

# MEDIA AND DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA TODAY: A REFORM PLAN FOR A NEW ADMINISTRATION

A REPORT FROM THE COMMON CAUSE EDUCATION FUND  
AUGUST 2008

**In a healthy democracy, those who disseminate information must not be fettered in their role of holding government accountable.**

A strong democracy depends on information and knowledge. The more sources of information we have, the greater our knowledge. The greater our knowledge, the more intelligently we can select our representatives in government at all levels, and the better we can guide their decisions.

The only industry explicitly protected in the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution is the media. The reason is fundamental: In a healthy democracy, those who disseminate information must not be fettered in their role of holding government accountable. The founders of our country understood this and made sure that “freedom of the press” was clearly stated in the highest law of the land.<sup>1</sup>

The media cannot play its role effectively unless it is independent from government influence. A variety of sources of information, independent of each other, is essential as well. On many issues, media outlets will to varying degrees reflect the interests of their individual owners. Real objectivity may always be elusive, but a variety of information sources available and accessible to the public ensures most necessary information is in the dialogue. Oppositely, there is real danger when there are fewer sources responsible for informing us.

Today the media world has become increasingly consolidated and corporatized. Of course the media is a business, but telecommunications companies use the public airwaves and therefore have an obligation to serve the public along with their commercial interests. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) was created and empowered by Congress to regulate use of the radio and television spectrum, interstate communications (such as telephone and cable), and international communications that begin or end in the United States. The radio and television spectrum — often referred to generally as “the airwaves” — is a publicly held resource that the FCC allows broadcasters to use as long as the broadcasters serve the “public interest, convenience, or necessity.”

The role of the media was further defined by the Supreme Court decision in *Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. Federal Communications Commission* (395 U.S. 367 [1969]), which affirmed that “it is the right of the viewing and listening public, and not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount.”<sup>2</sup> Significantly, this recognizes that the role of the media is not solely to make profits for the owning corporation. The media is to serve the public interest, and it may make money while doing so.

The media landscape is always changing, most recently with the growth of the Internet and other networking systems. While the Internet holds tremendous promise and has nearly limitless opportunities, such modes of communication too are at risk of becoming constricted by corporate interests. The insatiable demand for dollars on Wall Street is a powerful force that seeks to shift power from the people broadly and deliver it to the powerful few.

As with traditional forms of broadcasting, the Internet is a public resource that is being controlled by corporations. Public interests created the Internet through our military, academic and administrative government institutions.<sup>3</sup> Telephone and cable companies are permitted to run their wires over public rights of way that are granted so they can provide services to the public. States or local governments issue certificates or franchises to telephone and cable companies, for which they are required to operate in the public interest. For these reasons, plus the power of the FCC to regulate interstate communications, the public can reasonably expect government protection of our unrestricted access in using the Internet.

The media has a key role to play in ensuring our democracy functions properly, and it is the responsibility of citizens and regulators to ensure the media can play that role effectively. We have an obligation and the authority to regulate

**The role of the media is not solely to make profits for the owning corporation. The media is to serve the public interest, and it may make money while doing so.**

- 1 Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin both wrote extensively about the power and responsibilities of the media. “Thomas Jefferson on Politics & Government,” Eyer Robert Coates, Sr., August 6, 2008, <http://etext.virginia.edu/jefferson/quotations/jeff1600.htm> ; “Benjamin Franklin - On The Freedom Of The Press”, The Democratic Party, August 6, 2008, <http://www.democrats.org/page/community/post/davidlyoung/CVzb> and “I shall not burn my press and melt my letters”, David Talbot, Salon.com, September 9, 2003, <http://dir.salon.com/story/opinion/freedom/2003/09/02/franklin/>
- 2 U.S. Supreme Court, *RED LION BROADCASTING CO. v. FCC*, 395 U.S. 367 (1969), Findlaw, August 6, 2008, [http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/print\\_friendly.pl?page=us/395/367.html](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/print_friendly.pl?page=us/395/367.html)
- 3 “A Brief History of the Internet and Related Networks,” Internet Society, August 6, 2008, <http://www.isoc.org/internet/history/cerf.shtml>

the media to encourage it to perform its constitutionally intended role, and we have limits on overregulation that would stifle the role of the media. The trick is to find the right balance. The balance is out of kilter and it is time to assert responsible regulation so that the media can more effectively serve our democracy.

This document will identify specific problems with how the media is serving — or not serving — our democracy, and will propose solutions. We will address long-term issues that will require continual attention, such as how well the media is serving local community interests. And we will also address urgent issues such as the digital television transition. Some of the solutions we propose will require federal legislation, some will require the FCC to act, and some will require other solutions. The key point to this paper, however, is that while there are problems there also are real solutions — if we find the will to make them happen.

## Problem: Media Consolidation

The increasingly concentrated media ownership system has a negative impact on the quality of the news and information Americans receive about their local communities, the nation, and the world. With fewer companies doing journalism, fewer journalists are investigating and writing about public matters. This leads to several problems. When fewer reporters are reporting a story, the more likely it is that key facts will be missed or errors will go unchallenged. The fewer investigative journalists there are, the less wrongdoing will be exposed. And the fewer the outlets, the greater the likelihood that influence from owners and editors will dominate the information the public receives from their local media. If further consolidation is allowed, we will not only see less journalism, but the media that remains will be more likely to be corporate-controlled, and created with commercial gain solely in mind, instead of being representative of community interests.

In recent years, the pace of media consolidation has increased dramatically. The 1996 Telecommunications Act kick-started a spurt of radio consolidations that made Clear Channel a household name.<sup>4</sup> In 2003, then-FCC Chairman Michael Powell pushed through vast new media cross-ownership rules that would have allowed unprecedented consolidation. The public reacted passionately and vociferously, leading to over 3 million Americans contacting the FCC in opposition to consolidation. Congress took action to overturn the FCC's rules, but the courts intervened before they finished their process when the Third Circuit Court of Appeals overturned the FCC's cross-ownership rules in the decision *Prometheus Radio Project v. FCC* in June 2004.<sup>5</sup>

In any industry, corporations, if allowed, will seek market dominance. Corporations based in other parts of the country who don't understand local needs and concerns will purchase local media outlets so as to increase their profits. Media owners are not very likely to reflect the demographics of many local communities, being more white and male than the community as a whole.<sup>6</sup> This leads to concerns of other demographic groups being ignored by the ownership of the company. The media also starts on a path of "dumbing down" to the lowest common denominator, focusing on such matters as celebrities rather than issues of concern.

Big media corporations argue that the market will provide all that the public needs, and that consolidation provides greater economic stability for their industry. Since there are enormous barriers to entry into media ownership, this is self-protectionist. Not only are the costs of starting up a new broadcast TV station extremely high, there are limited licenses from the FCC to allow access to the airwaves. Licenses come up for renewal only every eight years, and are generally rubber-stamped for another eight years. The chances of a start-up company being able to get one are practically non-existent. The same is true for radio. Purchasing an existing TV or radio station is cost-prohibitive for all but a few individuals in our society. Starting up a newspaper is slightly easier, but still has high initial costs and a limited revenue stream. Very little professional local journalism is available solely online, even though some are experimenting with it. Online local journalism is still mostly just a rehash of what was in the local newspaper or on TV. The power of the media still rests on the trinity of TV, radio and newspapers, none of which is open to free competition.

**We have an obligation and the authority to regulate the media to encourage it to perform its constitutionally intended role...**

4 "The Telecommunications Act Of 1996 - Bonanza for Clear Channel, Radio for Conservative Voices," Seth Sandronsky, August 6, 2008, <http://www.swans.com/library/art12/seths02.html>

5 "Prometheus Radio Project V. FCC," Wikipedia, August 6, 2008, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prometheus\\_Radio\\_Project\\_v.\\_FCC](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prometheus_Radio_Project_v._FCC) and "Setback for Big Media," Eric Boehlert, Salon.com, June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2004, <http://dir.salon.com/story/news/feature/2004/06/25/fcc/index.html>

6 "The Diversity Crisis," Free Press, August 6, 2008, <http://www.freepress.net/node/37867>

**If women and minorities do not participate in the decisions of what to air, at best the issues of concern to them are given little importance or are completely ignored, and at worst they are portrayed in a negative and harmful way.**

The FCC, under the new leadership of Chairman Kevin Martin, began a series of public hearings on media ownership in 2006. Having recently been embarrassed by the revelation that the FCC destroyed two reports<sup>7</sup> that showed that media consolidation led to decreased local news reporting, the commission scheduled official hearings in Seattle, Chicago, Los Angeles, Tampa, Nashville, and Harrisburg, PA, as well as several unofficial hearings. Although the vast majority of public comments at the hearings and in public record were opposed to further media consolidation, and although a bipartisan group of 25 US Senators asked the FCC to spend more time on the issue before moving forward,<sup>8</sup> the FCC ignored the public and Congress and in December 2007 voted 3 to 2 to allow greater consolidation.<sup>9</sup>

This new FCC rule is not acceptable. It has removed the ban on newspapers and TV stations being owned by the same company in a particular market, allowing them to merge in the top 20 media markets in America. Loopholes also now allow them to consolidate in any market where a newspaper is financially “in distress” (without giving a proper definition of “in distress”).<sup>10</sup> About half of all minority-owned TV stations in America fit the criteria for which stations can be cross-owned, making them targets for buyout by big media companies. The new rule not only disproportionately impacts minority media; it also essentially homogenizes local media and decreases the diversity of voices.<sup>11</sup> This is likely to hurt the quality and relevancy of local news coverage.

The low rate of media ownership by women and minorities is a serious issue that has not been properly addressed by Congress or the FCC. Women own only 6 percent of TV and radio stations in America, although they represent 51 percent of the population. Minorities own only 3 percent of TV stations and less than 8 percent of radio stations. Women and minorities own 28 percent and 18 percent of all non-farm businesses in the US, respectively. Their ownership of the media is well below their representation in the economy as a whole.<sup>12</sup> This matters because the media shapes our society, and the ownership influences what is seen, read, and heard. If women and minorities do not participate in the decisions of what to air, at best the issues of concern to them are given little importance or are completely ignored, and at worst they are portrayed in a negative and harmful way. A truly democratic media requires diversity of voices, and that the power of the media is in diverse hands. Today, this is often not the case.

### **Problem: The Media is Failing to Serve Local Community Interests**

As former Speaker of House Tip O’Neill once said, “All politics is local.” If the media is to serve the public’s interest in terms of our democracy, we need to receive sufficient amounts of information on local issues and politics from our local media. Indeed, the Federal Communications Commission has rules for broadcasters about localism and describes “Broadcast Localism” thus:

*Broadcast radio and television are distinctly local media. They are licensed to local communities, and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has long required broadcasters to serve the needs and interests of the communities to which they are licensed. Congress has also required that the FCC assign broadcast stations to communities around the country to assure widespread service, and the Commission has given priority to affording local service as part of this requirement. Broadcast “localism” encompasses these requirements.<sup>13</sup>*

One of the most important “needs and interests of communities” is informing viewers about what is going on in their local politics so that voters have the information they need to participate in their local elections and to communicate with their elected officials. However, the amount of time that local broadcasters spend on local politics, even campaigns

7 “Senator Says Media Study Suppressed,” John Dunbar, Boston Globe, September 18, 2006, [http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/09/18/senator\\_says\\_media\\_study\\_suppressed/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2006/09/18/senator_says_media_study_suppressed/)

8 Letter to FCC Chairman Martin, Senator Byron Dorgan, et al, December 14, 2007, <http://dorgan.senate.gov/documents/newsroom/121707fccvote.pdf>

9 “FCC Loosens Newspaper-Broadcast Cross-Ownership Limits,” John Eggerton -- Broadcasting & Cable, 12/18/2007, <http://www.broadcasting-cable.com/article/CA6513656.html>

10 “Devil in the Details,” Craig Aaron, Marvin Ammori, Joseph Torres, and S. Derek Turner, November 2007, [http://www.stopbigmedia.com/files/devil\\_in\\_the\\_details.pdf](http://www.stopbigmedia.com/files/devil_in_the_details.pdf) page 6.

11 “Devil in the Details,” Craig Aaron, Marvin Ammori, Joseph Torres, and S. Derek Turner, November 2007, [http://www.stopbigmedia.com/files/devil\\_in\\_the\\_details.pdf](http://www.stopbigmedia.com/files/devil_in_the_details.pdf) page 13.

12 Television statistics reference “Out of the Picture,” StopBigMedia.com, August 6, 2008, [http://www.stopbigmedia.com/=out\\_of\\_the\\_picture](http://www.stopbigmedia.com/=out_of_the_picture); Radio statistics reference “Off the Dial,” StopBigMedia.com, August 6, 2008, [http://www.stopbigmedia.com/=off\\_the\\_dial](http://www.stopbigmedia.com/=off_the_dial)

13 “Broadcasting and Localism, FCC Consumer Facts,” Federal Communications Commission, August 6, 2008, [http://www.fcc.gov/localism/Localism\\_Fact\\_Sheet.pdf](http://www.fcc.gov/localism/Localism_Fact_Sheet.pdf)

close to an election day, is far from adequate. A nationwide study conducted by the Lear Center at the University of Southern California's Annenberg School in 2004 found that only eight percent of local news broadcasts that aired in the month before Election Day contained a mention of a statewide or local race. This despite a recommendation by the Presidential Advisory Committee on Public Interest Obligations of Digital Broadcasters – a panel that included top television executives – that stations should air at least five minutes per night candidate-centered discourses to help voters make informed choices.<sup>14</sup>

The consolidation of ownership of the media has a significant impact on localism. The more disconnected the ownership of the media is from a community the less it is devoted to serving it. This can have disastrous consequences to the local community. One well-known example was the catastrophe in Minot, ND, in 2002.

## **The more disconnected the ownership of the media is from a community the less it is devoted to serving it.**

Early in the morning of January 18, 2002, a train derailment sent a cloud of poisonous gas drifting toward the small town. Minot's fire and rescue departments attempted to reach Clear Channel, which owned and operated all six local commercial radio stations, to warn residents of the approaching threat. But in the age of canned programming and virtual DJs, there was no one in the conglomerate's studio to answer the call. The people of Minot were taken unaware. The result: one death and more than a thousand injuries.<sup>15</sup>

The Minot example shows clearly that the structure laid out by consolidated media is more likely to fail local communities than would locally owned media. But the problem goes beyond examples of tragedy. The kind of information and opinion aired, and how they relate to local communities has become a major issue. Sinclair Broadcasting, based in Baltimore, MD, is one of the largest broadcasting corporations in America, owning 57 stations in 35 markets. Until late 2006, Sinclair would air, on all its stations, an opinion piece at the end of the local news broadcast. Called "The Point with Mark Hyman," the opinion piece was produced in Baltimore and had no connection to local issues or concerns elsewhere. Sinclair offered no opportunity for counter-opinions or local opinion.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, the piece was intended primarily to promote the corporation's agenda in the guise of providing "public affairs" programming. The public interest was in no way served by these commentaries.

Broadcasters cite two specific ways in which they provide localism. The first is simply airing local news. Unfortunately, the quality of local news is declining as consolidation increases. Local reporters are laid off,<sup>17</sup> more nationally produced and wire service clips are aired<sup>18</sup> and crime, sports and weather dominate air time over local issues.<sup>19</sup> A pothole in a street is given more prominent coverage than a critical vote by city council, only because it is easier, cheaper, and less controversial to report. Also, many stations do not air local news at all, and many "share" their news by entering into agreements with other local stations. Thus, in this age of consolidation, even if the total number of hours of local news increases, the needs and interests of the community are becoming less and less effectively served.

Secondly, broadcasters cite the donation of public service announcements, promotion and money to charities as their service to the local community. However worthwhile this is, it must be recognized that most large corporations involve themselves in such activities. In a way, broadcasters are using these donations to double dip. They receive tax breaks for providing them and they point to them to justify retaining their free license to broadcast. The role of the media, however, is different from any other corporation. Broadcasters and newspapers have the power and a historical responsibility to go beyond donating to a cause and to focus on educating the public on why a cause is needed. For

**A pothole in a street is given more prominent coverage than a critical vote by city council, only because it is easier, cheaper, and less controversial to report.**

14 "Local News Coverage of the 2004 Campaigns," The Lear Center Local News Archive, USC Annenberg School for Communication, February 15, 2005, <http://www.localnewsarchive.org/pdf/LCLNAFinal2004.pdf>.

15 "911 Calls in North Dakota Town Reveal Dangers of Media Consolidation," Democracy Now!, January 25, 2007, [http://www.democracynow.org/2007/1/25/exclusive\\_911\\_calls\\_in\\_north\\_dakota](http://www.democracynow.org/2007/1/25/exclusive_911_calls_in_north_dakota)

16 "Sinclair's conservative commentary 'The Point' airs daily without progressive counterpoint," Media Matters, August 6, 2008, <http://mediamatters.org/items/200412020007>

17 "Journalists should speak up in media-consolidation fight," Ryan Blethen, Seattle Times, August 1, 2008, [http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/opinion/2008084856\\_ryan01.html](http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/opinion/2008084856_ryan01.html)

18 "Do Local Owners Deliver More Localism? Some Evidence from Local Broadcast News," Working paper by FCC that was suppressed by the FCC Chairman, June 17, 2004, <http://www.freepress.net/files/fcclocalnews.pdf>

19 "LOCAL NEWS COVERAGE OF THE 2004 CAMPAIGNS - AN ANALYSIS OF NIGHTLY BROADCASTS IN 11 MARKETS," Martin Kaplan, Ken Goldstein and Matthew Hale, The Lear Center Local News Archive USC Annenberg School and University of Wisconsin, February 15 2005.

**This Act needs to be overhauled with a new focus on promoting diversity and true competition, and preventing consolidation.**

example, instead of running public service announcements in the middle of the night for an organization helping homeless citizens, a broadcaster could air a series of exposés on why people are homeless in that community and which services are or are not effective in helping them.

## **Solutions to Consolidation and Improving Service to Local Community Interests**

### **Prevent and Reverse Consolidation of the Media**

- *The Resolution of Disapproval of the FCC's new Media Cross-ownership Rule*

While the FCC passed its new cross-ownership rule with the full support of the White House, there is considerable bi-partisan opposition to media consolidation. Numerous prominent Republicans such as Senator Olympia Snowe (R-ME) and former Senator Trent Lott (R-MS) are outspoken opponents of media consolidation. On March 6, 2008, Senator Byron Dorgan introduced a "Resolution of Disapproval" of the FCC's new rule in the Senate (S.J. Res. 28). This measure passed almost unanimously on a voice vote on May 15, sending a strong message to the FCC and the administration that media consolidation is not something that will stand. A companion measure is currently pending in the House of Representatives (H.J.Res. 79), sponsored by Rep. Jay Inslee (D-WA) and Rep. David Reichert (R-WA).

If the Resolution of Disapproval passes both houses of Congress, there will probably be a Presidential veto. In this case, it will need to go back for an override vote. If that is successful, the FCC must go back to the drawing board on ownership rules. The FCC is required by law to revisit ownership rules every few years.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, what we expect is to continue fighting not only against consolidation, but for more public-interest-friendly rules to make the media more democratic.

- *Overhaul the 1996 Telecommunications Act*

The real surge in media consolidation in America is directly related to the 1996 Telecommunications Act. The Act lifted ownership limits for radio stations, leading to incredible consolidation of radio station ownership. One company alone, Clear Channel Inc., at its peak owned nearly 1,200 radio stations across the country.<sup>21</sup> Before the change, a company could not own more than 40 stations nationwide. This Act needs to be overhauled with a new focus on promoting diversity and true competition, and preventing consolidation.

### **Support Community Media**

- *Public, Educational and Governmental Access TV*

One of the most effective tools Americans have to participate meaningfully in their democracy through the media is Public, Educational and Governmental (PEG) Access Television. PEG stations offer ordinary persons and community organizations the opportunity to create and present their own programming that they consider relevant to their community and air it on cable television. Public Access stations are non-discriminatory in what they will air (except for unprotected speech such as libel and obscenity). PEG stations air public affairs programming that local commercial stations do not — content vital to the community. Public Access stations show locally organized candidate forums, local citizens talking about issues in depth with others, and programming made by and for local minority populations. PEG Access is truly a democratic medium for local communities.

PEG Access exists because communications networks that use the public rights-of-way and public spectrum must provide means and support for public participation through community uses of media.<sup>22</sup> Local franchise agreements between a community and the local cable provider determine how much support is given to PEG, and where on the dial the stations are found. Local control is imperative because only the local community can adequately understand its specific needs. Unfortunately, the regulatory framework for PEG is inadequate and under attack by commercial interests, resulting in survival struggles around the nation for this vital local communications resource.

20 (Section 202(h) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 requires that the agency periodically review its broadcast ownership rules to "determine whether any of such rules are necessary in the public interest as the result of competition." Section 202(h) also states that Commission must "repeal or modify any regulation that it determines is no longer in the public interest.")

21 "False Premises, False Promises," Peter DiCola, Future of Music Coalition, December, 2006, <http://www.futureofmusic.org/research/radiostudy06execsum.cfm>

22 "Public Access Television," Wikipedia, August 6, 2008, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public-access\\_television](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Public-access_television)

## PEG access should continue to be protected and should be expanded...

The Alliance for Community Media suggests that the United States needs to establish a policy of “community reinvestment” through PEG that includes funds and bandwidth and/or spectrum that will be used for public purposes.<sup>23</sup> Preserving local control of franchising, dedicating channels that are easily accessible on basic cable and sufficiently funding PEG are all key to ensuring the public is served by community media.

PEG access should continue to be protected and should be expanded so that individuals and organizations will continue to be able to create their own media, provide public interest programming not available on commercial stations, and contribute to a more vibrant democracy as a result.

- **Low Power FM radio**

In most cities and towns, radio stations are controlled by a handful of wealthy corporations who tend to put their own profits ahead of the needs of the local communities they serve. This is starting to change for the better. Low Power FM radio stations (or LPFM) are being built all across the country. LPFM stations are used by schools, community groups, churches and nonprofits to broadcast local information to and about their communities. They are an essential alternative to consolidated commercial radio.

Low Power FM radio was first established in 2000. At that time, the National Association of Broadcasters, an industry trade group, convinced Congress that Low Power FM would interfere with big radio stations’ broadcasts. As a result, to date, Low Power FM has been limited to rural areas.<sup>24</sup> Contrary to NAB’s assertions, a recent study from the independent MITRE Corporation shows that Low Power FM causes no interference and can co-exist with major radio stations, even in big cities.<sup>25</sup>

Congress has a bill in each house, H.R. 2802 and S. 1675, that would bring community radio to more people across America. This legislation would make it easier to establish LPFM stations all over the country, including in urban areas they have been shut out of to date, without impacting the signals of existing full-power stations. Common Cause supports this legislation.

### **Create Meaningful Public Interest Obligations for Broadcasters and Hold Them Accountable**

Broadcasters receive free licenses to use the publicly owned airwaves, and in return they agree to operate in the public interest. These principles are enshrined in the Radio Act of 1927 and the Communications Act of 1934<sup>26</sup> in the mandate that “broadcasting serve the public interest, convenience and necessity.”<sup>27</sup> As broadcasters will soon have significantly greater capacity to provide content thanks to the February 2009 Digital TV transition, this provides a rare opportunity to make the case for greater public-interest obligations. The DTV transition allows broadcasters to air as much as five times more content on the same amount of bandwidth that they currently use. Since they will receive this extra capacity at no additional cost, it is reasonable to require specific programming in the public interest in return.

Other than vague statements about public affairs and localism, the only clear guidelines broadcasters have at this time is to air a certain amount of children’s programming as mandated in the Children’s Television Act of 1990.<sup>28</sup> Guidelines for public-affairs programming should be as clear as those for children’s programming. There should be a minimum of three hours per week of qualifying local civic or electoral-affairs programming on a licensee’s most-watched channel. A clear definition of what qualifies needs to be established so that the local weather and sports reports are not claimed as public-affairs programming. In addition to other requirements, a minimum number of locally produced public-service announcements (PSAs) should be aired by broadcasters and must be aired at times when viewers are likely to be watching.

---

23 “Alliance for Community Media’s Statement for the Platform Committees of the Democratic & Republican National Committees” Alliance for Community Media, August 6 2008, <http://www.ourchannels.org/?p=186#more-186>

24 “Low Power Radio,” Prometheus Radio Project, August 6, 2008, [http://prometheusradio.org/low\\_power\\_radio/](http://prometheusradio.org/low_power_radio/)

25 “Experimental Measurements of the Third-Adjacent Channel Impacts of Low-Power FM Stations,” Mitre Corporation, May 2003, <http://www2.freepress.net/lpfm/MitreReport.pdf>

26 “Communications Act of 1934,” <http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/1934new.pdf>

27 Radio Act of 1927, Pub. L. No. 632, 44 Stat. 1162, § 4 (1927). See also 47 U.S.C. §§ 307(a), 309(a), 310(d)

28 “Children’s Educational Television – FCC Consumer Facts,” Federal Communications Commission, August 6, 2008, <http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/consumerfacts/childtv.html>

Broadcasters can be held accountable to these new standards in a number of ways. First, licenses should once again be renewable every three years instead of every eight years so that if broadcasters are not living up to their license obligations, the public does not have to wait years to hold them accountable.

The FCC should create a revised license-renewal process that increases the amount of public participation and places the burden of proof on the broadcasters to demonstrate that they have fulfilled their obligations to the public.

Finally, the FCC should publish clear guidelines for the creation and powers of citizen advisory boards to assist broadcasters in understanding the needs of the community. This would help ensure that the community is served effectively, and help broadcasters fulfill their obligations.

### **Free Air Time for Candidates**

As part of a broadcaster's public-interest obligations, but not to be counted as part of their local civic or electoral-affairs programming, we support requiring broadcasters to offer a limited amount of free airtime to candidates for federal office. In our democracy, speech is free but communication is expensive — and never more so than during the campaign season. This paradox lies at the heart of our problems with money and politics. As the cost of political communication keeps rising, the competitive playing field of campaigns keeps tilting toward candidates who are wealthy or well financed. Not only does the better-funded candidate almost always win in our system, but, increasingly, these victories come at the end of campaigns that are so lopsided that they rob voters of genuine choice. In our gilded age of politics, if you're a challenger who can't write a big check to your local television station to pay for a nightly bombardment of ads, you'll still enjoy freedom of speech. You just won't have the ability to be heard, much less elected.

The most promising way to ensure lively debate in our elections as well as reduce the need for huge sums of campaign contributions is to create a system of free air time on broadcast television, as is done in virtually all of the world's other democracies. This would increase the flow and reduce the cost of political communication on the most important medium for politics and democracy — the broadcast airwaves. To best achieve these goals, a free air time system should impose two separate mandates on the broadcast industry. It should require television and radio stations to devote a reasonable amount of air time during the campaign season to issue-based candidate forums such as debates, interviews, town hall meetings, etc. And it should require stations to provide qualifying candidates and parties with vouchers to run a reasonable number of free ads in the period before an election.

Free air time is not intended to drive money out of politics altogether. But by providing a floor of communication opportunities to candidates, regardless of their financial circumstances, it would open up the political process to those currently priced out of the market. And by creating forums that allow for a free exchange of ideas among competing candidates, it would reduce the relative importance of moneyed special interests.

### **Women and Minority Ownership Issues**

The FCC must begin a comprehensive review of policies that impact women and minority ownership of the media. The FCC should start by collecting data on women and minority ownership, and create a process for continual assessment of barriers to entry for women and minorities. The FCC should regularly examine the effectiveness of its policies, and assess whether additional measures are needed. It should look at past FCC practices and policies, and assess the level of FCC participation (inadvertent or otherwise) in discrimination against women and minorities in the broadcast industry.

The FCC must create race- and gender-based eligible entity definitions to encourage ownership among underrepresented groups. In the past, the FCC has proposed using a small-business definition, which does not get to the heart of the issue. The FCC must also reinstitute its rule requiring broadcasters to file Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) reports (Form 395) and restore robust EEO enforcement. With better EEO enforcement, young minorities that have not been given the opportunity to work in this industry will have a new training ground that provides them the opportunity to learn the broadcasters' business, climb up the ladder to management levels and even become owners in an industry that is starved of minority ownership.

The minority tax certificate for media ownership should be restored, as it effectively increased the percentage of media outlets owned by minorities during its existence from 1978 to 1995. Since the largest impediment for women and minorities to owning media outlets is access to capital, Congress should revisit this program and craft a new version of the tax credit.



## Problem: Public Broadcasting

Public broadcasting, both PBS Television and National Public Radio, exist to serve the diverse needs of the viewing and listening public. Despite chronic funding shortages and an extremely complicated structure, public broadcasting often manages to fulfill its promise. Its scores of awards for quality national and local programming and hard-hitting investigative journalism, as well as the loyalty of its viewers, attest to the fact that public broadcasting is an essential part of our democracy. For four years in a row, a national poll by Roper ASW found that Americans ranked the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) the “most trusted institution” among national institutions that included Congress, the courts, the federal government, commercial broadcast networks, newspapers and cable television.<sup>29</sup>

At the same time, public broadcasting’s ability to realize the visionary potential conceived by its creators has been hindered throughout its existence by political pressures and funding shortages. In recent years, public broadcasting has been the target of repeated assaults on its budget, including a proposed 56 percent cut in the 2009-10 budget<sup>30</sup>. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) is supposed to shield Public Broadcasting Service shows from political influence but in recent years has done the opposite. Political appointees to the CPB have leaned on PBS to adjust their programming to be more favorable to one political party’s viewpoints.<sup>31</sup>

## Solutions to Protect Public Broadcasting

For public broadcasting to fulfill its promise fully, we need to secure both its long-term financial and programmatic health. First, Congress must stop defunding public broadcasting now and provide the resources it needs to operate effectively. From there, they must identify and create models for financial sustainability for public broadcasting that do not rely upon the vagaries of annual federal appropriations and advertising/underwriting revenues. The goal is to put in place a revenue source that provides long-term funding and at the same time relieves public broadcasting of undue political influence. As the digital TV transition will increase the capacity for PBS stations to air more content, increased funding is all the more critical. This additional capacity also provides an opportunity for greater local input on the new content, and the CPB should help establish a process to engage local communities to influence what public broadcasting airs in their area.

To prevent further instances of political pressure on public broadcasting programming, nominees to the CPB must be nonpartisan supporters of public broadcasting’s mission. Currently the CPB members are appointed by the President, which creates a challenge to an apolitical body. Alternative methods for appointments should be investigated, such as being appointed by another nonpartisan professional body like the Library of Congress or the Smithsonian Institute.

## Problem: New Media’s Capacity to Enhance Democracy Is Under Attack

In the last fifteen years we have seen the media change in a way that has created an entirely new dynamic. The growth of the Internet has created a new medium that allows for truly democratic participation in our democracy. Indeed, the Internet has made the First Amendment of the Constitution guaranteeing Freedom of Speech a “living document” for Americans in a way that nothing has before.

There are various ways in which the Internet has enhanced our democracy. Organizations and politicians have been benefiting from the new ability to react instantly to political opportunities and call for their supporters to take action in real time as well as much more cost-effectively. They have also found that they can promote themselves more effectively by maintaining a constant presence online as well as utilizing web 2.0 strategies such as social networking and interactive blogs. In addition, the Internet has allowed anyone with a message to reach out to millions of potential donors to support their efforts. Large numbers of small donors have allowed new political organizations to thrive and candidates that have more connection with the grassroots than wealthy special interests to run viable campaigns.

But while political candidates and organizations have benefited, the biggest impact of the Internet has been on the average citizen. Voters can research candidates and issues more in-depth than ever before. They can find out much

29 “National Roper Poll Ranks PBS #1 in Public Trust for the Fourth Consecutive Year,” PBS press release, March 22, 2007, [http://www.pbs.org/aboutpbs/news/20070322\\_roperpoll.html](http://www.pbs.org/aboutpbs/news/20070322_roperpoll.html)

30 “Tell them the Public Matters,” August 7, 2008, <http://www.telthepublicmatters.org/>

31 “U.S. Public TV’s Ex-Chief Faulted by Internal Probe,” Neil Roland, Bloomberg News Service, November 15, 2005, <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=10000103&sid=aFw4MIYqhunc&refer=us#>

**Indeed, the Internet has made the First Amendment of the Constitution guaranteeing Freedom of Speech a “living document” for Americans in a way that nothing has before.**

more about what organizations are in sync with their views and get involved with them if they choose. And Internet users can air their views so much more effectively than ever before, whether by having or participating in a blog, speaking out on social networking tools like Facebook or MySpace, emailing friends, relatives and acquaintances, or participating in online discussions on bulletin board sites. As our citizens participate more and more online, they enhance the public discourse about the future of our country and local communities. Even when people disagree with each other, the fact that they are not leaving the discussion up to just the entrenched interests already in power is healthy for democracy.

The problem with the new media we are faced with today is twofold. First, while the Internet has become a fantastic tool for those who use it, not everyone has access to what it offers. It is more likely that low-income citizens will not be part of this new resource — and it is they who most need an increased voice in our political process. Secondly, the entire nature of the Internet is at risk of being completely altered by corporate interests who have control of the wires over which the Net operates. If they had their way, the Internet would become more like cable television with providers deciding what sites you can visit, and they would create new tiers of service that would influence how fast we could access different sites on the Net.<sup>32</sup>

We can address some of the concerns about the “digital divide” by improving access to the Internet. Communities’ efforts to bring high-speed Internet access to all their residents should be supported. To protect the democratic nature of the Internet as a whole, we must insist on “Network Neutrality.”

## **Solutions to Ensure New Media Continue to Enhance Our Democracy**

### **Ensure Network Neutrality**

Net Neutrality is the principle that Internet users should be able to access any web content they want, post their own content, and use any applications they choose, without restrictions or limitations imposed by their Internet service providers (ISPs).

The word “network” in Network Neutrality is not restricted to the Internet. It applies to any network where the service provider is providing a platform for communication. Just as the federal government had to establish “common carriage” principles for the railroad system in the late 1800s, it needs to enforce the same principles for the Internet, text messaging, and any other new communications platforms that are developed.

Telephone and cable companies that provide Internet access to millions of Americans would like to get rid of Net Neutrality. They spend millions of dollars lobbying Congress for the right to create a two-tier Internet, where their own content and services (and those of businesses that pay their fees) would travel quickly and efficiently in the “fast lane,” while all other websites and services would be relegated to the “slow lane.”

The FCC let effective Net Neutrality protections expire in August 2006 as the result of a technical change in the way they address Internet governance. But it is important to understand that Net Neutrality has always been a guiding principle of the Internet — it is *the reason* that the Internet has been able to grow exponentially, fuel innovation, and alter how we communicate.<sup>33</sup>

Today there is no rule or regulation to prevent phone and cable companies from doing what they have said they want to do: charge content providers for the right to be on “their” Internet pipes, and make special deals with some companies to ensure their sites and services work faster and are easier to find by Internet users. That’s why it’s so critical that Congress act now to protect freedom on the Internet.

Without Net Neutrality, Internet service providers would be free to block or impede any online content or services, for any reason. They could also charge websites or applications for “priority service,” practically assuring that any site that couldn’t or wouldn’t pay their fees would no longer work as well or be as easy to find. That could spell the end of

**The problem with the new media we are faced with today is twofold... not everyone has access to what it offers...it is at risk of being completely altered by corporate interests...**

32 “Tolls May Slow Web Traffic,” Gregory Lamb, Christian Science Monitor, March 15, 2006, <http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/0315/p14s01-stct.html>

33 “The Neutral Internet: An Information Architecture for Open Societies,” Daniel J. Weitzner, August 6, 2008, <http://dig.csail.mit.edu/2006/06/neutralnet.html>

innovation, as small businesses, entrepreneurs, local governments, nonprofits and others would be locked out of a system controlled by the big telephone and cable companies. If network providers are allowed to control the flow of information, the open and freewheeling nature of the Internet could be lost.

## **Without Net Neutrality, Internet service providers would be free to block or impede any online content or services, for any reason.**

Even worse, we'll lose the Internet as our "town square" — where we talk to one another, exchange views, find information from many diverse sources of news and opinion, blog, contact candidates, and engage in our democracy. We will be left with an Internet that is mostly about selling things and is no longer about citizen engagement.

We are already seeing the impact of the loss of Net Neutrality. Verizon refused to allow political text messages from NARAL to go to its customers, even though those customers had signed up to receive the messages.<sup>34</sup> Comcast was caught denying and degrading legal file sharing communications on its network.<sup>35</sup> And the future looks even worse: AT&T has announced to potential investors that it is "ready to filter the Internet."<sup>36</sup>

Federal legislation can ensure the principles that have created the Internet we have today are protected.

### **Community Broadband**

Many communities are setting up "community broadband" networks, or high-speed Internet networks that anyone in the community can access for free. Community broadband benefits citizens by allowing everyone, regardless of economic status, to utilize the Internet. Common Cause supports workable community broadband efforts, as they increase the ability of citizens to participate actively in our democracy.

Communities throughout the country are finding that they can provide more efficient, affordable and accessible broadband Internet service than the telecom giants currently dominating their markets. Community wireless uses unlicensed space on the public airwaves to provide dependable high-speed Internet connections to homes all across America, community by community, without the high cost and hassle of traditional phone and cable wires. This technology has the potential to revolutionize how we create, distribute and access information.

As a result of intense lobbying by and campaign contributions from Internet providers and cable and telephone companies, several states have passed laws that prohibit municipal governments from setting up community broadband networks.<sup>37</sup> Federal legislation should affirm the rights of all municipalities to establish broadband networks as they see fit.

Related to this is allowing public utilities to provide broadband Internet service through their existing networks and dark fiber capacity. Public electric utilities already have a network on which to distribute broadband service. In particular, if the utility has fiber-optic capacity that is not currently in use ("dark fiber"), broadband Internet can be provided quickly and easily at low cost to consumers. However, competition is the last thing that cable and phone companies want. In Nebraska, they used their financial and lobbying muscle to ban the Nebraska Public Power District, a statewide public utility, from providing broadband service through its network.<sup>38</sup> This is despite the fact that in many locations where NPPD would be able to provide service, the cable and phone companies do not currently provide broadband.

The United States does not have a coherent and comprehensive strategy for development and enhancement of broadband. This must be addressed. The US has slipped in broadband penetration rankings from 4<sup>th</sup> place in 2001 to 15<sup>th</sup> place in 2007 among nations surveyed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.<sup>39</sup> The FCC should be empowered to begin work on developing a strategy that addresses broadband deployment, its costs,

**Community wireless uses unlicensed space on the public airwaves to provide dependable high-speed Internet connections to homes all across America, community by community, without the high cost and hassle of traditional phone and cable wires.**

34 "Verizon's Abortion Block Raises Net Neutrality Concerns", Martin H. Bosworth, ConsumerAffairs.com, September 27, 2007, [http://www.consumeraffairs.com/news04/2007/09/verizon\\_abortion.html](http://www.consumeraffairs.com/news04/2007/09/verizon_abortion.html)

35 "Comcast Blocks Bit Torrent Traffic," Highland Cynic, Geek.com, October 23, 2007, <http://www.geek.com/comcast-blocks-bit-torrent-traffic/>

36 "Has AT&T Lost its Mind?" Tim Wu, Slate.com, January 16, 2008, <http://www.slate.com/id/2182152/fr/rss>

37 "Community Broadband Act would overturn bans on municipal broadband," Eric Bangeman, ars technical, August 3, 2007, <http://arstechnica.com/news.ars/post/20070803-community-broadband-act-would-overturn-bans-on-municipal-broadband.html?rel>

38 Information gathered on the website of Use Public Power and in conversations with organization leaders, <http://www.usepublicpower.com/>

39 "OECD Broadband Statistics to December 2006," Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, August 6, 2008, [http://www.oecd.org/document/7/0,3343,en\\_2649\\_34225\\_38446855\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/7/0,3343,en_2649_34225_38446855_1_1_1_1,00.html)

and the future design of broadband technology. Economically, this is critical. The Brookings Institution estimated that America's slow growth of broadband compared to other nations could lead to a potential loss of \$1 trillion in economic productivity over the next decade.<sup>40</sup> However, a successfully implemented broadband strategy could create as many as 1.2 million new jobs in America according to the same report. While a rational broadband policy is critical for equal political participation, its economic benefits are equally important.

## Problem: The Agency Responsible for Ensuring that Media Serves the Public Interest Fails to Listen to the Public<sup>41</sup>

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulates how we get the news we need to govern ourselves, how we talk to one another over the phone or over the Internet, and whether everyone in the nation has easy and affordable access to the tools necessary to survive and succeed in the twenty first century. These are among the most important activities in our country.

Recently, the FCC has come under increased scrutiny regarding the processes it uses to make the rules that govern the broadcasting industry. A Government Accountability Office (GAO) study showed that the FCC leaks information to telecommunication industry lobbyists.<sup>42</sup> Congress complained that the FCC does not give enough time for public comment on proposed rules.<sup>43</sup> Public interest advocates were outraged over routinely being given short notice about public hearings.<sup>44</sup> Instances such as these demonstrate the need for FCC processes to be examined regularly and to find ways to improve them.

In many respects the FCC recapitulates the failure of the telecommunications market: a system in which incumbents with power arising from their great wealth determine outcomes without regard for the best interest of the majority of Americans. Just as only well-regulated markets can deliver genuine competition, only an FCC with transparent procedures in which incumbents do not routinely prevail can guarantee that the public's airwaves are used for the public interest rather than the enrichment of special interests.

## Solutions to Ensure the FCC Listens to the Public More Effectively

Common Cause, the Media Access Project and Econometric Research and Analysis offer a set of recommendations that Republicans and Democrats alike can support as simple, affordable ways to involve the public in the critical dialog over our media and digital future. These recommendations, if implemented, would boost public confidence in the FCC by making it more transparent and fair and a more efficient and effective enforcement agency:

### ***Open Access for the Public, Not Just Industry Lobbyists***

- *Publish meeting agendas enough in advance to give fair warning.*
- *Publish a list of orders on circulation — items that are considered by commissioners without a need for discussion at an open or closed agenda meeting — and update the list on a regular, scheduled basis.*
- *Make it standard policy to allow 90 days for public comment after publication in the Federal Register and note Federal Register publication in the FCC's daily digest.*
- *Hold more public forums outside D.C. and provide at least thirty days notice of any public forum. Moving out of D.C. would bring in fresh faces and fresh perspectives.*

40 "The Effects of Broadband Deployment on Output and Employment: A Cross-sectional Analysis of U.S. Data," William Lehr, The Brookings Institution, June 2007, [http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2007/06labor\\_crandall.aspx](http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2007/06labor_crandall.aspx)

41 All the content in this section comes from "Putting the Public Back in Public Interest: Painless Reforms to Improve the FCC," by Harold Feld, Gregory Rose, Jon Bartholomew and Ed Davis, December 2007, <http://www.commoncause.org/atf/cf/%7bf3c17e2-cdd1-4df6-92be-bd4429893665%7d/PAINLESSFCCREFORMS.PDF>

42 "GAO Report Slams FCC for Leaks," John Dunbar, ABC News, October 3 2007, <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/WireStory?id=3681708>

43 "25 Senators Write Martin, Urging Him to Delay Dec. 18 Vote," John Eggerton -- Broadcasting & Cable, 12/17/2007, <http://www.broadcasting-cable.com/article/CA6513459.html?rssid=193>

44 "FCC to Hold Localism Hearing Oct. 31," John Eggerton -- Broadcasting & Cable, 10/24/2007, <http://www.broadcastingcable.com/article/CA6494220.html?industryid=47170>

### **Open Up and Improve FCC Data**

- Establish advisory committees to get outside expertise on data collection, data processing, and data presentation, in order to examine the “meta-questions” about these issues.
- Create better indexing of the FCC’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS).

### **Attitude Adjustment/Make Better Use of Existing Authority and Resources**

- Make better use of existing rules and resources: Nothing prevents the FCC from making voluntary surveys mandatory on pain of fine or license revocation for failure to comply. Nothing prevents the use of FCC enforcement data and data from other government agencies in making public policy.
- The FCC must do a better job enforcing its own rules in a fair and consistent manner: The common perception, based on experience, is that the FCC rarely enforces its public file requirements or responds to complaints from individuals or small businesses — especially when filed against large companies with regular business before the Commission.
- Attitude adjustment: While many FCC staff do their best to assist members of the public, too many seem to regard industry representatives as “clients” while regarding members of the public as “nuisances.”

## **Problem: The Digital Television Transition Could Leave Millions Without Access To The Information They Need To Participate In Our Democracy**

On February 17, 2009, all television broadcasting in America (except for some low-power TV stations) transition from analog to digital signals. Those who subscribe to cable or satellite services, or who own a digital TV set or a digital-to-analog converter box won’t be disrupted by the change. But those who have relied on over-the-air television will turn on their analog sets and find no signal. The problem is explained clearly by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights/Leadership Conference on Civil Rights Education Fund in its report, “Transition in Trouble: Action Needed to Ensure a Successful Digital Television Transition:”

*Despite months of education and outreach efforts by government, industry, nonprofit community organizations such as the members of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, and numerous other groups, many American households remain either completely unaware or only partially aware of the impending digital television transition. Those who are aware of the transition are often confused about whether they will be impacted, and what actions, if any, they should take.*

*Broadcast television is the primary news source for most Americans. Especially reliant on free over-the-air television are low-income Americans, seniors, persons with disabilities, non-English speakers, and minorities — many of the communities served by members of the Leadership Conference. These communities also own a disproportionate number of older analog television sets that require a converter box to receive digital broadcasts.*

*For many members of these communities, free over-the-air broadcast television is a lifeline. It keeps them informed and engaged in their communities and warns them about potential life-threatening situations. Many Americans owe their lives to emergency weather or public safety warnings broadcast to their television sets.<sup>45</sup>*

The transition from analog to digital TV should mean that the public gets more: better quality TV pictures, and more programming that serves our needs for information about our local communities. It should also mean that the public airwaves could be used to make access to the Internet more available at low cost to rural, low-income and minority households, and to small businesses. This new technology could better inform and empower all Americans, and give the opportunity to prosper in this new information age to all of us, regardless of our income level or where we live.

Our elected officials must do all they can to ensure that low-income and minority families are not shut out of new technology, and that we find ways to encourage diversity of voices and more information to help citizens fully participate in their government. In the section of this document about public interest obligations, we explain how the DTV transition provides a rare opportunity to set real standards for public affairs programming. The other key issue to address is how people are impacted by the transition to digital broadcasting.

---

<sup>45</sup> The full report by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights on the Digital Transition, “Transition in Trouble: Action Needed to Ensure a Successful Digital Television Transition,” can be found at <http://www.civilrights.org/dtv>

## Solutions to Ensure a Smooth Transition to Digital Television Broadcasting

To ensure a smooth transition to digital broadcasting, the recommendations made by the Leadership Conference should be adopted as they will significantly increase the number of viewers who will be prepared for the digital transition. They include:

**Improve the organization of the transition.** The federal government should engage in the same kind of comprehensive planning for the nation's digital television transition that it did for the nation's Y2K computer transition, as recommended by the GAO in its November 2007 report on the DTV transition.

**Provide increased consumer outreach, education and research.** To increase consumer awareness and reduce confusion, the federal government must appropriate additional funding to provide public education and outreach to alert and assist populations at risk of losing over-the-air television service. The government should also encourage broadcasters to conduct analog shut-off tests such as that recently completed in Orlando and upcoming in Wilmington, NC, in more, if not all markets, prior to February 17, 2009.

**Reduce costs and burdens of transition on viewers.** The federal government should improve the coupon program by making them more available and eliminating the expiration date. It should also provide resources to help persons with disabilities navigate the transition.

**Preserve communities' access to their television stations.** The federal government must address the problem of preserving access to analog low-power community broadcast stations and rural translator stations through education, outreach, and a greatly increased supply of coupon-eligible converter boxes that enable a single analog television to receive both digital and analog broadcasts.

**Prepare for rapid response to problems.** The federal government should fund and organize Rapid Response Teams ready to act starting January 1, 2009, to assist the most vulnerable populations who may end up losing television service. The NTIA and FCC DTV consumer assistance telephone lines should be fully staffed and include customer service representatives trained in languages other than English, and in assisting people with disabilities, to help those who are confused about the transition or the coupon program.

**Small steps can make a big difference.** There are many other small steps the federal government can take to educate the public about the DTV transition. Every government agency and Congressional office should have a link on their websites to [www.dtv2009.gov](http://www.dtv2009.gov) and place informational bill stuffers in all their mailings. The Postal Service should place DTV transition posters in all post offices.

Bold and decisive action such as that recommended by the Leadership Conference must be taken quickly, or potentially millions of viewers in our nation's most vulnerable communities will be at risk of losing their lifelines to those communities — free over-the-air television service. The stakes are too great for our nation to allow the digital television transition to become the Digital Television Divide.

Congress authorized the change to digital television. It is the responsibility of Congress to ensure that no communities or consumers are unfairly and excessively burdened by the transition. Adopting these common sense recommendations will help considerably in the challenge of ensuring that on February 17, 2009, America leaves none of its communities and viewers behind.

---

## Conclusion

In the coming year, a new President will enter the White House and the makeup of Congress is likely to be considerably different than today. This presents an enormous opportunity to improve the media in America. We urge a new administration and new Congress to take the bold steps necessary to ensure that the media is a full partner in enhancing our democracy and serving the public. The reforms outlined here will take us long way to achieving that goal.

---

## Acknowledgments:

We extend a sincere thanks to all the individuals and organizations who helped make this document possible:

Alliance for Community Media  
Leadership Conference on Civil Rights  
Free Press  
Media and Democracy Coalition  
National Hispanic Media Coalition  
Prometheus Radio Project  
Harold Feld  
Gregory Rose  
Ann Bartholomew

All the staff at Common Cause who have contributed to text and editing of the content of this paper over a number of years.





# APPENDIX



## Contributions Chart

Many of the big media companies and their trade associations spend millions of dollars every year on lobbying and campaign contributions. Since the beginning of the 2006 election cycle, a group of some of the most vocal advocates on media issues has spent more than \$230 million dollars on contributions and lobbying. These include trade associations such as the National Association of Broadcasters, National Cable and Telecommunications

Company	Campaign Contributions				
	2006 cycle	2008 cycle	Total	Democrats	Republicans
AH Belo Corp	\$7,450	\$0	\$7,450	40%	60%
Americans for Tax Reform	\$0	\$250	\$250	0%	100%
Belo Corp	\$1,250	\$2,800	\$4,050	37%	63%
Bockorny Group	\$2,500	\$100,858	\$103,358	47%	53%
Capitol Broadcasting	\$0	\$7,900	\$7,900	87%	13%
Clear Channel Communications	\$620,684	\$384,850	\$1,005,534	41%	59%
Comcast Corp	\$1,514,491	\$1,549,640	\$3,064,131	55%	44%
Cox Enterprises	\$96,075	\$112,964	\$209,039	38%	60%
Discovery Communications	\$65,520	\$84,720	\$150,240	97%	3%
Gannett Co	\$9,750	\$5,810	\$15,560	73%	27%
General Electric (NBC Universal)	\$170,787	\$228,125	\$398,912	84%	16%
Independent Film & Television Alliance	\$500	\$500	\$1,000	100%	0%
ION Media Networks	\$4,600	\$5,600	\$10,200	65%	35%
Jovon Broadcasting	\$0	\$13,800	\$13,800	100%	0%
Media General	\$1,500	\$675	\$2,175	80%	20%
National Amusements Inc	\$43,710	\$121,101	\$164,811	63%	35%
National Assn of Broadcasters	\$800,294	\$496,670	\$1,296,964	46%	53%
National Cable & Telecommunications Assn	\$1,512,243	\$908,023	\$2,420,266	47%	52%
News Corp	\$692,720	\$785,994	\$1,478,714	58%	42%
Newspaper Assn of America	\$5,500	\$5,300	\$10,800	14%	86%
Private Equity Council	\$0	\$17,500	\$17,500	94%	6%
Qwest Communications	\$583,786	\$494,956	\$1,078,742	41%	59%
Tribune Co	\$3,250	\$21,050	\$24,300	69%	31%
Verizon Communications	\$1,866,720	\$1,214,804	\$3,081,524	45%	55%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$8,003,330</b>	<b>\$6,563,890</b>	<b>\$14,567,220</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>49%</b>

The Center for Responsive Politics, July 2008.

Association, and Newspaper Association of America as well as large media companies, including Clear Channel Communications and Verizon Communications. The organizations listed in the table lobbied on a variety of media issues, including some or all of the issues discussed in this report.

Lobbying					Grand Total
2005	2006	2007	2008	Total	
\$0	\$0	\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000	\$67,450
\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,194,000	\$350,000	\$4,544,000	\$4,544,250
\$355,000	\$345,000	\$525,000	\$80,000	\$1,305,000	\$1,309,050
\$0	\$0	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$120,000	\$223,358
\$160,000	\$80,000	\$0	\$0	\$240,000	\$247,900
\$2,180,000	\$2,520,000	\$2,471,750	\$1,857,490	\$9,029,240	\$10,034,774
\$3,951,000	\$3,500,000	\$8,769,323	\$5,490,000	\$21,710,323	\$24,774,454
\$2,020,000	\$2,200,000	\$4,140,000	\$1,500,000	\$9,860,000	\$10,069,039
\$160,000	\$500,000	\$800,000	\$360,000	\$1,820,000	\$1,820,000
\$580,000	\$60,000	\$200,000	\$100,000	\$940,000	\$955,560
\$551,000	\$920,000	\$417,000	\$262,000	\$2,150,000	\$2,548,912
\$120,000	\$120,000	\$220,000	\$160,000	\$620,000	\$621,000
\$0	\$440,000	\$120,000	\$40,000	\$600,000	\$610,200
\$40,000	\$40,000	\$120,000	\$0	\$200,000	\$213,800
\$952,047	\$166,683	\$149,976	\$74,917	\$1,343,623	\$1,345,798
\$0	\$0	\$4,103,000	\$4,010,000	\$8,113,000	\$8,277,811
\$7,800,000	\$8,560,000	\$8,900,000	\$5,620,000	\$30,880,000	\$32,176,964
\$6,550,000	\$14,020,000	\$13,020,000	\$6,550,000	\$40,140,000	\$42,560,266
\$4,400,000	\$3,070,000	\$5,730,000	\$1,640,000	\$14,840,000	\$16,318,714
\$1,610,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,578,000	\$820,000	\$5,608,000	\$5,618,800
\$0	\$0	\$1,402,500	\$1,690,000	\$3,092,500	\$3,110,000
\$3,440,000	\$3,120,000	\$3,361,345	\$1,710,000	\$11,631,345	\$12,710,087
\$156,445	\$161,325	\$260,000	\$121,797	\$699,567	\$723,867
\$11,766,110	\$13,202,500	\$14,027,000	\$9,000,000	\$47,995,610	\$51,077,134
\$48,291,602	\$56,125,508	\$71,628,894	\$41,496,204	\$217,542,208	\$232,109,428

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Clinton, Hillary	\$225,615	\$608,656	\$834,271
Obama, Barack	-\$1,500	\$584,704	\$583,204
McCain, John	-\$2,000	\$266,650	\$264,650
Sununu, John E	\$46,000	\$129,400	\$175,400
Santorum, Rick	\$154,100	\$0	\$154,100
Giuliani, Rudolph W	\$0	\$148,950	\$148,950
Dingell, John D	\$69,500	\$79,000	\$148,500
Burns, Conrad	\$147,850	-\$4,000	\$143,850
Stevens, Ted	\$82,499	\$57,250	\$139,749
Upton, Fred	\$78,200	\$51,600	\$129,800
Smith, Gordon H	\$63,950	\$56,500	\$120,450
Barton, Joe	\$85,500	\$32,500	\$118,000
McConnell, Mitch	\$54,000	\$63,850	\$117,850
Ensign, John	\$110,848	\$0	\$110,848
Romney, Mitt	\$0	\$105,975	\$105,975
Allen, George	\$104,950	\$0	\$104,950
Cantor, Eric	\$73,850	\$28,250	\$102,100
Kyl, Jon	\$99,750	\$1,500	\$101,250
Hastert, Dennis	\$86,600	\$13,500	\$100,100
Blunt, Roy	\$63,500	\$36,000	\$99,500
Rangel, Charles B	\$64,000	\$34,750	\$98,750
Rockefeller, Jay	\$32,500	\$66,250	\$98,750
Markey, Edward J	\$53,000	\$45,250	\$98,250
Nelson, Ben	\$97,450	-\$250	\$97,200
Hoyer, Steny H	\$43,500	\$51,355	\$94,855
Pryor, Mark	\$43,250	\$51,000	\$94,250
Baucus, Max	\$9,001	\$84,100	\$93,101
Cannon, Chris	\$48,300	\$43,000	\$91,300
Nelson, Bill	\$82,922	\$7,500	\$90,422
Walden, Greg	\$52,600	\$36,250	\$88,850
Towns, Edolphus	\$56,250	\$30,000	\$86,250
Boucher, Rick	\$50,000	\$35,500	\$85,500
Dodd, Christopher J	\$12,500	\$72,570	\$85,070
Pelosi, Nancy	\$40,000	\$44,900	\$84,900
Bean, Melissa	\$53,250	\$30,250	\$83,500

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Ferguson, Mike	\$62,250	\$20,750	\$83,000
Lott, Trent	\$60,000	\$23,000	\$83,000
Menendez, Robert	\$76,750	\$5,000	\$81,750
Terry, Lee	\$47,750	\$33,349	\$81,099
Conyers, John Jr	\$45,310	\$35,000	\$80,310
Stearns, Cliff	\$41,000	\$38,000	\$79,000
Clyburn, James E	\$24,500	\$53,000	\$77,500
Pickering, Charles "Chip" Jr	\$59,000	\$18,500	\$77,500
Becerra, Xavier	\$45,045	\$32,000	\$77,045
Bono, Mary	\$46,500	\$30,000	\$76,500
Talent, James M	\$76,300	\$0	\$76,300
Engel, Eliot L	\$60,499	\$15,500	\$75,999
Wynn, Albert R	\$27,650	\$46,600	\$74,250
McCaul, Michael	\$44,900	\$29,100	\$74,000
Smith, Lamar	\$46,700	\$27,100	\$73,800
Lieberman, Joe	\$74,425	-\$1,000	\$73,425
Landrieu, Mary L	\$11,750	\$61,365	\$73,115
Wilson, Heather A	\$53,200	\$19,550	\$72,750
Chabot, Steve	\$45,350	\$27,250	\$72,600
Whitfield, Ed	\$44,475	\$26,500	\$70,975
Emanuel, Rahm	\$34,500	\$35,000	\$69,500
Berman, Howard L	\$38,000	\$31,000	\$69,000
Specter, Arlen	\$13,150	\$55,776	\$68,926
Crowley, Joseph	\$34,250	\$33,250	\$67,500
Durbin, Dick	\$17,000	\$49,500	\$66,500
Coleman, Norm	\$12,400	\$52,900	\$65,300
Salazar, Ken	\$15,700	\$48,900	\$64,600
Barrow, John	\$29,600	\$34,750	\$64,350
Matheson, Jim	\$29,250	\$35,000	\$64,250
Stupak, Bart	\$37,499	\$26,750	\$64,249
Spratt, John M Jr	\$44,500	\$19,000	\$63,500
Reynolds, Tom	\$51,600	\$11,500	\$63,100
Buyer, Steve	\$45,500	\$17,500	\$63,000
Pallone, Frank Jr	\$42,500	\$20,500	\$63,000
Boehner, John	\$35,400	\$27,250	\$62,650

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Corker, Bob	\$43,700	\$18,550	\$62,250
Snowe, Olympia J	\$62,000	\$0	\$62,000
DeWine, Mike	\$61,850	\$0	\$61,850
Biden, Joseph R Jr	\$30,050	\$31,500	\$61,550
Hatch, Orrin G	\$58,500	\$2,500	\$61,000
Solis, Hilda L	\$43,000	\$18,000	\$61,000
Gonzalez, Charlie A	\$30,750	\$29,800	\$60,550
Shays, Christopher	\$50,600	\$9,450	\$60,050
Pryce, Deborah	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$60,000
Radanovich, George	\$33,500	\$26,500	\$60,000
Sullivan, John	\$40,500	\$19,500	\$60,000
Cantwell, Maria	\$58,100	\$1,000	\$59,100
Cornyn, John	\$17,300	\$41,400	\$58,700
Fossella, Vito	\$36,500	\$21,500	\$58,000
Kennedy, Mark	\$57,750	\$0	\$57,750
Johnson, Tim	\$10,660	\$46,750	\$57,410
Udall, Mark	\$12,912	\$44,000	\$56,912
Collins, Susan M	\$0	\$56,450	\$56,450
Sensenbrenner, F James Jr	\$46,500	\$9,500	\$56,000
Ford, Harold E Jr	\$55,931	\$0	\$55,931
Carper, Tom	\$54,450	\$600	\$55,050
Bonilla, Henry	\$55,000	\$0	\$55,000
McCrery, Jim	\$28,600	\$26,000	\$54,600
Lautenberg, Frank R	\$20,000	\$34,500	\$54,500
Schwartz, Allyson	\$29,000	\$25,250	\$54,250
McCaskill, Claire	\$39,250	\$14,750	\$54,000
Doyle, Mike	\$37,248	\$16,000	\$53,248
Blackburn, Marsha	\$31,250	\$21,500	\$52,750
Rogers, Mike	\$31,188	\$21,500	\$52,688
Feeney, Tom	\$25,000	\$27,136	\$52,136
Gordon, Bart	\$27,500	\$24,500	\$52,000
Murphy, Tim	\$30,500	\$21,500	\$52,000
Rush, Bobby L	\$34,500	\$17,500	\$52,000
Shimkus, John M	\$26,782	\$24,750	\$51,532
Putnam, Adam H	\$14,750	\$36,500	\$51,250

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Edwards, Chet	\$32,000	\$18,500	\$50,500
Green, Gene	\$19,000	\$31,500	\$50,500
Pitts, Joe	\$29,733	\$20,500	\$50,233
Melancon, Charles J	\$27,500	\$22,500	\$50,000
Hutchison, Kay Bailey	\$49,699	\$250	\$49,949
Keller, Ric	\$17,500	\$31,750	\$49,250
Ross, Mike	\$25,000	\$23,500	\$48,500
Van Hollen, Chris	\$19,650	\$28,350	\$48,000
Warner, Mark	\$0	\$47,750	\$47,750
Richardson, Bill	\$0	\$47,150	\$47,150
Graham, Lindsey	\$14,750	\$32,150	\$46,900
Eshoo, Anna	\$32,800	\$14,000	\$46,800
Salazar, John	\$36,950	\$9,500	\$46,450
Gerlach, Jim	\$23,300	\$23,000	\$46,300
Hooley, Darlene	\$21,500	\$24,760	\$46,260
Dreier, David	\$36,200	\$10,000	\$46,200
Franken, Al	\$0	\$45,900	\$45,900
Hill, Baron	\$5,250	\$40,374	\$45,624
English, Phil	\$22,000	\$23,500	\$45,500
Kennedy, Edward M	\$44,100	\$250	\$44,350
Tauscher, Ellen	\$19,750	\$24,500	\$44,250
Pence, Mike	\$31,500	\$12,500	\$44,000
Murtha, John P	\$24,750	\$19,000	\$43,750
DeMint, James W	\$19,500	\$24,050	\$43,550
Myrick, Sue	\$29,500	\$14,000	\$43,500
Roberts, Pat	\$5,000	\$38,500	\$43,500
Paul, Ron	\$0	\$43,222	\$43,222
Waxman, Henry A	\$28,000	\$15,000	\$43,000
Harkin, Tom	\$3,500	\$39,450	\$42,950
Byrd, Robert C	\$42,750	\$0	\$42,750
Meeks, Gregory W	\$23,250	\$19,000	\$42,250
Goodlatte, Bob	\$30,050	\$12,000	\$42,050
Brown, Sherrod	\$33,300	\$8,500	\$41,800
Cubin, Barbara	\$40,125	\$1,487	\$41,612
Inslee, Jay R	\$25,550	\$16,010	\$41,560

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Herseth Sandlin, Stephanie	\$26,744	\$14,800	\$41,544
Davis, Tom	\$26,500	\$15,000	\$41,500
Kerry, John	\$4,350	\$36,565	\$40,915
Perlmutter, Edwin G	\$20,500	\$20,250	\$40,750
Thompson, Bennie G	\$17,750	\$23,000	\$40,750
Bass, Charles	\$40,500	\$0	\$40,500
Hall, Ralph M	\$21,600	\$18,500	\$40,100
Drake, Thelma	\$27,000	\$13,000	\$40,000
Conrad, Kent	\$37,500	\$2,000	\$39,500
DeGette, Diana	\$24,000	\$15,500	\$39,500
Northup, Anne M	\$35,000	\$3,250	\$38,250
Reid, Harry	\$0	\$38,100	\$38,100
Bachmann, Michele Marie	\$29,300	\$8,760	\$38,060
DeLay, Tom	\$39,000	-\$1,000	\$38,000
Tanner, John	\$17,500	\$20,500	\$38,000
Shadegg, John	\$27,475	\$10,250	\$37,725
Cardin, Ben	\$35,500	\$2,000	\$37,500
Bradley, Jeb	\$36,250	\$1,200	\$37,450
Chambliss, Saxby	\$2,500	\$34,750	\$37,250
Larson, John B	\$18,750	\$18,500	\$37,250
Sessions, Jeff	\$9,000	\$28,200	\$37,200
Barrett, Gresham	\$17,000	\$20,000	\$37,000
Deal, Nathan	\$22,500	\$14,250	\$36,750
Schiff, Adam	\$24,000	\$11,500	\$35,500
Moore, Dennis	\$28,250	\$7,000	\$35,250
Issa, Darrell	\$24,000	\$11,000	\$35,000
Chafee, Lincoln D	\$34,250	\$0	\$34,250
Burgess, Michael	\$23,000	\$11,000	\$34,000
Sanchez, Linda	\$19,000	\$15,000	\$34,000
Butterfield, G K	\$6,500	\$27,000	\$33,500
Thomas, Craig	\$33,500	\$0	\$33,500
Baca, Joe	\$17,000	\$16,100	\$33,100
Lofgren, Zoe	\$15,000	\$17,750	\$32,750
Bayh, Evan	\$32,499	\$0	\$32,499
Buchanan, Vernon	\$16,000	\$16,000	\$32,000

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Roskam, Peter	\$22,000	\$9,760	\$31,760
Matsui, Doris O	\$26,250	\$5,500	\$31,750
Wicker, Roger	\$0	\$31,750	\$31,750
Carney, Chris	\$1,500	\$30,200	\$31,700
Woods, David Dwight	\$0	\$31,650	\$31,650
Schultz, Debbie Wasser- man	\$13,999	\$17,100	\$31,099
Stabenow, Debbie	\$31,061	\$0	\$31,061
Dent, Charlie	\$10,500	\$20,500	\$31,000
Feinstein, Dianne	\$30,900	\$0	\$30,900
Gillmor, Paul E	\$24,500	\$6,000	\$30,500
Shaw, E Clay Jr	\$30,200	\$0	\$30,200
Whitehouse, Sheldon	\$13,500	\$16,500	\$30,000
Meek, Kendrick B	\$10,750	\$19,000	\$29,750
Levin, Carl	\$1,000	\$28,610	\$29,610
Boswell, Leonard L	\$22,500	\$7,100	\$29,600
Altmire, Jason	\$250	\$29,250	\$29,500
Casey, Bob	\$25,850	\$3,500	\$29,350
Lungren, Dan	\$17,750	\$11,000	\$28,750
Ruppersberger, Dutch	\$17,250	\$11,500	\$28,750
Domenici, Pete V	\$3,250	\$25,300	\$28,550
Bachus, Spencer	\$27,500	\$750	\$28,250
Watt, Melvin L	\$22,250	\$6,000	\$28,250
Bishop, Sanford D Jr	\$14,500	\$13,500	\$28,000
Camp, Dave	\$9,500	\$18,500	\$28,000
Sanchez, Loretta	\$14,000	\$14,000	\$28,000
Pomeroy, Earl	\$12,850	\$14,760	\$27,610
Bingaman, Jeff	\$27,550	\$0	\$27,550
Norwood, Charles W	\$27,500	\$0	\$27,500
Johanns, Michael O	\$0	\$27,249	\$27,249
Kline, John	\$19,935	\$7,000	\$26,935
Klobuchar, Amy	\$13,183	\$13,500	\$26,683
Reichert, Dave	\$10,650	\$15,500	\$26,150
Dole, Elizabeth	\$6,100	\$20,000	\$26,100
Sestak, Joe	\$0	\$26,100	\$26,100
Weldon, Curt	\$26,100	\$0	\$26,100

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Capps, Lois	\$17,000	\$9,000	\$26,000
Cuellar, Henry	\$12,100	\$13,511	\$25,611
Dorgan, Byron L	\$5,750	\$19,550	\$25,300
Akaka, Daniel K	\$25,250	\$0	\$25,250
Sessions, Pete	\$21,100	\$4,000	\$25,100
Sweeney, John E	\$29,100	-\$4,000	\$25,100
Dicks, Norm	\$14,000	\$11,000	\$25,000
King, Pete	\$13,500	\$11,000	\$24,500
King, Steven A	\$14,000	\$10,500	\$24,500
Space, Zachary T	\$2,500	\$22,000	\$24,500
Reed, Jack	\$400	\$23,856	\$24,256
Harman, Jane	\$7,000	\$17,000	\$24,000
Ryan, Paul	\$16,000	\$8,000	\$24,000
Tiahrt, Todd	\$16,000	\$8,000	\$24,000
Wolf, Frank R	\$20,000	\$4,000	\$24,000
Hayworth, J D	\$23,250	\$0	\$23,250
Tiberi, Patrick J	\$13,300	\$9,750	\$23,050
Coble, Howard	\$13,500	\$9,500	\$23,000
Thompson, Mike	\$16,500	\$6,500	\$23,000
Wilson, Charlie	\$18,700	\$4,000	\$22,700
Ackerman, Gary	\$18,650	\$4,000	\$22,650
Lewis, Ron	\$14,000	\$8,500	\$22,500
Mack, Connie	\$10,500	\$12,000	\$22,500
Edwards, John	\$0	\$22,275	\$22,275
Leahy, Patrick	\$13,500	\$8,750	\$22,250
Murphy, Patrick J	\$3,500	\$18,750	\$22,250
Hobson, Dave	\$16,000	\$6,000	\$22,000
Smith, Adrian	\$8,750	\$13,113	\$21,863
Barrasso, John A	\$0	\$21,800	\$21,800
Forbes, J Randy	\$15,701	\$6,050	\$21,751
Steele, Michael	\$21,600	\$0	\$21,600
Brady, Robert A	\$2,500	\$19,000	\$21,500
Capito, Shelley Moore	\$15,500	\$6,000	\$21,500
Sires, Albio	\$11,500	\$9,943	\$21,443
Cummings, Elijah E	\$16,250	\$5,000	\$21,250

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Inglis, Bob	\$16,000	\$5,000	\$21,000
Neal, Richard E	\$8,000	\$13,000	\$21,000
Schakowsky, Jan	\$13,000	\$8,000	\$21,000
Sali, William T	\$10,500	\$10,250	\$20,750
Davis, Geoff	\$12,000	\$8,500	\$20,500
Giffords, Gabrielle	\$10,725	\$9,662	\$20,387
Fitzpatrick, Michael G	\$20,334	\$0	\$20,334
Gillibrand, Kirsten E	\$3,300	\$16,900	\$20,200
Renzi, Rick	\$17,900	\$2,250	\$20,150
Hart, Melissa	\$20,000	\$0	\$20,000
Skelton, Ike	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$20,000
Walsh, James T	\$13,500	\$6,500	\$20,000
Baldwin, Tammy	\$8,850	\$11,000	\$19,850
McIntyre, Mike	\$9,500	\$10,250	\$19,750
LoBiondo, Frank A	\$9,200	\$10,500	\$19,700
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln	\$12,000	\$7,500	\$19,500
Martinez, Mel	\$9,000	\$10,500	\$19,500
Marshall, Jim	\$10,350	\$9,000	\$19,350
Alexander, Lamar	\$0	\$19,000	\$19,000
Chocola, Chris	\$19,000	\$0	\$19,000
Jordan, James D	\$7,000	\$12,000	\$19,000
Weiner, Anthony D	\$15,500	\$3,500	\$19,000
Lugar, Richard G	\$18,500	\$0	\$18,500
Pombo, Richard	\$18,500	\$0	\$18,500
Risch, James E	\$0	\$18,500	\$18,500
Rodriguez, Ciro D	\$2,600	\$15,500	\$18,100
Oberstar, James L	\$6,000	\$12,000	\$18,000
Latham, Tom	\$5,750	\$12,000	\$17,750
Weller, Jerry	\$15,000	\$2,750	\$17,750
Blumenauer, Earl	\$5,000	\$12,500	\$17,500
Carter, John	\$12,500	\$5,000	\$17,500
Lampson, Nick	\$5,500	\$12,000	\$17,500
Rehberg, Denny	\$8,500	\$9,000	\$17,500
Davis, Artur	\$3,000	\$14,292	\$17,292
Kind, Ron	\$10,000	\$7,250	\$17,250

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Knollenberg, Joe	\$11,000	\$6,250	\$17,250
Graves, Sam	\$8,100	\$9,000	\$17,100
Beauprez, Bob	\$17,000	\$0	\$17,000
Berry, Marion	\$5,000	\$12,000	\$17,000
Schmidt, Jean	\$10,000	\$7,000	\$17,000
Price, Tom	\$8,900	\$8,025	\$16,925
Ellsworth, Brad	\$3,500	\$13,250	\$16,750
Thompson, Fred	\$0	\$16,650	\$16,650
Allen, Tom	\$9,000	\$7,550	\$16,550
Burr, Richard	\$14,000	\$2,500	\$16,500
Sherwood, Don	\$16,500	\$0	\$16,500
Sodrel, Michael E	\$16,500	\$0	\$16,500
Kelly, Sue	\$16,250	\$0	\$16,250
McHenry, Patrick	\$9,250	\$7,000	\$16,250
McMorris, Cathy	\$9,500	\$6,750	\$16,250
O'Donnell, Rick	\$17,050	-\$1,000	\$16,050
Hastings, Doc	\$11,000	\$5,000	\$16,000
Johnson, Nancy L	\$16,000	\$0	\$16,000
LaTourette, Steven C	\$10,000	\$6,000	\$16,000
Rogers, Hal	\$14,000	\$2,000	\$16,000
Scott, David	\$5,500	\$10,500	\$16,000
Arcuri, Michael	\$4,300	\$11,500	\$15,800
Mahoney, Tim	\$4,000	\$11,800	\$15,800
Pastor, Ed	\$9,500	\$6,250	\$15,750
Wamp, Zach	\$7,668	\$8,075	\$15,743
Inhofe, James M	\$5,625	\$10,000	\$15,625
Wexler, Robert	\$3,000	\$12,500	\$15,500
Young, C W Bill	\$11,000	\$4,500	\$15,500
Scott, Robert C	\$8,000	\$7,350	\$15,350
Andrews, Robert E	\$12,250	\$3,000	\$15,250
McKeon, Howard P "Buck"	\$8,250	\$7,000	\$15,250
Mollohan, Alan B	\$11,250	\$4,000	\$15,250
Kean, Thomas H Jr	\$15,200	\$0	\$15,200
Boxer, Barbara	\$2,100	\$13,050	\$15,150
Castle, Michael N	\$9,350	\$5,800	\$15,150

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Higgins, Brian M	\$13,550	\$1,500	\$15,050
Cochran, Thad	\$4,000	\$11,000	\$15,000
Cole, Tom	\$3,500	\$11,500	\$15,000
Kuhl, John R Jr	\$11,000	\$4,000	\$15,000
Lewis, Jerry	\$8,000	\$7,000	\$15,000
Frelinghuysen, Rodney	\$7,000	\$7,750	\$14,750
McCarthy, Kevin	\$12,750	\$2,000	\$14,750
Hulshof, Kenny	\$11,700	\$3,000	\$14,700
Lamberti, Jeffrey	\$14,600	\$0	\$14,600
Fattah, Chaka	\$10,000	\$4,500	\$14,500
Moran, Jim	\$9,000	\$5,500	\$14,500
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana	\$7,000	\$7,500	\$14,500
Shuster, Bill	\$6,000	\$8,500	\$14,500
Simmons, Rob	\$14,500	\$0	\$14,500
Simpson, Mike	\$8,000	\$6,500	\$14,500
Murphy, Chris	\$2,100	\$12,240	\$14,340
Granger, Kay	\$6,250	\$8,000	\$14,250
Delahunt, Bill	\$14,000	\$0	\$14,000
Enzi, Mike	\$5,000	\$9,000	\$14,000
Foley, Mark	\$14,000	\$0	\$14,000
Kingston, Jack	\$9,000	\$5,000	\$14,000
Peterson, John E	\$9,000	\$5,000	\$14,000
Porter, Jon	\$8,000	\$6,000	\$14,000
Webb, James	\$12,850	\$1,000	\$13,850
Carnahan, Russ	\$7,500	\$6,000	\$13,500
Dewine, R Pat	\$13,500	\$0	\$13,500
Thune, John	\$3,500	\$10,000	\$13,500
Hagel, Chuck	\$13,315	\$0	\$13,315
Flake, Jeff	\$10,500	\$2,800	\$13,300
Gard, John	\$13,250	\$0	\$13,250
Murphy, Lois	\$13,200	\$0	\$13,200
Ryun, Jim	\$12,600	\$500	\$13,100
Hensarling, Jeb	\$4,500	\$8,500	\$13,000
Johnson, Sam	\$7,000	\$6,000	\$13,000
Jones, Stephanie Tubbs	\$7,500	\$5,500	\$13,000



Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Nunes, Devin Gerald	\$7,500	\$5,500	\$13,000
Welch, Peter	\$7,000	\$5,950	\$12,950
Boyd, Allen	\$4,750	\$8,000	\$12,750
Biggert, Judy	\$9,500	\$3,000	\$12,500
Bilirakis, Gus	\$8,750	\$3,750	\$12,500
Kirk, Mark	\$4,500	\$8,000	\$12,500
Smith, Adam	\$7,000	\$5,500	\$12,500
Kolbe, Jim	\$12,325	\$0	\$12,325
Souder, Mark E	\$5,300	\$7,000	\$12,300
Lincoln, Blanche	\$3,250	\$9,000	\$12,250
Kilpatrick, Carolyn Cheeks	\$5,600	\$6,500	\$12,100
Inouye, Daniel K	-\$1,000	\$13,000	\$12,000
LaHood, Ray	\$11,750	\$250	\$12,000
Lewis, John	\$4,750	\$7,250	\$12,000
Miller, George	\$1,000	\$11,000	\$12,000
Musgrave, Marilyn	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$12,000
Neugebauer, Randy	\$8,000	\$4,000	\$12,000
Rothman, Steven R	\$6,500	\$5,500	\$12,000
Gutknecht, Gil	\$11,875	\$0	\$11,875
Miller, Brad	\$10,750	\$1,000	\$11,750
Obey, David R	\$9,700	\$2,000	\$11,700
Hall, John	\$5,875	\$5,800	\$11,675
Madrid, Patricia A	\$9,500	\$2,000	\$11,500
McCarthy, Carolyn	\$8,000	\$3,500	\$11,500
Otter, C L 'Butch'	\$11,500	\$0	\$11,500
Tester, Jon	\$7,876	\$3,500	\$11,376
Cooper, Jim	\$5,750	\$5,500	\$11,250
Craig, Larry	\$9,250	\$2,000	\$11,250
Mica, John L	\$4,500	\$6,750	\$11,250
Brown, Matthew A	\$11,200	\$0	\$11,200
Bryant, Ed	\$11,200	\$0	\$11,200
Bishop, Rob	\$8,000	\$3,150	\$11,150
Cornett, Mick	\$11,000	\$0	\$11,000
Hayes, Robin	\$9,000	\$2,000	\$11,000
Hinojosa, Ruben	\$6,000	\$5,000	\$11,000

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Klein, Ron	\$2,000	\$8,800	\$10,800
Dix, Bill	\$10,650	\$0	\$10,650
Brady, Kevin	\$6,000	\$4,500	\$10,500
Conaway, Mike	\$5,000	\$5,500	\$10,500
Larsen, Rick	\$2,500	\$8,000	\$10,500
Murray, Patty	\$3,000	\$7,500	\$10,500
Nadler, Jerrold	\$6,000	\$4,500	\$10,500
Slaughter, Louise M	\$1,000	\$9,500	\$10,500
Yarmuth, John A	\$4,450	\$6,000	\$10,450
Sherman, Brad	\$5,000	\$5,250	\$10,250
Case, Ed	\$10,200	\$0	\$10,200
Doolittle, John T	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
Green, Al	\$7,000	\$3,000	\$10,000
Hoekstra, Peter	\$8,000	\$2,000	\$10,000
Latta, Robert E	\$0	\$10,000	\$10,000
Ney, Bob	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
Nussle, Jim	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
Taylor, Charles H	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
Thomas, Bill	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000
Smith, Chris	\$7,621	\$2,000	\$9,621
Baker, Richard	\$7,500	\$2,000	\$9,500
Bennett, Robert F	\$4,000	\$5,500	\$9,500
Brownback, Sam	\$3,500	\$6,000	\$9,500
Courtney, Joe	\$2,000	\$7,500	\$9,500
Levin, Sander	\$3,000	\$6,500	\$9,500
Michaud, Mike	\$8,000	\$1,500	\$9,500
Pearce, Steve	\$8,000	\$1,500	\$9,500
Vitter, David	\$5,500	\$4,000	\$9,500
Walz, Timothy J	\$2,500	\$6,800	\$9,300
Whalen, Mike	\$9,100	\$0	\$9,100
Galvert, Ken	\$6,000	\$3,000	\$9,000
Cramer, Bud	\$6,000	\$3,000	\$9,000
Frank, Barney	\$7,000	\$2,000	\$9,000
Franks, Trent	\$5,000	\$4,000	\$9,000
Jones, Walter B Jr	\$3,000	\$6,000	\$9,000

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Kanjorski, Paul E	\$9,000	\$0	\$9,000
Reyes, Silvestre	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$9,000
Schwarz, Joe	\$9,000	\$0	\$9,000
Wittman, Rob	\$0	\$9,000	\$9,000
Kennedy, Patrick J	\$6,700	\$2,200	\$8,900
Maffei, Dan	\$2,250	\$6,600	\$8,850
Brale, Bruce	\$6,200	\$2,488	\$8,688
Young, Steve	\$8,400	\$250	\$8,650
Brown, Corrine	\$3,500	\$5,000	\$8,500
Cardoza, Dennis	\$6,000	\$2,500	\$8,500
Johnson, Hank	\$4,500	\$4,000	\$8,500
Meier, Raymond A	\$8,500	\$0	\$8,500
Napolitano, Grace	\$7,500	\$1,000	\$8,500
Shuler, Heath	\$0	\$8,500	\$8,500
Bond, Christopher S 'Kit'	\$0	\$8,400	\$8,400
Payne, Donald M	\$6,650	\$1,450	\$8,100
Chandler, Ben	\$6,000	\$2,000	\$8,000
Coburn, Tom	\$5,000	\$3,000	\$8,000
Herger, Wally	\$5,000	\$3,000	\$8,000
Linder, John	\$7,000	\$1,000	\$8,000
McHugh, John M	\$3,000	\$5,000	\$8,000
Oxley, Michael G	\$8,000	\$0	\$8,000
Huckabee, Mike	\$0	\$7,850	\$7,850
Donnelly, Joe	\$2,250	\$5,550	\$7,800
Costa, Jim	\$3,500	\$4,250	\$7,750
Baird, Brian	\$4,000	\$3,500	\$7,500
Davis, David	\$1,000	\$6,500	\$7,500
Honda, Mike	\$2,500	\$5,000	\$7,500
McNulty, Michael R	\$4,000	\$3,500	\$7,500
Richardson, Laura	\$0	\$7,500	\$7,500
Gingrey, Phil	\$2,250	\$5,000	\$7,250
Duckworth, Tammy	\$7,162	\$0	\$7,162
Bruning, Jon	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000
Clay, William L Jr	\$2,000	\$5,000	\$7,000
Fallin, Mary	\$6,500	\$500	\$7,000

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Gallegly, Elton	\$6,000	\$1,000	\$7,000
Israel, Steve	\$3,000	\$4,000	\$7,000
Langevin, Jim	\$5,000	\$2,000	\$7,000
Matsui, Robert T	\$7,000	\$0	\$7,000
McNerney, Jerry	\$1,000	\$6,000	\$7,000
Price, David	\$4,000	\$3,000	\$7,000
Hunter, Duncan	\$4,000	\$2,800	\$6,800
Carson, Andre	\$0	\$6,750	\$6,750
Wu, David	\$2,500	\$4,250	\$6,750
Yassky, David	\$6,600	\$0	\$6,600
Manzullo, Don	\$2,000	\$4,550	\$6,550
Burton, Dan	\$5,000	\$1,500	\$6,500
Castor, Kathy	\$4,500	\$2,000	\$6,500
Davis, Lincoln	\$2,500	\$4,000	\$6,500
Ehlers, Vernon J	\$4,500	\$2,000	\$6,500
Emerson, Jo Ann	\$4,000	\$2,500	\$6,500
Goode, Virgil H Jr	\$3,500	\$3,000	\$6,500
Pascrell, Bill Jr	\$3,500	\$3,000	\$6,500
Holt, Rush	\$5,100	\$1,000	\$6,100
Isakson, Johnny	-\$250	\$6,300	\$6,050
Abercrombie, Neil	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$6,000
Akin, Todd	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$6,000
Cleaver, Emanuel	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$6,000
Davis, Jo Ann	\$5,000	\$1,000	\$6,000
Diaz-Balart, Mario	\$2,500	\$3,500	\$6,000
Gohmert, Louis B Jr	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$6,000
Hastings, Alcee L	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$6,000
Lamont, Ned	\$6,000	\$0	\$6,000
Maloney, Carolyn B	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$6,000
Miller, Gary	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$6,000
Ortiz, Solomon P	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$6,000
Turner, Michael R	\$2,000	\$4,000	\$6,000
Mitchell, Harry E	\$250	\$5,712	\$5,962
Farrell, Diane Goss	\$5,850	\$0	\$5,850
Fortenberry, Jeffrey Lane	\$4,750	\$1,000	\$5,750

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Marchant, Kenny Ewell	\$2,250	\$3,500	\$5,750
Moran, Jerry	\$1,750	\$4,000	\$5,750
Pederson, Jim	\$5,733	\$0	\$5,733
Boozman, John	\$2,500	\$3,000	\$5,500
Jackson, Jesse Jr	\$1,000	\$4,500	\$5,500
Ramstad, Jim	\$4,500	\$1,000	\$5,500
Saxton, Jim	\$4,000	\$1,500	\$5,500
Vilsack, Thomas J	\$500	\$5,000	\$5,500
Whitehead, Jim	\$0	\$5,500	\$5,500
Lantos, Tom	\$3,350	\$2,000	\$5,350
Schaffer, Bob	\$250	\$5,100	\$5,350
Garrett, Scott	\$3,250	\$2,000	\$5,250
Grijalva, Raul M	\$4,250	\$1,000	\$5,250
Hare, Philip G	\$2,000	\$3,250	\$5,250
McCotter, Thad	\$250	\$5,000	\$5,250
Crapo, Mike	\$1,000	\$4,010	\$5,010
Bishop, Timothy H	\$4,000	\$1,000	\$5,000
Boehlert, Sherwood	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
Davis, Danny K	\$2,000	\$3,000	\$5,000
DeLauro, Rosa L	\$4,000	\$1,000	\$5,000
Jefferson, William J	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
Jenkins, Bill	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
Jennings, Christine	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
Jindal, Bobby	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
Johnson, Eddie Bernice	\$2,000	\$3,000	\$5,000
Regula, Ralph	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
Shaheen, Jeanne	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000
Tierney, John F	\$2,250	\$2,750	\$5,000
Vavricek, Joseph J	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000
Velazquez, Nydia M	\$2,000	\$3,000	\$5,000
Udall, Tom	\$3,700	\$1,250	\$4,950
Driehaus, Steven Leo	\$0	\$4,850	\$4,850
Peterson, Collin C	\$0	\$4,750	\$4,750
Mfume, Kweisi	\$4,700	\$0	\$4,700
Kucinich, Dennis J	\$2,000	\$2,600	\$4,600

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Fitz-Gerald, Joan	\$0	\$4,500	\$4,500
Jackson Lee, Sheila	\$2,000	\$2,500	\$4,500
Lowey, Nita M	\$3,500	\$1,000	\$4,500
Royce, Ed	\$2,500	\$2,000	\$4,500
Ryan, Tim	\$2,000	\$2,500	\$4,500
Stark, Pete	\$2,000	\$2,500	\$4,500
Wilson, Joe	\$3,000	\$1,500	\$4,500
Taylor, Van	\$4,450	\$0	\$4,450
Boren, Dan	\$1,375	\$3,065	\$4,440
McDermott, Jim	\$2,400	\$2,000	\$4,400
Capuano, Michael E	\$3,750	\$500	\$4,250
Grassley, Chuck	\$1,250	\$3,000	\$4,250
Gregg, Judd	\$4,000	\$250	\$4,250
Busby, Francine P	\$4,200	\$0	\$4,200
Kitts, Derrick	\$4,200	\$0	\$4,200
Paulsen, Erik	\$0	\$4,150	\$4,150
Cranley, John	\$4,100	\$0	\$4,100
Huffman, Steve	\$4,100	\$0	\$4,100
Cohen, Stephen Ira	\$0	\$4,000	\$4,000
Etheridge, Bob	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$4,000
Gilchrest, Wayne T	\$0	\$4,000	\$4,000
Lynch, Stephen F	\$3,500	\$500	\$4,000
McGovern, James P	\$3,000	\$1,000	\$4,000
Merkley, Jeff	\$0	\$4,000	\$4,000
Miller, Jeff	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$4,000
Oberweis, James D	\$0	\$4,000	\$4,000
Petri, Tom	\$1,000	\$3,000	\$4,000
Poe, Ted	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$4,000
Rahall, Nick	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$4,000
Serrano, Jose E	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000
Visclosky, Pete	\$1,000	\$3,000	\$4,000
Webster, Daniel	\$3,947	\$0	\$3,947
Wulsin, Victoria Wells	\$1,750	\$2,150	\$3,900
Skelly, Michael Peter	\$0	\$3,800	\$3,800
Adler, John H	\$0	\$3,750	\$3,750

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Cimperman, Joseph	\$0	\$3,650	\$3,650
Berkley, Shelley	\$1,000	\$2,500	\$3,500
Broun, Paul Jr	\$0	\$3,500	\$3,500
Brown, Henry	\$2,500	\$1,000	\$3,500
Brown-Waite, Ginny	\$3,500	\$0	\$3,500
Culberson, John	\$0	\$3,500	\$3,500
Lee, Barbara	\$3,500	\$0	\$3,500
Miller, Candice S	\$0	\$3,500	\$3,500
Padgett, Joy	\$3,500	\$0	\$3,500
Wyden, Ron	\$0	\$3,500	\$3,500
Bouchard, Michael J	\$3,250	\$0	\$3,250
Hackett, Paul	\$3,250	\$0	\$3,250
Rice, Andrew	\$0	\$3,050	\$3,050
Alexander, Rodney	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$3,000
Costello, Jerry F	\$500	\$2,500	\$3,000
Crenshaw, Ander	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$3,000
Duncan, John J Jr	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$3,000
Hafen, Tessa	\$3,000	\$0	\$3,000
Heller, Dean	\$3,000	\$0	\$3,000
Lucas, Frank D	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$3,000
Moore, Gwen	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$3,000
Sutton, Betty Sue	\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000
Thornberry, Mac	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$3,000
Torsella, Joseph M	\$3,000	\$0	\$3,000
Walberg, Tim	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$3,000
Weldon, Dave	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$3,000
Bilirakis, Michael	\$0	\$2,800	\$2,800
Marlow, James	\$0	\$2,800	\$2,800
Skinner, Nancy	\$2,800	\$0	\$2,800
Tenenbaum, Michael	\$0	\$2,800	\$2,800
Campbell, John	\$1,750	\$1,000	\$2,750
Sorensen, Sheila	\$2,750	\$0	\$2,750
Bee, Timothy	\$0	\$2,700	\$2,700
Hilleary, Van	\$2,600	\$0	\$2,600
Van Susteren, Lise C	\$2,600	\$0	\$2,600

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Tinker, Nikki	\$250	\$2,300	\$2,550
Boustany, Charles W Jr	\$2,500	\$0	\$2,500
Foxx, Virginia	\$1,500	\$1,000	\$2,500
Martin, Andrew	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500
McCollum, Betty	\$1,000	\$1,500	\$2,500
Mikulski, Barbara A	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500
Roybal-Allard, Lucille	\$2,500	\$0	\$2,500
Shelby, Richard C	\$0	\$2,500	\$2,500
Sinton, Steve	\$2,500	\$0	\$2,500
Snyder, Vic	\$2,500	\$0	\$2,500
Trauner, Gary	\$2,000	\$500	\$2,500
Donoghue, Eileen	\$0	\$2,450	\$2,450
Barnes, Kay	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Cote, Adam	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Dahlkemper, Kathleen	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Flores, Manuel	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Holden, Tim	\$1,300	\$1,000	\$2,300
Knight, Rand	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Manion, Tom	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
McCamley, Bill	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Polis, Jared	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Teague, Harry	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Titla, Mary Kim	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Wiviott, Don	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300
Badnarik, Michael	\$2,250	\$0	\$2,250
Lentz, Bryan	\$2,250	\$0	\$2,250
Myers, Thomas V	\$0	\$2,250	\$2,250
Tancredo, Tom	\$1,500	\$750	\$2,250
DeFazio, Peter	\$1,100	\$1,000	\$2,100
Cox, Christopher	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Daskas, Robert James	\$0	\$2,000	\$2,000
Ellison, Keith	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$2,000
Everett, Terry	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$2,000
Filner, Bob	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$2,000
Fox, Al Jr	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Hagan, Kay R	\$0	\$2,000	\$2,000
Hefley, Joel	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Istook, Ernest J	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Lamm, Peggy	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Loeb sack, David	\$0	\$2,000	\$2,000
Millender-McDonald, Juanita	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Murkowski, Frank H	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Nodler, Gary	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Norton, Eleanor Holmes	\$1,500	\$500	\$2,000
Sanders, Bernie	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Stivers, Steve	\$0	\$2,000	\$2,000
Vas, Joseph	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Voinovich, George V	\$0	\$2,000	\$2,000
Weiss, Patty	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Zanzi, Italo Andres	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Burner, Darcy	\$1,750	\$0	\$1,750
Kennedy, Brian	\$1,750	\$0	\$1,750
Kilroy, Mary Jo	\$750	\$1,000	\$1,750
Woolsey, Lynn	\$1,500	\$250	\$1,750
McGavick, Michael	\$1,650	\$0	\$1,650
Barth, Anne	\$0	\$1,500	\$1,500
Kellam, Phil	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500
Lamborn, Douglas L	\$1,000	\$500	\$1,500
McEwen, Bob	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500
Miller, Harris N	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500
Rainville, Martha T	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500
Stanton, Edward L	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500
Westmoreland, Lynn A	\$1,500	\$0	\$1,500
Thompson, Tommy	\$0	\$1,499	\$1,499
McSweeney, David	\$1,450	\$0	\$1,450
Courage, John	\$1,424	\$0	\$1,424
Abate, Camille Marie	\$300	\$1,000	\$1,300
Bilbray, Brian P	\$1,300	\$0	\$1,300
Ogonowski, Jim	\$0	\$1,300	\$1,300
Carter, John William	\$1,250	\$0	\$1,250

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Crank, Jeffrey G	\$1,250	\$0	\$1,250
Langheier, David Domenic	\$1,250	\$0	\$1,250
Olver, John W	\$1,000	\$250	\$1,250
Roberts, Erwin	\$0	\$1,250	\$1,250
Sarbanes, John	\$250	\$1,000	\$1,250
Clarke, Yvette D	\$200	\$1,000	\$1,200
Hollinger, Paula	\$1,200	\$0	\$1,200
McKinney, Cynthia	\$0	\$1,106	\$1,106
Wager, Richard C	\$0	\$1,050	\$1,050
Aderholt, Robert B	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Armstrong, Wil	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Begich, Mark	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Berkowitz, Ethan A	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Blasdel, Chuck	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Bocchieri, John A	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Bode, Denise	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Brandt, Rocky Skipper	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Bunning, Jim	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Burns, Max	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Burns, Timothy G	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Cahir, William John	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Calongne, Laurinda L	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Connealy, Matt	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Doggett, Lloyd	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Fawcett, Jay	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Fortuno, Luis	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Foster, Bill	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Gibbons, Jim	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Gilmore, Jim	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Gutierrez, Luis V	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Hinchey, Maurice	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Honeycutt, Deborah Travis	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Hunter, Duncan D	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Kirkpatrick, Ann	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Kleeb, Scott	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Laffey, Stephen	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
LaRouche, Lyndon H Jr	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Larson, Lyle	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Lee, Tammy Louise	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Lipinski, Daniel	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Lucas, Ken	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Lunsford, Bruce	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
McCullough, Glenn L	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Meister, Steve	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Morrow, Bill	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Ogsbury, Jim	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Powers, Jonathan	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Rocque, Michael R	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Rogers, Mike D	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Sabo, Martin Olav	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Smither, Bob	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Stender, Linda D	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Taylor, Gene	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Tsongas, Niki	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Turner, Mike	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Wildes, Michael	\$1,000	\$0	\$1,000
Young, Don	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000
Barton, Sue	\$990	\$0	\$990
Feingold, Russ	\$950	\$0	\$950
Kluko, Chad	\$900	\$0	\$900
Johnson, Timothy V	\$350	\$500	\$850
Carson, Julia	\$800	\$0	\$800
Roulstone, Douglas Robert	\$500	\$300	\$800
Connolly, Gerry	\$0	\$750	\$750
Gaw, Steve	\$0	\$750	\$750
Goddard, Rick	\$0	\$750	\$750
Marchand, Steve	\$0	\$750	\$750
Wall, Jamie	\$750	\$0	\$750
Wetterling, Patty	\$750	\$0	\$750
Winter, Bill	\$750	\$0	\$750

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Brown, Charles D	\$450	\$250	\$700
Morrison, John	\$700	\$0	\$700
Ember, Reichgott Junge	\$550	\$0	\$550
Nader, Ralph	\$250	\$300	\$550
Martin, James Francis	\$0	\$501	\$501
Anderson, Tucker	\$500	\$0	\$500
Bennett, Jerry	\$0	\$500	\$500
Bright, Bobby Neal Sr	\$0	\$500	\$500
Ciresi, Michael V	\$0	\$500	\$500
Coffman, Mike	\$0	\$500	\$500
Collins, Mac	\$500	\$0	\$500
Cook, Jeff	\$500	\$0	\$500
Detert, Nancy C	\$500	\$0	\$500
Eldridge, Jamie	\$0	\$500	\$500
Farr, Sam	\$0	\$500	\$500
Feder, Judith	\$500	\$0	\$500
Finegold, Barry R	\$0	\$500	\$500
Fischer, Gregory Edward	\$0	\$500	\$500
Grant, Larry L	\$500	\$0	\$500
Gravel, Mike	\$0	\$500	\$500
Griffith, Parker	\$0	\$500	\$500
Harrell, Gayle B	\$0	\$500	\$500
Harris, Katherine	\$500	\$0	\$500
Herr, Lois K	\$500	\$0	\$500
Hudson, Tramm	\$500	\$0	\$500
Jackson, Jack Jr	\$500	\$0	\$500
Jenkins, Lynn	\$0	\$500	\$500
Jenkins, Woody	\$0	\$500	\$500
Kagen, Steven Leslie	\$0	\$500	\$500
Kennedy, John Neely	\$0	\$500	\$500
Kildee, Dale E	\$0	\$500	\$500
Kurita, Rosalind	\$500	\$0	\$500
Lummis, Cynthia Marie	\$0	\$500	\$500
McFarland, Kathleen Troia	\$500	\$0	\$500
Mejias, David L	\$500	\$0	\$500

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Minnick, Walter Clifford	\$0	\$500	\$500
Murkowski, Lisa	\$500	\$0	\$500
Nation, Joe	\$500	\$0	\$500
Paccione, Angie	\$250	\$250	\$500
Pryor, Will	\$500	\$0	\$500
Seals, Dan	\$500	\$0	\$500
Segall, Joshua Steven	\$0	\$500	\$500
Sekula-Gibbs, Shelley	\$500	\$0	\$500
Stephen, John A	\$0	\$500	\$500
Stulce, Terry	\$500	\$0	\$500
Sullivan, John P	\$500	\$0	\$500
Ting, Jan	\$500	\$0	\$500
Watkins, Robert J	\$0	\$500	\$500
McGrew, David Michael	\$450	\$0	\$450
Schweikert, David	\$0	\$450	\$450
Hellon, Mike	\$300	\$0	\$300
Long, Todd	\$0	\$300	\$300
Pirro, Jeanine	\$300	\$0	\$300
Treadwell, Sandy	\$0	\$300	\$300
Bonoff, Terri	\$0	\$250	\$250
Brinkman, Tom Jr	\$250	\$0	\$250
Christian-Green, Donna	\$250	\$0	\$250
Collins, Leroy Jr	\$250	\$0	\$250
Dickinson, Rick	\$250	\$0	\$250
Doran, Kelly	\$250	\$0	\$250
Graf, Randy	\$250	\$0	\$250
Guthrie, Steven Brett	\$0	\$250	\$250
Halvorson, Deborah "Debbie"	\$0	\$250	\$250
Hogue, Bob C	\$250	\$0	\$250
Hurst, Andrew	\$250	\$0	\$250
Irey, Diana Lynn	\$250	\$0	\$250
Katz, Lewis	\$250	\$0	\$250
McLaughlin, Joe	\$0	\$250	\$250
Oropeza, Jenny	\$0	\$250	\$250
Rales, Joshua B	\$250	\$0	\$250

Recipient	2006	2008	Grand Total
Rivera, Lionel Rolando	\$250	\$0	\$250
Rivera, Perfecto	\$250	\$0	\$250
Robinson, Christopher R	\$0	\$250	\$250
Rodriguez, Roberto J	\$250	\$0	\$250
Simon, Ellen	\$250	\$0	\$250
Stern, Bruce	\$0	\$250	\$250
Summers, Charles E	\$0	\$250	\$250
Busansky, Phyllis H	\$200	\$0	\$200
Chavez, Martin	\$0	\$200	\$200
Harvey, Ted	\$0	\$200	\$200
Jones, Jason Lee	\$0	\$200	\$200
Lotz, George Blaine	\$0	\$200	\$200
Rubenstein, Herbert Ray	\$200	\$0	\$200
Derby, Jill T	\$10	\$0	\$10
Hinojosa, Leticia	\$0	\$0	\$0
Meehan, Marty	\$1,000	-\$1,000	\$0
Orman, Greg	\$0	\$0	\$0
Price, Joshua Clinton	\$0	\$0	\$0
Weber, Jerry	\$0	\$0	\$0
Kohl, Herb	\$0	-\$500	-\$500
Crane, Phil	-\$1,000	\$0	-\$1,000
Portman, Rob	-\$1,000	\$0	-\$1,000
McCollum, Bill	-\$2,000	\$0	-\$2,000
			\$18,062,309

The Center for Responsive Politics, July 2008.

PEOPLE.ACTION.DEMOCRACY.



1133 19th Street, NW, 9th Floor, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel 202.833.1200 / Fax 202.659.3716  
[www.commoncause.org](http://www.commoncause.org)