-neutral classification, such as full file review, is not mutually-exclusive from continuing to pursue the question of how to justify a race-conscious definition.

I agree with you that it would be difficult, but I don't agree on the reason for its difficulty. In the Parents United case, we basically saw reasoning used to hold for the second time in three years diversity in education the context as а compelling governmental interest in language that I think probably overrules or substantially undercuts Lutheran Church decision if it applied here.

The difficult -- the reason it's difficult is that the Commission, since 2000,

NEAL R. GROSS

hasn't done any work. It hasn't commissioned any meaningful studies. It's left the studies that it has had sit in the shelf. Well, that's over, we can't change it.

But the best course the Commission could probably take would be to adopt the least dilute, most effective, most fair raceneutral interim definition that it can and simultaneously recognize that while it may be difficult, it doesn't hurt to try to see whether a race-conscious definition could be evolved.

Such a definition need not be based on diversity here. You're right. It could be based on a remedial theory and I would show -- indicate, too, that the record in the docket on media ownership has shown years of FCC ratification and involvement in discrimination.

And also to promote competition, the Commission's primary goal was just simply finding a way to unlock the management and entrepreneurial and creative of skills of vast numbers of people who haven't had those

NEAL R. GROSS

opportunities. It's not efficient. And a way to do that, if found to be compelling, and it should -- would be worthy of being pursued.

So, if -- I wonder whether you would agree that it might be useful for the Commission to pursue both tracks simultaneously, that is, adopt the best raceneutral definition as an interim matter while also renewing its efforts to see whether a race-conscious definition could be sustained.

MR. BERRY: Т think that's excellent question. With respect to second part of the question, the -- as I think the Chairman of this Committee indicated, the further notice seeks comment with respect to the possibility of developing a race-conscious definition that would be constitutionally sustainable and, to the extent that Commission or others wish to explore that and, you know, do the work that's necessary, you know, that's not something that is for me to comment on or oppose.

I think that to the extent you want to do more research to have the Commission to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

do the work that you feel is necessary to have a sustainable race-conscious definition, I don't think it would be appropriate for me to prejudge the outcome of that proceeding.

Certain, anything you come up with will be subject to strict scrutiny, but to the extent the Commission wishes to do that, that is tee'd up in the further notice and I'm not saying I'm here opposing that at all, because I don't.

With respect -- and I also agree with you that moving forward on a race-neutral definition at this time is the appropriate course of action. And the question then becomes what is the best race-neutral way of doing it. And that's more of a policy issue that I'm not going to comment on.

I guess I would have two points with respect to full file review, though, that give me some concern, but -- and the first is that I think with respect to how you would define that, one must be very, very careful, because, as I'm sure you're aware, in both the Lutheran Church case and the

NEAL R. GROSS

Maryland/DC/Delaware Broadcaster's Association case, the Commission went into court and maintained that what was being done really was not the use of a racial classification.

there was no specific, you know, quota, no specific it was not designed to pressure in some sense and -- in terms of having a race-based preference. in both times that the D.C. Circuit, I think, really skeptical view of what the Commission was doing and disagreed.

So, I think that any kind of full file review, one would have to be very, very careful to make sure that, indeed, it was race-neutral.

The second point with respect to the difficulty of full file review is that in the educational context, when you are doing a -- let's say for admissions purposes, if you're carrying certain applicants to other applicants and making a determination of who's going to get the slot.

In the Commission's context when you have mutual exclusivity, you go to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

auction. So, you would be measuring an applicant against some kind of standard. And the question is: How do you define the standard and how do you do it in a raceneutral way and how do you do it in a way that's administratively viable.

And with respect to the latter question, I would defer to the Media Bureau and the likes in terms of how it's administratively viable.

But again, you'd have to define the standard and the process of review in such a way that is genuinely race-neutral. You'd also have to make sure that you don't take into account impermissible First Amendment considerations in terms of, let's say, looking for what kind of program and commitments they're going to make, et cetera.

So, I'm not saying that it's impossible to do, I'm just saying that the kind of full file review that you're talking about raises a lot more complexities and legal uncertainties than does what's in the item right now, and I think that's something

everyone should take into consideration.

But again, it all is -- I think the courts have said in this area the devil is in the details, so it's a question of what are those details.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Go ahead.

MEMBER WINSTON: I wanted to chime in because I'm not convinced that this is the course of conduct that I would recommend for the Commission.

It seems to me that what we're being told is we're just going to have you lose now as opposed to losing later. And it seems to me that, given those two choices, I'd rather take my chances and lose later if I have to.

But the notion that, you know, you look at this industry. You look at the racial makeup of the licensees in this industry, you look at the racial makeup of our country and you say, "We're not going to do anything about it because we may have trouble down the road with the courts."

That isn't an acceptable answer to

NEAL R. GROSS

me. And I recognize that strict scrutiny is a tough hurdle, but all these cases are fact-based, and we're not looking at any -- you know, we've not had any discussion about any specific program or any specific way of dealing with a race-conscious look at that program.

So, until you put all those pieces together in a way of going forward -- you know, David pointed out we've got an awful lot of information that's been developed in the record over the course of the last decade.

Some of that record may be stale. Some of it may not be. So, I don't think -- because there is some good information, good studies in the record that were developed several years back, and I think if you take all the pieces together and say, "You know, we're looking to have a winning strategy that's going to make a difference," I think you come out differently than if you say, "We're going to cave now to do something that we doubt is going to have any real impact."

And I don't think that that's --

NEAL R. GROSS

that's not a strategy that I would support. 1 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Andy. 2 MEMBER SCHWARTZMAN: If I can take 3 4 time to respond to that. CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Go ahead. 5 MEMBER SCHWARTZMAN: I think, 6 really, you're raising policy issues, so I'll 7 step in. 8 Ι think the Chairman 9 agrees, 10 11

actually, with what David outlined, which is that it's important to adopt the best raceneutral definition right now while we continue to work on other definitions, and I think he believes that the item that we have put forward to the Commissioners contains lot of proposals and some significant reforms to our rules that are going to be beneficial to many.

However, he still is open and, as Henry mentioned, we are having a further notice to look at whether we can expand the definition in a constitutional manner, but he believes that there are some significant proposals and rule reforms that are going to be beneficial to many.

NEAL R. GROSS

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Andy.

MEMBER SCHWARTZMAN: I'd like to concur, in general, with Jim's remarks, and I do agree that there's no reason not to go forward with a -- in the short term, with the best race-neutral approach possible, but I do want to stress that the pessimism that you are expressing, Matt, as Jim says, may be excessive.

The Commission has, on many prior occasions, been willing to vote items where it knew that its chances in court were less than perfect, and I, you know, would encourage -- and I hope this committee will encourage the Commission not to be gun-shy.

Two other observations about your comments. First, you made reference to the First Amendment difficulties of requiring news and public affairs programming or programming commitments of some kind or another -- I can't remember exactly what you said.

I don't regard that as an impediment. I regard that as an ideological position, rather than something based on case

NEAL R. GROSS

law.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And the second observation that I would make is that it's not necessary to take new comments or build a new record to find that there was 30 years of history systematic discrimination on the part of the Federal Communications Commission in the wording of broadcast licenses, awarding segregationist institutions, licenses to refusing licenses to minorities.

That's been established. There's a literature on it and there's already a solid basis for the Commission to find evidence of past intentional discrimination in what amounts to the vast majority of the incumbent licenses presently there.

So, again, I think that there's a strong factual platform from which to start, and I would encourage you not to be as pessimistic or -- and to view this as a much more promising opportunity than I think I'm hearing, Matt.

MEMBER HONIG: Briefly, too, I agree with the comments that have been made.

NEAL R. GROSS

I think full file review would be --- could best be characterized as having a moderate level of difficulty.

In the space of a couple of months, bright people can figure it out. Certainly, it's not sufficient to rest on a small business definition. That wouldn't -- that wouldn't pass rational basis review because, in fact, it's regressive.

But, we'd want to emphasize that sometimes when the Commission has dealt with issues related to minority ownership, it adopts the report and order and then, in effect, goes away for years. We've done that now, we'll just let it rest.

And that seems to have been what with the effort happened to qet SDB an definition, unfortunately. It's important that it not happen again and that Commission is going to adopt interim an standard while it pursues the work needed to tie down an SDB definition, I'd agree it may not be as difficult as we feared it could be, or take as long as we feared it could be, that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

the Commission would be well-advised establish a time period no more than six months, eight months to finish the work, it properly, collect what's it been done, add to anything that's necessary, and then ramp it up and in the best possible way, and defend it aggressively in court.

MEMBER WINSTON: Am I correct, we - this Committee was organized in 2003? We've
been at it four years. What have we got to
show for it?

The notion that we're going to suddenly, you know, the Commission is going to get into high gear on these subject strikes me as fanciful, and that's why I'm concerned about what course of action we take now, because I think we get into it once again, justice delayed, justice denied situation of never getting back to this.

So, if we've got -- if we'd got something tee'd up now to actually happen, I'd like to see it have some teeth in it, because I don't know when we'll get a chance again.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MEMBER WINSTON: No, I mean, I certainly thing that these are difficult issues, and I guess I will just respond in a couple -- I wanted to respond on one point that Andy had made.

And that is, with respect to the evidence of public discrimination by the FCC, again, this is something that lawyers in the Office of General Counsel have looked at very carefully in terms of the evidence that's just been submitted into the record, and the -- I'm not making any definitive statement because one never knows how courts are going to come out, and there's a good-faith argument to be made on both sides.

But, when you look at the type of evidence that's in the record here, versus the type of evidence that's been used in the transportation context, the evidence of direct public discrimination by the FCC in the past is significantly less than there was in the transportation context, which was a public discrimination.

And also, this has never been an

NEAL R. GROSS

interest that's been asserted in the past in terms of FCC race-based classification, so I'm not nearly as optimistic as you are in terms of going forward with that as a rationale.

I'm not saying you can't. I'm not

I'm not saying you can't. I'm not saying you can't make a good-faith argument on it, but I think looking at it in a neutral manner, it's difficult to say that the case here is nearly as compelling as it has been in the transportation context. That's the only thing I would say.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Well, thanks for coming, Matt.

Commissioner, you got what you needed?

COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: That was great. I think it was an excellent discussion back and forth and that's exactly why we pay you so well.

Just so I understand it, my sense is that your concern is that we not move forward now with something that would undercut the longer-term goals, better to try to get it right, either do it now right or delay until

NEAL R. GROSS

such time as we can get the SDB definition or 1 2 at least some interim measure. If we can't get the interim measure 3 4 by the date that we have a vote scheduled for, 5 then we ought to put that out to comment and make sure we get it right instead of moving 6 ahead with something in the interim basis now 7 that might actually undercut us in the hopes 8 that someday we'll fix it. Is that accurate? 9 10 MEMBER HONIG: That would be my 11 position. MEMBER SCHWARTZMAN: I agree with 12 that, too. 13 COMMISSIONER ADELSTEIN: Well, very 14 15 much, everybody, for -- that was fantastic. That was a great discussion. 16 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Thank 17 you, Commissioner. Thank you for coming. 18 That was completely unexpected, so 19 Ι everybody benefitted from that 20 hope conversation. 21 22 As I noted, we might as well stay with this. I was going to bring this up at 23 24 the end of the meeting, but I'll bring it up

1	now.
2	And I know Becky, are you still
3	with us?
4	MEMBER KLEIN: Yes, I'm still here-
5	_
6	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay. Good,
7	because I'm
8	MEMBER KLEIN: for about another
9	ten minutes.
10	CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay. Well, I
11	don't think this will take very long. As I
12	mentioned earlier, the Chairman has indicated
13	that there will be a further notice, that we
14	would we are invited to participate in
15	that.
16	If you all are interested in doing
17	that and I take it from the comments here
18	that we seem there seems to be a great deal
19	of interest.
20	Without objection, I'll go ahead
21	and form the subcommittee to deal with that,
22	and we will participate in that part of the
23	rulemaking.

Any objections to that?

MEMBER KLEIN: Henry, this is 1 Becky. I have a question on that. 2 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Sure. 3 4 MEMBER KLEIN: So, in order 5 participate, you're talking about Committee as a whole that would come to some 6 7 kind of consensus and how we would ourselves within the context of the 8 9 correct? CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Correct. 10 11 MEMBER KLEIN: Will we be given a chance, the Committee as a whole, ultimately 12 talk about the positions, 13 to vote orto because --14 15 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Absolutely. Absolutely. The process would be exactly as 16 we do everything else. 17 Okay. All right. 18 MEMBER KLEIN: That would be fine. I just -- my sense is 19 that this is really a little bit out of the 20 scope of the Committee itself. 21 22 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes. Because, you know, 23 MEMBER KLEIN: 24 necessarily the issues are relevant to each of

us, but also there's probably going to 1 2 different effects on different members of this Committee and different perspectives from this 3 4 Committee. 5 So, you know, I can imagine that it would be difficult for -- it may be difficult 6 7 to come to a consensus, and then what happens for those people who 8 may not take perspective of the majority of this Committee. 9 Well, 10 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: that's 11 always a problem and a challenge and I'm not sure it's beyond the scope of the Committee 12 when the Chairman has asked us to participate, 13 or invited our participation. 14 15 MEMBER KLEIN: Okay. I didn't realize that he was tasking us to do that. 16 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Well, we 17 Yes. hadn't been tasked to do anything. 18 He said "If you'd like to, I'd be happy to take your 19 points of view in the further notice." 20 MEMBER KLEIN: 21 Okay. 22 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: So --MEMBER KLEIN: Well, that's good to 23 24 know.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Here's Michelle 1 2 Carey from the Chairman's Office. In fact, your comments 3 MS. CAREY: 4 actually reminded me of one thing. Commissioner Adelstein just 5 asked members of the Committee what their views were 6 on our pending proceeding, and I wanted to 7 point out that, at least, from where I'm 8 sitting, I haven't heard from the rest of the 9 members, and from the Chairman's perspective 10 11 he, you know, to the extent this is an issue that you want to be involved in, that's your 12 choice. 13 He would want to hear what all the 14 15 members think and not, you know, certainly he takes all of your views into consideration, 16 17 but would want to know what, collectively, the Committee thinks and hear from all of you and 18 not just a few of you. 19 So, that's important to him, 20 well. 21 22 MEMBER KLEIN: Okay. Thanks, Michelle. 23 24 MEMBER FOX: I can talk for

minute, too, because obviously I'm -- I work for a large company and we're part of the Committee, and there's been times when we've decided not to take a role on an issue or I've had personal views and sort of conveyed those and then stepped out of the debate as something that involves the company itself.

I think we can all deal with those

I think we can all deal with those issues on an individual basis. And I'm sure other members have had similar experiences.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Sure. I think that's right. All right. Well then, without objection, we'll proceed in that fashion and follow the normal procedure with the Committee, and maybe Becky's right, we won't be able to come up with a Committee consensus position, but maybe we will.

All right. Becky with that, I will turn the mike over to you to report on your committee's activities.

MEMBER KLEIN: Okay. Thank you.

And this will be relatively quick and straightforward.

So, as of early October we have

NEAL R. GROSS

been focusing on the concept of developing a brochure and the brochure would highlight and itemize and list different resources, types of resources that a small minority in women-owned business can prevail upon for financial matters, for legal matters, for engineering consulting, other types of consulting, trade associations that are pertinent to them, acquisition opportunities within the government, any pertinent websites and URL's that might be helpful that would give rules and regulations.

And, of course, you know, other particular types of resources that I haven't mentioned here, I invite discussion or input on. So, ideally, the brochure would be a wonderful tool to be able to promote and distribute at events such as the conference that Rodney is working on, and other such conferences.

Also, Barbara, I think we indicated or talked before about the potential of having this, if it's approved, uploaded on the FCC website, is that correct?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 | MEMBER KREISMAN: Certainly.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: She said

"Certainly."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Okay. MEMBER KLEIN: And so that is what we're proposing, and the scope of the brochure that's being visualized. I think outstanding there's some issues that the Committee would -- subcommittee would need to discuss and input from the Committee as a whole would be very beneficial, and that is, as we gain these resources and we put them on the brochure, what kind of references vetting process do we undertake, if any, do we just put a general disclaimer at the bottom and that would suffice?

If something -- we want this brochure, obviously, to be credible to anybody that wants to rely on it. So, you know, I think we need some discussion on, you know, what we think would be, A, a reasonable standard in that regard.

And then the subcommittee will need to decide to -- how often do we update this since, of course, there will be ongoing

resources out there that we either discover, 1 2 or new ones that come about. CHAIRMAN RIVERA: 3 Do you want to 4 speak to this a little? think 5 MEMBER KREISMAN: Ι it's great. I think what we need is, probably, for 6 all the subcommittees, maybe some dates for 7 subcommittee meetings, starting the beginning 8 of next year where we can sit down and really 9 should involved, 10 hammer what be for out 11 example, in the brochure. CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Any questions for 12 Becky? 13 think it's a fine initiative, 14 15 Becky. Thanks so much. What are the next steps for your subcommittee, then? 16 MEMBER KLEIN: Well, I think that 17 the subcommittee needs to have a conference 18 call and maybe discuss a couple of 19 issues, and then talk about maybe where to go 20 find 21 some of these resources, 22 outreaching to these resources so that we can start compiling the meat and potatoes of a 23 24 brochure and putting it together, because what we'd like to have at the next full Committee meeting is an actual mock-up of a draft brochure.

CHAIRMAN RIVERA: All right.

MEMBER KREISMAN: It might be great if we could get ahold of whatever resources you have, Jim, and you have, David, you have, Andy, that, you know, we can put in one place. It just basically references, you know, hello, you can go to talk, you know, consult this to get information about companies that are lending money, you can go here to get this -- and I know some of this is already in existence, but it's sort of scattered.

What we'd like to do is not put something -- not a multipage thing, but something that's very simple, that you look at, open up, and at least sends you to the right spot. And we're not taking anyone's glory, we're going to send them right back to you, but something that can be a focal point.

So, it might be great if we can get something -- you can send us an email or something with respect to some of the things

already in existence that we can just cross-1 2 reference and send it back to you. CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes, that would 3 4 be very helpful. So, I don't think you need a vote 5 form us at this point. Do you, Becky? 6 MEMBER KLEIN: I don't think so. 7 Ι think once we have the mock-up's, that would 8 be the time to do that. 9 All right. 10 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: 11 Thanks very much. Great report. Does anybody have any new business 12 to bring before the Committee? 13 Yes? 14 15 MEMBER HONIG: I have one quick question. appoint 16 Do we need to subcommittee to work on this, the full file 17 review and other issues? 18 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Right. I'll do 19 if that. And anybody's interested 20 participating in that, please let me know. 21 Send me an email. We'll send an email out to 22 the entire committee asking for folks who are 23 24 interested, if Ι and don't get

volunteers, I'll make some. 1 2 Any other new business? MEMBER HONIG: I also just wanted 3 4 to note that the minutes should reflect the fact that the conference idea originated with 5 Commissioner Tate who's really pushed for 6 this--7 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Yes. 8 MEMBER HONIG: last 9 since coming to fruition. 10 and Her initiative ought to be recognized. 11 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: We'll make sure 12 that's in the minutes. Yes. That's a good 13 point. Yes, it's her baby. 14 15 Anything else? Listen, I want to thank --16 Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. 17 MEMBER KREISMAN: This is being 18 transcribed and we will put the transcript on 19 the website. 20 CHAIRMAN RIVERA: Okay. 21 I'm going to thank you all for coming and for 22 those of you on the phone for participating. 23 24 I want to wish you all a happy holidays, and

think we are going to have a great year in 2008. We've got a lot of great things in the pipeline. And next year at this time we don't want to have Jim Winston ask us that question that he asked. "What have we got to show for it?" And I'm sure that we won't be in that position.

So, again, thank you and season's greetings to all of you. We adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:18 a.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

NEAL R. GROSS

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

NEAL R. GROSS

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