UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

BROADBAND AND NEW MEDIA STRATEGIES FOR MINORITY

RADIO

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, January 26, 2010

1	PARTICIPANTS:
2	Introduction of Workshop:
3	CAROLYN FLEMING-WILLIAMS Senior Deputy Director Office of Communications
4	Business Opportunities Federal Communications Commission
5	RICK WADE
6	Senior Adviser and Deputy Chief of Staff Department of Commerce
7	Panelists:
8	MARIO ARMSTRONG
9	Radio Host, XM/Sirius radio, USTalkNetwork.com, WYPR & WEAA
10	ERIC BROYLES
11	Founder and CEO, Megree, Inc.
12	FRANK FLORES Chief Revenue Officer and General Manager, Spanish
13	Broadcasting Systems
14	ANITA STEPHENS GRAHAM Partner, Opportunity Capital Partners
15	ZEMIRA JONES
16	President/CEO of All American Management Group, Inc.
17	JAMES L. WINSTON
18	Executive Director, National Association of Black-Owned Broadcasters (NABOB)
19	CANDIDA MOBLEY-WRIGHT
20	President, Voices, Inc.
21	FRANK MONTERO Co-Managing Partner with the law firm Fletcher,
22	Heald & Hildreth

1	PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D):
2	CLEVELAND SPEARS Producer/Padio Host/Ceneral Manager iM/radio
3	Producer/Radio Host/General Manager, iM4radio Broadcasting Network
4	LORIS ANN TAYLOR Executive Director, Native Public Media
5	Excederve Bireceor, Nacive rabite meata
6	* * * *
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

PROCEEDINGS

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: First I'd like to welcome you, our roundtable participants and our audience, to OCBO's Roundtable on Broadband and New Media Strategies for Minority Radio, a very important and critical topic for all of us. I hope that our roundtable, that you've had an opportunity to look at the agenda and the full bios of all of the participants here as well as some of the questions that we will be addressing this morning. I've been told that we have a very aggressive agenda this morning. We're going to try to get through the topics as efficiently as we can.

We view this as an opening conversation so we hope that this is just the beginning. We'll be seeing you back here again or in our office again to continue discussing these topics and very important issues and hopefully lead to some successful business strategies and successful business models.

In the interests of time I'm going to

briefly introduce each of you around our square here. Then we'll launch into very brief opening remarks and then we'll launch into our roundtable. I will begin with my guest co- moderator Rick Wade. He is the Senior Adviser and Deputy Chief of Staff of the Department of Commerce, and we're very honored to have him with us here today. He has had a long and distinguished career in public service starting in various positions in the State of South Carolina. He was a senior adviser in the presidential campaign of President Barack Obama, so welcome.

Mario Armstrong I understand is caught in traffic and we hope that he will be able to join us at some point this morning. By way of background, he is both a radio and TV host. He is founder of a new social network called TechTechBoom.com and has a keen interest in technology and how we're able to use that to advance not only our youth but to advance our media.

We're happy that Geoffrey Blackwell was

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 able to join us. He is the Director of Strategic Relations and Minority Business Development of 2 Chickasaw Nation Industries Inc. As such his 3 4 responsibilities include the integration of 5 emerging technology, and he also serves on the Advisory Counsel of Native Public Media, a project 6 7 of the National Federation of Community Broadcasters. To him I say welcome back. He is a 8 former FCC employee as well as a member of the 9 Commission's Diversity Federal Advisory Committee 10 so he really needs no introduction to the FCC. 11 12 We have Eric Broyles. Eric is founder

and CEO of Megree Inc., a social networking utility that's focusing on our connectedness particularly with respect to nonprofits and humanitarian organizations. His was formerly with AOL and also a telecommunications attorney.

Welcome, Eric.

We have next to Eric, Frank Flores. He is General Manager and Chief Operating Officer of Spanish Broadcasting Systems. To you we say bienvenidos. One of his duties is to oversee the

revenue and profit of all of the Spanish

Broadcasting System's radio stations. In this

case he has a real bottom line interest in the

discussion that will be taking place this morning.

Unfortunately Anita Stephens Graham has come down

with the flu and won't be able to join us this

morning but has promised to provide her comments

in a written statement so that we have the benefit

of over 20 years' experience in the private equity

industry and she's involved with a lot of radio

transactions.

We have Zemira Jones. He is president and CEO of the All American Management Group, a company whose mission is the very thing that we will be addressing today, transforming traditional radio and its brand strength into a multiplatform business strategy. He is also a veteran of the broadcasting industry. He's served as a VP of Operations with Radio One, so we welcome you as well and all of your expertise.

Switching now to my right we have James Winston who is the dean of African American radio.

He is the Executive Director and General Counsel of the National Association of Black-Owned Broadcasters. He also serves on the Commission's Federal Advisory Committee and really has been OCBO's go-to person whenever we've dealt with issues involving radio because of his knowledge and experience representing the owners and members of NABOB. Welcome, and again no stranger to the FCC.

Candida Mobley-Wright is President of Voices Inc., a radio production and syndication company with programming which reaches a wide syndicate of radio stations. Her focus is on creative ad strategies that educate, inspire and uplift. Welcome.

Frank Montero is currently co-managing partner of Fletcher Heald & Hildreth and again no stranger to the Commission. He is on the Diversity FACA as well as being a former Director of OCBO and has participated many times in our workshops and roundtables here at the Commission.

Cleveland Spears is General Manager and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Program Director of iM4radio. He has an innovative radio format that builds online radio stations and produces media content for them, and he is only accessible on the internet, so we welcome him back. He's also been a friend to OCBO and participated on many of our panels before.

When it comes to radio we thought about something that the great writer and American humorist Mark Twain once said. When he heard a report that he had recently died he said, "Rumors of my demise have been greatly exaggerated." We hope it is the same with radio. For a while radio has been beaten, battered and bruised over these many years. It still stands and continues to provide an important outlet for local news, entertainment and programming. What is clear however is that digital and interactive technologies, satellite radio, internet, iPods, are changing the traditional business model and rewriting the landscape for all of communications and entertainment.

Just to give you a little bit of the

21

22

1 statistics, and I'm sure you can fill me in here as well, in 2006 radio advertising accounted for 2 3 \$20.1 billion of total advertising revenue and 4 internet advertising accounted for \$16.9 billion. Just 1 year later however for the first time in 5 history, internet advertising surpassed radio when 6 7 it climbed to \$21.7. In 2008 internet ad revenue rose even higher. While this trend is continuing 8 and the gap in advertising dollars is widening, it 9 is expected that radio ads will still command 10 \$22.2 to \$22.8 billion in the years 2010 and 2011, 11 12 respectively. In spite of this shift in advertising dollars, in 2008 90 percent of all 13 percent of all consumers aged 12 and over listen 14 15 to radio at least once a week, a higher 16 penetration rate than television, magazines, 17 newspapers or the internet, so that's very important to keep in mind. 18 19 Today radio must compete with a myriad

Today radio must compete with a myriad of communications platforms that did not exist a mere two decades ago. If radio is to survive in this new business climate, it must be Darwinian.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It has to adopt and it has to change. It's clear that what traditional radio embodied in format, service and outreach to the listening audience of the last decade is not what radio is going to look like in the future if it is to thrive. Radio's unique ability to respond to and remain relevant to the local community it serves may very well be its secret to survival. As the former Speaker of the House Tip O'Neill said, "All politics is local" and we say no format is better able to keep its hands on the pulse of the community than local radio. So we find that today's successful radio stations are embracing the internet and high-def radio to stay connected with their listening audience. These stations have used the internet to establish websites, newsletters, et cetera, and other kinds of collaborations to maintain and expand their audience. They have coordinated on-air advertising campaigns with their online advertising efforts.

We have assembled today a distinguished panel of experts from various fields to talk about

the current state of radio just where we are today, where radio is headed, where it should be headed and now stations can position themselves to adopt some of the successful practices that are redefining this medium and create innovative models to breathe new life into this industry.

With that I'm going to ask Rick to start us off with just a little bit of diagnosis. Where are we? What is the current state of radio?

Let's lay out the foundation.

MR. WADE: Let me first say thank you as well to Carolyn. I look forward to being with you this morning. I do want to emphasize as well the importance of this conversation. At the Department of Commerce many of you may be aware that the Department of Commerce along with the Department of Agriculture's Rural Utility Service are engaged now in the Obama administration's effort to deploy broadband infrastructure and increase access across the country and we're in that process as we speak. So we're very, very interested in this topic not just from a

communications perspective and our ability to have broadband technology across America but also from a business perspective and the ability to maintain and sustain minority radio as job creators and thriving business across our country.

sort of state of play of minority radio in America and why is it in trouble, small local minority radio. A number of issues obviously that we would need to discuss whether it's consolidation, obviously access to capital, collateralization, competition from new media such as the internet, et cetera. As Carolyn talked about, the shift in advertising dollars, what is the extent of the advertising revenue from radio to the internet. And also how long will we expect that trend to continue and what is the significant impact.

Jim, let's start with you. I think you have been obviously a pioneer and integral part and leader in this whole space. Why is small local community radio in trouble and what is the current state of play?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. WINSTON: There obviously are many different facets that are going on in local radio. What you saw for the past decade was a consolidation of media ownership in radio and in order to reduce costs for those consolidated groups many group owners began doing syndicated programming to reduce costs which took away a lot of the local news, information and talent from local radio. Then you have the current recession which has also had a very significant impact. When retailers aren't selling they stop advertising, when they stop advertising radio suffers greatly because it depends more than most other advertising media on local sales, so radio has taken a hit there. We've got the unique situation of the rating service. There's only one rating service in the top 105 radio markets, Arbitron. They are changing the way they measure radio in the top 50 markets. They've done 33 markets already where they've gone from diary measurements to the Personal People Meter which has caused the ratings for minority formatted

radio stations in the top 33 markets anyway to plunge dramatically, so we've seen that impact on radio. There are a lot of different things impacting radio right now and the loss of advertising to the internet is a part of that. I think when you look at all of those things happening at the same time you see a radio industry that's under significant pressure and is going to require some new thinking in terms of how we continue to go forward and are successful?

MR. WADE: Others in terms of the state of play or diagnosis?

MS. MOBLEY-WRIGHT: This is a conversation that I have had with Jim in the past and one that I spoke briefly with Mr. Reed and others at the FCC. One of the big challenges as an advertising agency that I see in working with stations as they cry out for more advertising dollars, and this is in both radio and in minority print, one thing that I constantly bring up to them is there are advertising dollars available in the federal government. The federal government is

1	one of the top 50 advertisers in our country and
2	in the year 2000 President Clinton signed an
3	executive order, and the reason this happened is
4	because as you'll remember there was a gentleman
5	who threatened to sue the federal government
6	because of a bill that was initiated during the
7	Nixon administration in which a certain percentage
8	of all the federal government advertising dollars
9	were supposed to be targeted to minority media.
10	They did a study and they out of the \$4 billion
11	that was spent, and I have some quotes here, that
12	money was from DOD, Treasury, HHS, Interior, the
13	National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I'm
14	looking at \$4 billion that over a 5-year period
15	DOD which accounted for more than 50 percent of
16	these advertising dollars spent less than 2
17	percent of its advertising dollars to
18	minority-owned broadcasters. So from my
19	perspective because I do a lot of advertising in
20	the government space, these are dollars that are
21	very difficult to get targeting minority
22	communities and they have an impact on the

effectiveness of those advertising campaigns as they affect minority communities. So that's something to look at when you're starting to talk about broadband and broadband usage and how the marketing and communication and outreach dollars are going to be spent as they are used to educate minority communities. So it solves two issues. It's an educational issue as well as a minority media spend issue.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Frank, you look like you want to jump in here.

MR. FLORES: If I can chime in, I agree with what the speakers have been saying. Right now there are probably about three different layers of movement happening in and around the radio industry all of which are changing the dynamics of where radio fits in and what its competition is, and combined they've made up at least over the past say 8 to 10 years or maybe 6 to 8 years this perfect storm for particularly minority radio. You have more recently obviously the economic downturn which has driven down

valuations of these proprieties. It's hit the advertising dollars hard because remember, to take one example, think of car dealerships and think of how badly the car dealerships have been hit, so those advertising dollars are drying up. What I'm hearing frequently is the receivables are trailing longer and longer. People used to pay in 15 days are paying in 30 days, people who are paying in 30 days are paying in 60 days so that's then putting pressure for these broadcasters under their existing loan covenants.

aside from the recession which I also should mention that the recession has hit particularly with the minority audience and I know I can speak for the Latino audience, it's hit their audience very hard in the pocketbook. So at the same time you have these broader tectonic plates moving with the entry of all these new vehicles for delivery of content and there's a perception I think on the part of the investment community and loan community that radio is not worth it anymore, the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

capital was always difficult to begin with but now it's gotten critical as far as the ability to access capital for some of these existing broadcasters to keep their operations going.

Then you have as Jim pointed out this attack going on by service providers whether it's the Personal People Meter which has dramatically changed the way a lot of these stations' ratings are being monitored. You've got the record industry trying to impose a performance royalty on the radio stations. So they're kind of being hit in all directions. But they do have several things still going for them. Radio as long as it's in the dashboard still holds a very, very valuable place as far as being able to access their listernership. Radio particularly with the example of Spanish radio, many of those listeners still get their news content information from free over-the-air radio. Radio tends to be a first mover where you have a migrating population in the late 1990s and early 2000s where you had an explosion in the Latino population in the

southeast, in the Carolinas, in Georgia, in Alabama, also in the Midwest in Ohio, in Michigan, and frequently radio was one of the first movers to go into those new communities, frequently AM radio. A lot of times it's religious AM radio, but they're some of the first movers that are there other than the print media to establish a hub around which this newly landed migrant population can create a community to provide local information and that's an invaluable service, but it is under attack right now no doubt.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Zemira?

MR. JONES: I think Frank gave a great overview and Jim and Candida brought up some very important points. I've just come in from the front. I've been running radio stations for over 20 years and been in business for 30 and I've run just about every format in the south, all the urbans, the news talks, the country, all the rock formats, jazz, kids' radio, ESPN, so I've seen what's happening to the business that I live. What's not unique is that all businesses go

through these life cycles and we have to remember that, the introduction, growth and maturity of the client stages. Some industries, some companies, find ways to reset the clock to a new value proposition and that's what we have to do. So the whole idea that radio could die or is going away just shows that maybe we don't understand that business life cycles are a very real part of our economy.

That being said, it is a regulated industry and so the bottom line if nothing else is remembered from what I say, the spectrum of radio needs to be protected because we need that spectrum protection for a lot of key reasons.

One, with the love of high tech going on right now, we forget that low tech has equal power and so high tech and low tech work together to form a very cohesive bond serving the community and the economy. Frank touched on it but I really wanted to echo what he was saying.

Second, we have to remember how we got here. We got here because the business did very

1 well. I'll speak as a small member of the radio community. I'll be talking about myself as well 2 3 as everyone else. We enjoyed a tremendous run 4 with radio and it's a legacy industry. Here is an industry that was kicking off 40 to 60 percent 5 margins for years and enjoying a very exclusive 6 right to serve the community and we want to 7 continue that right. But what we didn't do was we 8 didn't invest in the future of our medium. 9 medium is ubiquitous. It is romantic in our 10 economy. People have fallen in love with it and 11 taken it for granted. What happened was that we 12 13 felt it will always be there and because we were 14 ubiquitous, we are ubiquitous and, yes, we do 15 still have over 90 percent of our audience still 16 intact. Other media can't say that. So we have really served our community well in that regard. 17 But in the last business cycle in the 1990s we 18 were in that maturity to early decline stage and 19 20 one of the things that helped us was once 21 consolidation was allowed through the telecom bill 22 it lulled us to sleep. What we started to do was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

continue that same trajectory, we didn't invest in the future, we became ingratiated with the legacy of radio, in love with our past strength and we didn't plan for our future. We didn't invest in it not only from a technology standpoint but in a human condition we did not retool our own people.

Right now there are sea-level executives, general managers, salespeople, promotions people, people on the air who are serving the community having ingratiated themselves to the marketplace but they don't have the skills to compete in today's market. We are going to have to reset the clock. When I was talking about moving to a new position in the value chain, if you look at the stress fractures in our industry, we can do that but it's going to take a yeoman's effort internally in the industry, at the Commission to protect the spectrum as well as reinvesting the profits that are remaining which are not very much.

I'll say one last thing because you raised an interesting point about revenue. Four

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

years ago the advertising revenue for radio was about \$20 to \$21 billion. In 2009 most of the reports that I've been getting and tracking, it's closer to \$13 billion; \$13.3 billion was the last number that I heard. That is a huge swing in a 4-year period. So you have stations having double-digit declines year over year, quarter by quarter, 20 percent, 15 percent year-over-year declines from the prior year. Yes, the covenants of most of these major groups and small operators have crashed and burned. There has to be a major reset and it takes the financial community as well as the regulatory community and broadcast owners themselves.

MR. BROYLES: As a follow-on to Zemira's comment, I'm also reminded of another witty quote by Mark Twain on death. It was a slight on my hometown, Cincinnati. He said, "When I die I hope it's in Cincinnati because I won't find out about it for 20 years." I think that that statement, to follow-on on Zemira's comment, how small local radio broadcasters lived in Cincinnati when it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

came to understanding media consumption patterns of individuals. When you look at the emerging technologies of the internet, wireless devices and all sorts of technology, solely focusing on it as competition there should have been a little more effort in terms of collaboration and I think that if you take a look back in history that that is one of the big issues of why you see some of these small and local radio companies struggling now is that consumers had a major shift in the way they received information, news, entertainment, it was a big shift and there was no requisite variety between how the operators responded to what was going on in the environment. I think that you touched on that with the product life-cycle matters and that I think is one of the reasons. I'll talk a little bit more as we get down about how we thought about those things 12 years ago at AOL in terms of looking at how consumers received information. I want to say one other MR. MONTERO: I agree with almost everything that thing.

everybody said about the radio business up until now. I think that the radio operators got fat and lazy. I think they were lulled into thinking that it was never going to change, that it was always going to be the same even though they saw that happened to the print industry with the advent of the internet with internet users being able to get anything that's in print free online. We didn't think that could happen to us and we were fat and we were lazy and we weren't innovative enough.

Now I think it's time for us to smell the coffee. The good thing about it is that radio still remains a highly, extremely viable source of music, news and information. Frank talked about Hispanic radio stations because that's the business that I'm in. I can tell you that it's a good business for us because in the eve of the 2010 census and we believe when the dust clears on that you're going to see even a greater percentage of Hispanics living in the U.S. mainland and you're going to see that the marketing power that we have is virtually still untapped.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Unfortunately, when budgets are crunched, the first ones to go are black and Hispanic radio stations. That hasn't changed. The first ones to go in an economy is the business that we're in. We're the first ones to feel it.

That dopy movie that was made, that Austin Powers movie where he claimed he lost his mojo, I think we lost our mojo. We lost the sexiness of what the radio stations are all about. Now we find ourselves backpedaling and counterpunching and it's a shame because we're still as you mentioned before well over 90-percent penetration in all homes. You can't get into a car without putting on the radio. In Hispanic communities we are still the primary source of news and information and language. So we're not going away anytime soon. We just need to look at the model and say we've got to do it a little bit differently.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: We've heard the contributing factors of variety, we've heard consolidation of the industry, we've heard about

the advertising dollars maybe not being aware of the some of the sources of advertising revenue, the life cycle, the loss of mojo, so there are a variety of contributing factors. The telecom act of 1996 should have been a warning bell, a wakeup call that was perhaps missed by a lot of folks so that we've laid the foundation.

I wanted to ask Geoffrey if there are any differences. You're dealing with sovereign nations when you talk about Native American radio. What is their status? Have they been affected to the same extent by some of the contributing factors that have already been laid out?

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you. First I want to say thank you, Carolyn, Mr. Wade and Mr. Reed for inviting me to participate. I am here on behalf of Loris Ann Taylor, the Executive Director of Native Public Media. Unfortunately, record rain and record snowfall in northern Arizona conspired against her ability to be able to be here. I really appreciate your question because to continue with this, I'm pinch-hitting for Loris

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

and I think to continue that analogy, there are some curveballs being thrown around the table to our experience that are a little both difficult to relate to and very recognizable at the same time.

When you asked the question about why is it in trouble, in Indian country we think when has there been a time when we haven't been in trouble? Native communities with few exceptions are cyclically impoverished, remote, economically distressed, low demographic communities that have significant geopolitical challenges and not just terrain challenges when you're talking about deployment of communications. Certainly Mr. Winston, Mr. Montero and Mr. Jones, we can relate directly to the things that you're talking about in terms of the changing field, changing tectonics, the kinds of things that changes at a national level have significant ripple effects in remote America.

Certainly I think one way to try to relate here is something that you led me to,
Carolyn, with your question. Native broadcasters

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

are community broadcasters. Native Public Media is a project of the National Federation of Community Broadcasters and there is a significant reason for that. There are very few commercial stations, with all that having been said about the challenges of the economy in Indian country, the 34 stations that are members of Native Public Media are all community licenses. They are institutions of tribal governments, of tribal communities, of Native Nations. They are anchor institutions. Yes, there are challenges, there are troubles, but when it comes to terrestrial radio on tribal lands, there is a bright future. Maybe it's as simple as it's good to be the only game in town when there are few games in town. I said there are 34 stations. When the Commission opened its FM noncommercial educational license window in 2007, there were about 50 applications from tribal nations doubling the network potentially in Indian country and many of those construction permits have already been granted. We certainly have the same challenges in

1 terms of something that Frank said in terms of accounts receivable deadlines. They're certainly 2 3 getting longer whether your revenue is ad revenue 4 or whether it comes from a community. But it's a 5 time I think when with some of the commonalities I want to reach out to my colleagues here and say 6 welcome to Indian country. Welcome to the 7 challenges of getting assets to be able to develop 8 an economy. That having been said, Native 9 10 broadcasters also I will continue in the time we have to try to relate directly to our discussion 11 12 here because these are institutions of 13 governments, these are institutions. We cannot 14 have a step backward. We can't afford a step 15 backward in an environment where we have a 5 to 8 16 percent broadband penetration rate. It will be 17 terrestrial radio stations that will help be the drivers of that new technology, new media, media 18 19 2.0. So some of these problems, it would have 20 been wonderful to have been ahead of, but others I think there's some commonality here that's being 21 experienced by the Native Nations and their 22

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 broadcasters as well. Thank you.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Thank you. like to welcome Mario Armstrong. He's made it through the traffic hurdles. As a reminder, he's both a radio and TV host, a founder of a number of organizations and very keenly interested and aware of the technology and where we are and where we're headed. He's the co-founder of a social networking utility, TechTechBoom. I just like saying that. Welcome. We were just laying the foundation and talking about the current status and I think we've thrown out a lot of the contributing factors that have led to the current state of radio. The purpose of this session is not to talk about the problems because there are many. We want to recognize, and I think a few of you also touched on the fact, even with all of the odds, radio is still here. So we're moving on to the segment of questions to talk about how radio still rises even today.

times is the current national initiative for

I think some key examples from recent

Census 2010. I hear PSAs. I think there probably could be more of them in terms of their ad revenue for that initiative. But who else can read the local community, those folks who would otherwise not participate at all, except local radio? I've heard PSAs, I've heard rap songs, et cetera. There's nobody who could do that for us but us.

Another example taken from the recent tragedy in Haiti where there is a small radio station in New York, Radio Soleil. I've never heard of Radio Soleil. There were the only radio station or one of the only radio stations broadcasting throughout the earthquake and thereafter. I understand people were lined up around the block trying to get in to get information about their loves ones in Haiti. Those are just two examples of the many, many examples of why radio must continue and why it's still relevant.

I think we want to explore how can radio capitalize on some of these unique abilities and make the case that they merit investment. Maybe

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

they need to talk about innovative business models and strategies, but radio has something unique to offer. How can that case be strongly made?

I'll speak up MS. MOBLEY-WRIGHT: because our company is a beneficiary of Census We are placing the local spot radio and TV as a subcontractor to GlobalHue and one of the benefits of the limited dollars that are being spent in minority radio, we're doing black outreach which includes African American, Caribbean and Haitian communities, is the ability to cross-promote on a local level. So you have your broadcast, whatever your spot, PSAs, and your interviews, but then you have the local remotes so that you can press even deeper into those communities with local remotes, promotions being done. So that creates a whole nother local of synergy of education and motivation that will come out of those kinds of campaigns. That's what radio offers. You're doing what we call grassroots ad well as tree top outreach which is the kind of campaigning that you'll need to get

4

5

6

7

8

- people motivated to fill out their census forms,

 to so that's a primary example.
 - MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Is there a weight or value when you go in for financing given to that aspect of local radio?
 - MR. JONES: Not really. If anyone knows of someone, I'll leave my card.
 - MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: There's goodwill.
- 9 MR. FLORES: Can I just say something? 10 The census brings about a kind of special set of circumstances and I'm going to explain it to you. 11 12 As the person who fronts SBS radio stations across 13 the country, I met with GlobalHue and I met with Daisy Esposito who is the Spanish end of the 14 15 advertising agency that's responsible for placing some of the local dollars in our markets. I said 16 to them I am going to do something over and above. 17 18 Why? Because I think it is incredibly important for us to get the right read on this. I think 19 20 it's critically important for us to make sure that our listeners are opening their doors for the 21 22 census takers, because as you know, there are so

many of us who come from so many different countries, they don't trust the government. So we have a problem with that, and that becomes our problem because if you've got undocumented individuals who are still buying products and services, who are still spending a crapload of money in the economy, but you're not getting credit for it, we're not getting credit for it so that marketplace is at a loss there.

I met with them and said we will go over and above what we would do for any client, but the proviso is don't expect this for your car companies or McDonald's. Don't come back and tell me you did this campaign for this one. This is different. It is our chance to really make a difference, and if we can make a difference demographically to show truly what our audience is all about, truly how big it is, you know what, that can only mean more money to the marketplace.

MR. MONTERO: I agree. On the census point, Frank tell me if you agree with this, but it is commonly believed that the 1990 census was a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

watershed moment for investment into the Hispanic market, especially the media market, because in the 1980s when nobody really paid attention to Hispanic media, Univision was a small sleepy company being run by Hallmark, and suddenly when the 1990 census came out it was the first time that it was predicted that by the turn of the century the Hispanic market would be the largest ethnic minority in the country. It's not a coincidence that the amount of capital that started flowing into Hispanic media in the early 1990s in the wake of the 1990 census shot up dramatically, SBS IPO, Univision IPO, Heftel Broadcasting IPO. It just exploded during that period.

Having said that, will the upcoming census drive a dramatic change in investment in Hispanic media or African American media? I don't know. Do you know where you could see it? Keep you eye on South Asian media. You're seeing real fast growth as radio stations are going to in band on channel terrestrial digital. You're seeing

some of those digital channels and they're being brokered by Pakistani formats, Indian formats, East Asian formats. In New York City you're seeing real big growth in Russian formats. If the census were to show dramatic increases in those demographics then you could certainly see a situation where the census drives interest and investment in markets that perhaps the investment community didn't have their eye on just like they didn't really have their eye on the Hispanic community in the 1980s.

MR. BLACKWELL: Carolyn, I think one of the strengths of minority radio regardless of which sector of the minority community we're talking about is that it is largely cultural.

We're talking about cultural programming and cultural broadcasting. That is certainly one of the strengths of Native radio is that it it's cultural preservation, it's cultural exercise.

The 565 tribal Native nations in the United States, each one has its own unique history and language and tradition and of the 34 nations that

have stations, it's not just an exercise looking backwards, but it's an exercise looking forward taking these new technological mediums and utilizing them in a way to create new cultural practices and new cultural experiences.

In advocating for ourselves in this place and in other places where we're looking to collateralize our assets, that is one of our greatest assets is that we speak with an authentic voice to our communities. That is not to be underestimated.

MR. WADE: I'm very curious about this.

This is fascinating to hear the dialogue around the census obviously which is a Commerce effort that we are engaged in right now. I'm also interested, and perhaps Mario can contribute here, is there anything generational that we can learn from in terms of the use of online strategies?

During the previous presidential campaign I think we learned a lot in having been a part of a number of those conversations on how we use online strategies, how we engage Generation Xers and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

others and how does that add value in our efforts to sustain radio as a business and have we made that transition and shift to what is quite frankly something we can't avoid? I'm curious about your thoughts in that regard?

MR. ARMSTRONG: First of all, thank you so much for having me here today and contributing to this awesome panel of brain and intellect power that you have here. As it relates to your point, you're absolutely right. When I go out and speak to the youth of today about technology and this is across the country and in some places Europe or Switzerland and Korea, just to give you a sense of what's going on, I'm pulling up a stream right now live from a radio station right from my iPhone. This is an iPhone application and it's going to go into the programming that's on the air right now in just a second here. My point is these are the devices that the generation is carrying, these devices and others, and what we are seeing is that by 2013 the access to the internet is going to be dominated by these handheld devices and not by

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

desktop computers. So that means we have an opportunity because we can access the content anytime, anywhere.

So that opens up a whole other opportunity that I think has really been overlooked for quite some time and it's time that we pay attention to what tools people are utilizing and where they're utilizing these tools to get access to the content that they're looking for. One thing that I'm not really seeing because many of the youth today are looking for these types of programs that could be more geared toward them on these devices that offer them all types of opportunities, to share the content, to move it from one place to another, to be able to save it and be listen to it later, to favorite it and share it to a friend, all types of transactions can take place on these devices when you're acquiring the content. But what I'm not really seeing to a large degree is the mobile application development of a lot of local and minority-owned radio stations. In other words, developing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

applications for these mobile devices. This is a total revenue stream opportunity, number one. Number two, it's an empowering marketing vehicle for how you can reach these audiences. So you take those combinations, and number three, the analytics that you can derive from what people do on these devices, what they're clicking on, how long are they on it, what calls to action do they engage with, all of these things are very, very powerful analytics that I would throw up against PPM any day to challenge whether those analytics can provide better than what Arbitron and others are putting out there.

When you see these statistics that I'm not making up, when you clearly see more and more people carrying these devices, what I hear from people that are telling me they're listening to a program from their favorite station back in Baltimore but they now live in California, that's incredible so that they can still remain in tuned to what's happening locally to the areas that they care about the most. So I think the internet

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

obviously is really what is the groundwork and broadband connectivity and adoption is clearly the issue that we need to get to. One of the things that we've noticed if you look at Pew internet research and others, Hispanics and African Americans consume more media on handheld devices than any other ethnicity. That is an amazing statistic that we cannot ignore and I'm frankly tried of us being consumers of it and not creators of it and I think the opportunity now is for us to look at creation to benefit. I think of iM4 Radio and others that are in that space and I want to see mobile development in that space.

MR. BROYLES: To follow-up on what Mario said, here is a specific example of how when you look at again the changing media consumption patterns and its impact on radio, one of the thins that the internet allows is it allows people to get information and entertainment in the long tail. So you can get to a level of granularity with respect to entertainment and news that's impossible via radio or television broadcast or

1 any other just because you don't have the capacity. For example, it's one thing to say I 2 3 like karate. It's another thing to say I want to 4 watch Moo Duk Kwan, Tai Kwan Do, Tang Soo Do so 5 that the internet allows people to really target very, very pointed areas. An opportunity exists 6 for radio. Radio is going to always relevant and 7 particularly to local content and that's an 8 important piece. What radio operators can do is 9 10 drive some of this more granular content onto their broadband platforms, their mobile 11 12 applications if they develop those which could be 13 done, or websites. That's just one simple 14 example. You see that now where WTOP will say if 15 you want to hear about this news go to our 16 website. On their online presence or their new media platforms they're empowered to just dig down 17 18 deeper and more specific to where consumers want 19 to get information and that's why Twitter and 20 Facebook and these other social networking platforms, they get people very granular 21 information that you can't get through mass media 22

1 programming.

2 MR. FLORES: I also think that we're 3 closer to it than other media have been in terms 4 of closer to looking at these things as opportunities. In today's "New York Times" they 5 were talking about the Apple Tablet and in the 6 lead article it says, "Apple Tablet: Print Media's 7 Hope for a Payday." Print media, you want to talk 8 9 about an industry that's taken it in the shorts in 10 the last few years, print media has really been almost laid to rest. They're hoping that this new 11 12 device which Apple is going to be pitching the 13 living crap out of is going to be another entrée for them to get that missing audience that they 14 15 lost by being able to charge for content. What 16 Eric says is that we're still local content providers. We need to bridge that gap between 17 what's happening especially in the younger 18 19 generation. The younger generation doesn't look at radio as a viable tool. They think about it, 20 they might listen to it, but they'll never admit 21 22 they're listening to it.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 MS. MOBLEY-WRIGHT: It's not cool anymore.

MR. FLORES: It is not cool. There was an article last week, I think it was in the "Times" again, and they were talking about the Kaiser Foundation study. They were talking about they did a study from 8- to 18-year- olds. Some incredible things were talked about in this study. Seventy-six percent of 8- to 18-year-olds have an iPod or an MP3 that they listen to about 2-1/2hours a day. The reason why I'm saying this is when they were talking about how electronically connected they are to all of these different devices to get music, information, what have you, radio wasn't mentioned in this article at all. Radio was not mentioned once, and I went over it four or five different times. Now I find out when you get into it a little bit more that the 2-1/2 hours of music listening that they're listening to, 32 minutes is radio. That was buried some place but it wasn't in the original article. That is a commentary on where we're at. We're just not

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that especially that 8- to 12-year-old, the 8- to 15-year- old, and we've got to get back there.

There is definitely a MR. MONTERO: perception of a problem with radio and it's funny because it's not cool to listen to radio that you hear on the part of teenagers and preteens is very much like what you're hearing from banks and hedge funds and investment companies. They're in lockstep. Radio is not cool anymore. The funny thing is, and this came up last year when I was at the BIA Financial forecast and I did an informal poll with my daughters. I've got a 14-year-old and I've got an 11-year-old so they're right in the sweet spot. I noticed that when they're sitting in my car that the first thing they say is, Dad, get that old fogy music off. I want to hear in the case of my 14-year-old Hot 99.5. So I'm sitting there and I'm thinking to myself this is the same 14-year-old who says that radio is really not cool, but yet she knows the frequency, she knows the format, and then when I talk to her a little later and she's listening to the songs on

1 her iPod, I went up to her and I said, Anita, I'm just curious. When you download a song off the 2 3 iPod, how do you know which song to download? Which ones do you get? How do you find out about 4 5 it? She says, a couple of ways. Stuff my friends listen to, but mostly I hear it on the radio. 6 7 MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: It's got to be something cool. 8 9 MR. MONTERO: But here's the thing. Unless she's sitting in the car and she's not 10 driving yet, she's not listening to the radio. So 11 12 your point to having the applications so that this 13 content can get to the devices that they are plugged into is critically important. 14 15 MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: I want to 16 follow-up that point about the coolness, what is 17 more cool than more listening to the radio over 18 the internet? What is more cool than iM4 radio? 19 MR. SPEARS: IM4radio Broadcasting 20 Network is a direct result of what Mario was talking about. The problem is content. They want 21 more content. They're tired of the same five 22

1 songs. Most people are tired of the same five songs every 19 minutes. That's the problem. 2 3 People are looking for something different. I'm fairly new to the industry. I've been on -- radio 4 for 10 years and iM4radio was created 7 years ago 5 out of the need that people wanted different 6 content. We're totally online. We're not an FM 7 station and we're not a terrestrial station at 8 9 all. We're not a satellite station. We're 10 online, and just like Mario said you can access 11 online. There was a teenager who created the Fstream app or the iPhones so people can tune in 12 13 and listen through their phones, so that's where it is and that's where we are. We're working with 14 15 the census to reach people through their phones because unlike a radio, you go everywhere with 16 your phone, to the bathroom with the phone. Your 17 phone is everywhere with you and that's where we 18 are right now. We have to meet people where they 19 20 are and that's the phone. 21 MR. JONES: These are excellent points 22 but I want to make sure that we don't get caught

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

up in the moment and forget the lesson that we didn't get the last time. Radio is constantly being talked about as a technology and there is technology built into the business, but it is not the technology. This is one of the distinctions I think that has allowed to miss opportunities. Radio has always been a human condition. It's always been about the people behind the microphone and not just the microphone. An earlier question was what's unique about radio and urban and Hispanic radio? The credibility of radio has much less to do with the music that's being played, and has everything to do with the personality behind that microphone. They have developed a trust with the community. That's why it works. That trust is transformative and it can be reemployed into any platform and extended into any platform, and that's one of the unique powers that we still have as an opportunity.

When one of Frank's personalities gets on the air and say something, anything that goes on right after or just before what he says or she

1 says is much more powerful to that audience than 2 it is when it's sent out electronically on a 3 platform. We are right now as a country enamored 4 by technology. We're drunk with it. It causes us 5 to miss the deeper value and deeper truth. When radio started out as a medium in the 1920s it was 6 really about the personalities and it continued 7 that way. We're really a human search engine if 8 9 you think about it. If you think about the power 10 of what our medium is, there are hundreds of thousands of records out there and some 11 personality, some programmer decides these 40 will 12 13 be a hit and they end up being a hit. What's up with that? What happens is the credibility of the 14 15 humans behind it and their band presence that makes radio unique, makes it super local, and 16 that's what we can export to other media. Yes, I 17 believe what Mario is saying is absolutely true. 18 19 For example, as for the African American audience, 20 over 56 percent of them are under the age of 35 and 30 percent are under the age of 18. They have 21 long since gone away from the old transistor to 22

1 | the new transistor that Mario just showed us.

that's going to grow exponentially.

That is the transistor radio of today and tomorrow. This coming year there will be \$560 million spent just in mobile advertising and

MR. WADE: I know we're going to take a break in just a few minutes, but from a pure business model and if we're talking about how do we sustain radio stations today and in the future, this type of hybrid operation, online paired with current traditional radio, is that where investors want you to go and the advertising dollars are currently? Frank you talked about this earlier, isn't this shift absolutely necessary if you are to sustain yourselves financially from a purely business model, isn't that what the advertising and other investors want?

MR. FLORES: Rick, if you're talking to a captive audience which I really do believe that urban and Hispanic broadcasters are talking to, it is imperative that you embrace the new technology, you bundle it up, you find some great synergistic

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

connections to it and then you sell it back to them because you're selling back to a marketer or an advertiser who knows little about your audience because they're looking at you as the expert in that. So why not do all of that? That's what we're trying to do. We're trying to bundle up TV, radio, internet, bring it all to an advertise and say you want entrée into this marketplace which you don't understand and you don't speak their language and you don't understand the culture, you don't need to. We're going to be the bridge to that and we're going to show you how to do it and we're going to do this cross-platform kind of service for you so that you can really appreciate the dynamics of that marketplace and get everything that you need to get out of it so that you do need to go that way.

MR. WINSTON: May I throw out a question? Obviously this a trend that's been developing over several years and we discuss this at NABOB conferences quite frequently. What I hear from my members because we bring in experts

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to talk about internet platforms for radio, and what I hear from my members again and again is that the revenues are not tracking the needed investment so that the problem you have is that when you start investing in higher-technology activities for your radio station, you can't justify it on a revenue basis. I was interested in hearing from Frank and Zemira who have been on the frontlines there that the large part of the reluctance of radio to embrace these new technologies is not because they don't see them developing and don't understand that they are there, but the problem is they can't convert that into revenue sufficient to cover those new investments and those ongoing operating costs of having skilled people on staff to operate these higher-tech functions. I'd like to get some response from the guys on the frontline about that.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Just let me say that we are being streamed and one of the questions coming across was who's going to pay for

1 the investment.

2 MR. BLACKWELL: To answer your question 3 from the Native perspective, if we don't, nobody 4 else will, and that goes to the point of who's 5 going to pay for it. We are not drunk with technology in Indian country. The 1990 census was 6 a watershed for Indian country because it 7 demonstrated such an extreme need for 8 9 communications. It illustrated less than a 10 50-percent telephone penetration rate in Indian 11 country. That rose to just under 70 percent in 12 the 2000 decennial census. And we have a broadband penetration rate to run the kinds of 13 applications and mobile devices we're talking 14 about that's estimated around 5 to 8 percent. 15 That comes from discussions among tribal leaders 16 from across the United States. So we have an 17 environment where we're trying to build and 18 sustain these Native radio stations that are still 19 20 very relevant because they are one of the few games in town. They do increasingly play a public 21 safety and homeland security type of role as well. 22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But trying to engage a new generation that is most definitely adaptive, we're some of the most highly adaptive societies in the history of the world in Indian country. We have always used the best of what we've learned from our neighbors and others, and that certainly includes modern technologies and communications technologies.

It is also still an environment that is so strong culturally that it is a place where word of mouth can still be very reliable, where the mother network is still some place where you can really learn what's going on. I agree with Mr. Spears when he says it's all about individualism, it's about the ability to find and make what is otherwise being broadcasting chosen for you, making it relevant to yourselves. On tribal lands in order to be able to do that, we have to find business models that are sustainable and in Indian country sustainable does not always mean profitable. That is why so many tribal governments themselves have become their own carriers of last resort, their own providers,

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

their own broadcasters. Nobody else will do it
for them.

There's another significant reason why we have to engage with new platforms, internet-based platforms, that reservations and tribal lands have not always been the easiest places to live, the best place to find a job, the best place to educate children or raise your family and we have significant urban and suburban native populations. Just as Mr. Armstrong was saying, how do I stay in touch with my people back in Baltimore? It's the same exact question for tribal people, how do we stay back in touch with folks who are at Rocky Boy out on Navajo or where my family is from in Oklahoma or Nebraska? I look forward to the time where we're going to talk about business models because we've done some studies. Native Public Media and the New America Foundation has done a study that has proven some fundamental truths that apply in this environment but I'll wait until that time.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: I'd like to get

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

any more thoughts on who's going to pay and then we're going to take a break.

MR. JONES: Growth is what the investors are looking for. They want to be sure that they can get three times plus out of it whether they're a debt or an equity player and radio hasn't been able to in the current model to demonstrate that. Radio has obviously been going in the other direction. But there's a reset opportunity and embedded in the noise, one of the things that we're seeing is that we've gone in the 1970s from I would say broadcasting to target marketing to niche marketing to one- to-one marketing to now it's nanomarketing. There was a new MIT study that just came out that was saying how this nanomarketing and advertising is starting to show diminishing returns on profitability to the advertisers. It's already starting that we have gotten to minute in our targeting that the ROI is not as lucrative as it was just 18 months.

We also see I think a big truth coming in that says hope for radio and that's in Twitter. We

1 all can get information on the internet ourselves. Just about anything we ca want we can find 2 ourselves. We don't need anyone else anymore 3 thanks to Google and others. But if I want to 4 5 follow you, Rick, there are thousands of people who would like to follow you and do what you say just 6 because you put it out there because credibility is 7 much more important just access to information and 8 that's why radio has always had a real power. 9 So using technology to export that not only in 10 traditional over the air but combine that with new 11 12 technology online as Mario was talking about is a 13 great combination. That tension is coming back. 14 That's why you're seeing people following people and not just going out using technology for 15 information and using that to monetize and 16 switching to new models that I'm sure we'll talk 17 about will give radio an opportunity for a 18 19 renaissance. 20 MR. FLORES: I think we've come around full circle. We started by talking about the 21 problems that minority and local radio stations 22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

have when we talked and the tough economy, we talked about the rating services and how they've affected us. Now we get down to the nitty- gritty in terms of how do we expand our business, how do we stay viable in the face of all of this new technology. I'm not from the south unless you call the South Bronx the south, but they have a saying that says it's hard to think about draining the swamp when you're up to your ass in alligators, so most of us are up to our asses in alligators. We're trying to see what it is that we could do to survive year to year while still trying to expand our business, while still trying to say we want to be viable and profitable in the year 2015, so how do we get there? Right now on this present course, the way the old model was isn't going to work.

MR. SPEARS: I think what has to happen is that people really have to pay attention to like Mr. Winston said what's out there? Who's doing this new style of radio? People, the gatekeepers, the powers that be, have to listen to

new ideas. You have a broadcasting network, you have individuals such as Mario who's working with youth. They know exactly what's going on. We have our finger on the pulse. The station has been around for 7 years. Like I said, we don't do any terrestrial streaming. We're totally online. We have 106,000 listeners on a budget of less than \$10,000 per month for 6 years. It's time for people to pay attention to what's already here. It's here. We're doing it. Mario is doing it. People have to pay attention.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I'd like to piggyback off of what Cleveland is saying, and just so it's clear, I live in so many different areas of content generation. Just to give you a quick understanding, I'm weekly on CNN delivering content for them, I'm on satellite radio delivering content for them, I'm on NPR, Public Radio which is not commercial radio as we know, then I'm on KOIS with Russ Parr, I'm on Tom Joyner, then we're on the internet, and then I'm doing podcasting. My point with saying all of

1 this is that I get to see so many different models and so many different uses and adoption and 2 3 techniques that it's interesting that I can't foresee how radio can survive if it does not go to 4 5 a hybrid model. When you ask the question who needs to pay, there's a lot of confusion. You've 6 just heard some stats and figures from someone 7 who's doing it. There is a lot of confusion and 8 misperception as to what it costs to make these 9 types of things take place and I think we get so 10 focused on how much money is it going to take. 11 Ι 12 understand the issue that we need to generate 13 revenue, but at what point do you reinvest in 14 yourself to say we need to change? No one else is 15 going to do it for us. There are grant 16 opportunities that these stations don't go after because they haven't really looked at that 17 18 particular model. But when you look at that, I 19 cannot foresee why when the cost of entry is 20 really in practicality so low to get engaged. 21 answers that you hear back will be we don't have I get that and I've met with some of 22 the staff.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

those folks and I understand it, but have the really, really researched what it takes to pull it off? And are we talking about a whole overhaul or are we talking about a phased approach? Are we willing to experiment with our medium to find new ways to develop new programming? We've heard personalities, we've heard that drive content, we've heard local, we've heard focused, all of those things. We are seeing more rock stars on the internet today when some of the multimillion people who we are paying for these radio shows. Why is that? Because of some of the things that Zemira just pointed out. People want to follow people who have great content, not necessarily personality-driven stuff anymore. Obviously personality works well and you need that for entertainment purposes to some extent, but the content trumps that and rises above all that. People will listen to a more horrible podcast before they listen to a well-invested radio show that they do not like and that's just the reality. I have people who are taking devices and

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

bypassing the radio in the car. They're bypassing
radio. They don't even think. IPod, bypass.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: On that point,
Mario, I think you've set us up to take a little
break. We can think about how we can get folks
back on the track and not bypassing radio in our
next segment. Let's take about a 10-minute break.

(Recess)

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: We've laid the foundation and we've talked about what works and what doesn't work, and now we're on the precipice of the future and the future is now. In the entertainment world we've heard about so- called collabos, artists will team with other artists to extend their reach into a new demographic or to expand their sales, et cetera. This is a concept that we think that others in the media should think about. We've talked about it generally when we've talked about hybrids between traditional radio and some of the new platforms and new country technology. I want to kick off this part of our session with are there examples of

broadband's use today? What are radio stations doing today to engage in new technologies and new platforms? What examples are out there? I know it's not a hybrid, but certainly we have the example of a purely streamed network and maybe, Cleveland, you can talk about your formatting. What's a typical programming session or programming for iM4 radio?

MR. SPEARS: The typical radio is very different from what you normally would see on regular radio. We run off of a TV schedule. Our on-air personalities are not on the air every day 4 hours a day which enables us to be able to provide fresher content. People pay attention a little bit more with our on-air personalities. We have about 34 right now out of our Largo location. That can be everything from soul music to talk to rock, everything, we pretty much play it and that's what people are paying attention to.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Mario, what are you seeing that's happening today?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Beyond what I've already

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

mentioned earlier?

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: You can reiterate all of that. You have some radio stations who are engaged in using some other platforms.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Absolutely. You have radio stations using more and more different platforms, but what I'm seeing and I mentioned this earlier and I think is definitely a solution as something that we should start to focus on and is the mobile development of our content. What I mean by that is either making our websites mobile or making applications made of applications. There's a difference between the mobile web and making your website accessible on a mobile device, and a clear difference in creating an app that has a set of features and functionality that runs on these types of mobile devices. I think as we pointed out earlier, ad spending is increasing in the mobile space. Zemira pointed out some specific figures. I've spoken with some of the companies that do advertising or help companies advertise their brand on mobile devices and that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

is clearly growing. If you look at the recent events, albeit a disaster of the event that it was with Haiti, you saw an empowerment of people using their mobile devices to get engaged.

Why I'm saying that is because that's also setting the stage for micropayments, it's also setting the stage for people being comfortable using their phones to make financial transactions whether that be consuming content or donations. So I think we're at that tipping point and we need to take advantage of the fact that our audiences, Native American, Hispanic or Latino and African American are using these devices more so than others on the mobile web and capitalizing on the adoption of us as content providers leveraging these tools. So I think from that perspective I'm seeing specific examples like NPR which has an iPhone application that is a specific app that they've created. Then I've seen smaller stations like WTMD in the Baltimore market create its own iPhone application and we're talking probably about \$4- to \$5,000 iPhone app because I know we

went through some hard figures. Obviously these things can go to \$20- or \$30,000 depending on the functionality of what we're looking for. But you can get into the game of mobile streaming and mobile content providing for under or around 5K.

MR. WINSTON: May I ask a question? As I expected, I was going to learn a lot here.

Mario, when you say create an app I assume when you said that somebody created an app for the iPhone it's one of these situations where you go to the iPhone store and you download that app.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Correct.

MR. WINSTON: Why would each station need to create its own app? I thought you were saying that there was an app and that you could go to the Apple store and get and then your station could access that app and be accessible to the world.

MR. ARMSTRONG: What I'm saying is that each station should create its own defined application unless you have an ownership group.

Then it makes sense for the ownership group to

1 look at creating one application where you can 2 access all the different stations that it owns. MR. BROYLES: Jim, you could think of 3 4 the app like a low-power television station. 5 solely targeted to your programming and it would be an app. I concur. The mobile app that we 6 built for the product that my company is launching 7 later this quarter, we spent about \$50,000 and 8 9 that's a complex technology where we're close to seven figures for the web-based application, but 10 for the mobile we spent about \$50,000 and it's 11 12 very complex. It's going to show how everyone in 13 the world is connected. Whether you are in our 14 system or not, it maps it out. So you and I meet 15 and we punch in each other's name, that 16 application as complicated as it is, although it 17 piggybacks, it's API to our more expensive web-based application, it still was a \$50,000 app. 18 19 MR. ARMSTRONG: API is an application 20 program interface. 21 MR. BROYLES: Thanks, Mario. 22 MR. ARMSTRONG: At the end of the day

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 it's a snippet of code that you place onto your
2 application.

MR. BROYLES: You can tell the professionals here.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I just wanted to make sure it was clear. I thought your point was well raised and I just wanted to make sure.

MR. MONTERO: I've heard several stations or station groups within a particular market looking to create their own micro social networking site within the given market where people sign up. Many stations as you know already will frequently have Facebook groups or Twitter feeds either from the station or the part of their on-air personalities, but they're creating social network sites that may be unique to San Antonio or some place like that and will have feeds of activities of interest within that given community tying into the station and maybe having a live feed from the station. But they also tie into their advertisers and not just banners or links to the advertisers' websites which, Mario, as you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

pointed out is great, immediate feedback to those advertisers of who is coming to their site and how they're getting there because they're getting there from the social networking site.

But they're also using it as a vehicle to be able to print or download anything from coupons for those advertisers, concert ticket giveaways, be the fourth caller. You don't go to the station anymore. If you're the fourth caller you just download the tickets right from the social networking site and you may have to subscribe to the social networking site because some of those activities are only available to those who are participating in the social networking site which pulls them in even that much And then taking that social networking site and creating an app so that you can download it onto your iPhone or your PDA and be able to access it or download podcasts with the audio off of your PDA.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Does that make a case for some of the big ISPs like Comcast or

1 Verizon or even the big search engines like Google or Yahoo to make an investment in these sorts of 2 3 collaborations? Is that part of a case to be made 4 for investment? 5 MR. ARMSTRONG: There's a case to be 6 made if they want to make some money. 7 MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Is there a because incentive for them? 8 9 MR. ARMSTRONG: That's what I mean. 10 There's a case to be made because of if you look at the lack of broadband adoption in this country 11 12 and there's a bunch of other things that need to 13 be dealt with and I know that we already have an FCC plan and this February we'll be hearing more 14 15 about that National Broadband Plan. Right? 16 MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Or thereabouts. 17 MR. ARMSTRONG: What was that? 18 MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Yes. 19 MR. ARMSTRONG: I'll keep my comment 20 really short and brief on this. The point is 21 absolutely because you have areas of the country 22 that they can say what they want, but the

providers have not decided to go into certain areas because of certain types of infrastructure that's not available or that needs to be built out and there's a significant cost to doing that construction and I get all that. And when you have a certain amount of houses or a certain population that they don't really foresee possibly as a money-generating revenue scenario, they call it redlining. I'm not suggesting anyone is doing that, but it's just weird to me that we don't have full broadband adoption across the country accessible.

What that does bring into play though is something that we need to look at as a solution. Forget the wired. Why aren't we thinking about wireless? For example, 4G or YMAX technologies or evolutions of even what you hear a lot about, 3G technologies. I was just at CES 2 years ago and so this is actually in just this last year, but the one thing I want to share with you is internet in the vehicle will be here and is here to some degree, but will be here in the mainstream very

shortly. The pieces of the puzzle are there.

Once you have something like YMAX, and for those who do not know, that is like a 30-mile-wide radius of a WiFi hotspot. So imagine being able to drive around your city and have that type of connectivity without dropping that connectivity. You could not be tuning into frequencies. You

could be tuning into internet addresses on the dial in vehicles coming.

MR. SPEARS: Just add to that, actually that's happening right now. We've got a young people who are figuring out a lot of things at our station and what we're doing is a little mechanism that we have right here. You're probably familiar with it. This is plugging into a phone. Some cars have auxiliary jacks right now in their cars so people are able to listen in their cars through a simple auxiliary jack plugged into their phone into the car so our station and other stations are able to be listened to right now just from something that simple.

MS. MOBLEY-WRIGHT: Carolyn, the point

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that you left off with before we took our break, that question was never really dealt with. asked who is going to pay for it? In listening to what Mario said with regard to the Googles, the Yahoos and the implications of broadband as they enter into these communities and that whole idea of redlining that you threw out there, where is the value in the investment? When you look at e-commerce and when you look at the numbers that are always being thrown out with regard to minority populations and all of that, why wouldn't the Googles and Verizons, et cetera, want to make those investments also? Mario just threw it out there so quickly, but there are grants that are available. Not to beat up on our government again, but there's a woman, Linda Smith. going to quote her from the book "Who Moved My Cheese" -- the new cheese is government cheese and it's green now. There is money available and the problem is that we don't know how to access those grants and get that information so that the station owners can take advantage of perhaps money

that the federal government makes available. But if a case can be built for those investors whether it's the federal government or whatever for eCommerce as good corporate citizens for the educational aspects of broadband, it seems to me that the investment opportunities should be there for those who are brilliant enough to put those packages together to include those elements it would seem to me.

MR. BLACKWELL: The because opportunity is the ability to reach the majority of Americans who are not served by mainstream media in the Native American context. In many places tribal nations are local drivers of economies because of their unique status and the unique types of businesses that they can engage in and the fact that they make good local partners for economic drivers.

I'm of the opinion and I agree with

Mario and Cleveland have said. I think that

there's going to be a point in time of where

they've led us in this discussion. There's going

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to be a point in time where this amazing explosion of technology is going to come back around full circle to where people are looking what is the good content? What is the actual content? is the authentic content? I'm a reluctant early adopter personally. I tend to fall in love with devices. I'm very envious with what's going on over here on the table. But when I find something that works, I'm constantly looking for who is reporting on this the best? Who's telling the best story? Who's actually digging into this and getting the information to me. That goes from all sorts of different news sources that come into my household.

It is also an environment in Indian country because of the lack of basic services, it's the ability of these companies some of which you mentioned to get in on the ground floor in the creation of the backbone of a network that will be a new economic driver for rural America. And there is precedent. I wanted to bring the group's attention to a study that I mentioned earlier.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

This is the first ever study on broadband in Indian country. It was undertaken by Native Public Media and the New America Foundation. entitled "New Media Technology and Internet Use in Indian Country: Quantitative and Qualitative Analyses." The discussion at this point, we've led up to what's the value proposition? What's the business model going to look like if we're using terrestrial radio as the backbone branching off into new media platforms and what role do the big majority firms, bit search engine firms or others, play in this? One of the fundamental truths of tribal lands is a real lesson in demand aggregation for broadband use.

The other that we're never going to succeed in a national census is sheer numbers. We have a very low population base in remote America, so for any communications service to survive or to even approach profitability, it has to aggregate demand, and Native Public Media and the New America Foundation in their study here lays out in many places in Indian country where that demand

1 aggregation has begun with anchor institutions, 2 the anchor institutions that are unique to our 3 insular communities, our governments, our educational institutions, or health and safety and 4 welfare institutions. In many places those radio 5 stations are regarded as one of those institutions 6 in nation building in trying to bring together the 7 demand for a critical infrastructure in certain 8 places. There's a very good example of what you 9 10 were talking about, Mario, the creation of an app or a new platform. The Coeur d' Alene tribe in 11 12 northern Idaho is a very good example of how 13 certain federal programs have been utilized aggregating demand building off of a community 14 15 technology center now growing into a 16 residential-based service that has a media 17 component to it. A couple of years ago they 18 launched a native YouTube called Rescast, and that's res as in reservation and not resolution. 19 20 It is a very good example of the type of authentic, true content programming that will be 21 22 relevant.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

One thing that's fascinating about

Indian country is that it is fascinating. Anytime
somebody makes a movie or does a report or
program, "Dances With Wolves" is off the chart in
terms of people who attended wanting to learn more
about it. We've got a culture that is entirely
engageable by these new technological mediums.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: When you talk about the new technology and how it's being incorporated, we want to make sure that if there are things that the government can be doing to advance or to eliminate or reduce if there's a market entry barrier. For instance, someone has suggested that the copyright laws may act as a barrier and radio stations have to pay the costs, they're too cumbersome of they are laws that restrict how they can stream content, how they can use content. I'd like to step back for a moment to see if there are any institutional or regulatory or statutory barriers there that the government could look at as a way of advancing and opening new markets.

1 MR. MONTERO: I couldn't agree more. 2 think a major problem for adaptation of the 3 internet as an alternate means to deliver real-time content over the internet has been the 4 5 copyright laws. As Jim pointed out, who's going 6 to pay for it? It's not just paying out the 7 infrastructure needed for the delivery, but it's also paying these additional copyright royalty 8 Where you saw this in fact, as many of you 9 fees. 10 know, in the past year there was a proposal or a bill on the Hill that would have required radio 11 12 stations to pay performance royalties for 13 over-the-air broadcasts and there was a huge concern about that because with the radio industry 14 15 being in the state that it is that having to pay that performance royalty on top of the royalties 16 17 that they already pay to the composers of the 18 music under AFCAP and BMI and Publishers and SECAC that it was going to be the straw that would break 19 20 the camel's back. It was pointed out that stations already pay royalties for streaming. 21 shouldn't they pay royalties for over-the-air 22

broadcasts? My response to that is it is precisely the royalties for streaming that is preventing many stations from streaming at all.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Maybe that's an area that really needs some intense study and maybe a proposal in terms of modifications to the existing copyright laws.

MR. MONTERO: I certainly thing so, and I would be inclined to think that many of the radio broadcasters sitting around this table would agree.

MR. JONES: I would agree. I can tell you that that was one of the major hindrances in our investing in advancement in the 1990s. We looked at it and said we would like to be there, but we can't afford to be there. And the ambiguity that was around what could come up in the future, there was too much risk in getting into the internet. But I would like to say that the OCBO has a great opportunity to broker a partnership. Radio has credibility that's unmatched and that's why we aren't losing the

1 audience that other media is losing. What we 2 don't have is the dexterity of broadband. 3 Broadband in minority communities doesn't have the 4 credibility. So here you have one entity without the credibility and the other one without the 5 technology. If we put them together and having 6 strategic partnerships, radio can help adoption 7 rates exponentially. Radio can be a great 8 9 salesman for doing that because in African 10 American communities in the United States, one of the problems with adoption is there's no 11 12 credibility. Why should I buy into it? It hurts 13 our whole economy in the community because broadband is one of the pathways to education, 14 15 broadband is one of the pathways to employment, et cetera. So it becomes in the public interest to 16 help radio be a champion for broadband and also 17 that can be part of the funding opportunity to 18 help radio make that transition from where it is 19 20 now. I want to make sure that not only people 21 but people listening why it's so difficult to make 22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

that transition. I'm a big fan of Mario's. I was part of a company that invited Mario to be in one of our operations early on to bring talent, and you're going to hear a lot more from young men like Mario. One of the challenges was Marion wasn't in the room, we had these meetings in boardrooms and on the seventh floor of Radio One.

MR. ARMSTRONG: They wouldn't let me in.

I was knocking on the door.

MR. JONES: You didn't read the email? The challenge here is that 4 or 5 years ago radio was at \$20 to \$21 billion. It's now at \$13 billion. That's all radio. Black radio is even worse than that. I want to make sure we get this because it has affected the Native American community as well as the Latino community in the same ways. You had the economy and then you have the Personal People Meter which really was a dragon slayer and it really hurt urban radio even more because 100 rating points that we're selling under the diary model shifted to 70 rating points so that an advertiser who was buying 100 ratings

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

before, all of a sudden for that same audience the measurement says you only have 70 rating points so I'll just reduce your budget. It wasn't 70 rating point. It was the same audience. But the difference was like if you're driving a car and you're driving 70 miles an hour because you're going by miles per hour and then all of a sudden you go to Europe and you're driving at 125 and 125 kilometers is equal to 70 miles an hour. That same speed is just a different measurement but the ad community did not look at it that way and they discounted urban radio. So now urban radio is fighting just to keep the bank away and it can't invest in its future because it's fighting for survival every day. So it can't hire the young bright minds like the Marios that it wants to hire because it can't afford it. And because we see I asked the CEO of Google about 5 years ago what do you think we should do if you were in my place running radio and not where you are not but knowing what you know? He told me I'd hire young people. At the time I understood it

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

intellectually but I only got it emotionally about

3 to 4 years later. That was the most brilliant

single thing he could do.

Public Radio is further ahead than commercial radio. Public Radio gets it. Maybe they're smarter than us. I'm going to try to make some calls later. But I've been studying what they're doing and it's fascinating. It's a glimpse of what commercial radio is doing and later we can talk about some of those models, but that's a glimpse of it. It's just that we see some models we can execute. There are companies that are creating apps for mobile for mobile right now and for radio right now. I think Fred Jacobs Media has one that's excellent for it. They just launched a brilliant app for C-SPAN that catapulted C-SPAN about 3 or 4 months ago. So there are a lot of new things are going that are very interesting, but we can't get there from here as broadcasters.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: What can commercial radio learn? Are there things that you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

can learn from the NPRs of the world?

MR. MONTERO: It's interesting that you mentioned NPR because you're right, NPR is ahead, but NPR is a content provider. NPR doesn't own radio stations. They have affiliates, but because they don't own radio stations, they're like PBS that doesn't own TV stations. It was easier I think for them to see that this is just a pipe. These radio stations that are affiliated with us are just one of many pipes and so they could see the big picture of we have to look for other pipes or we have to always be making sure our content whether it's in the form of an app or what have you is constantly on the cutting-edge pipes, whereas many existing minority radio broadcasters whether it's Radio One or whether it's SBS, they own their radio stations and they have content. Increasingly I think you're going to start pushing the envelope, we already are, of what is radio? could ask this question about TV. What is TV? Ιf you have a TV station and you have local content on your TV station but the vast majority of your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

viewers are getting you over cable, are you a TV station or are you a cable channel? Does it matter? Is it really all about the content or is it about the FCC license that you have to have to broadcast over the airways?

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: I think Jim wants to respond to that.

MR. WINSTON: Frank has just put his finger on the dichotomy that you live with if you're a broadcaster which is that you have content to provide but you also have a fixed cost of that tower, that studio, those monthly electric bills to broadcast. So the problem is that from a consumer viewpoint, they don't care how they receive your content, but you bought a radio station, you went to the bank and you borrowed X amount of money and you gave them a business The model said I need to spend X amount of money every month to maintain the hardware, I need to pay X number of people every month salaries to keep the content flowing out of the hardware, and those costs are fixed. So when the industry

changes and the value of your pipe goes down and the advertisers are paying you less for the value of the pipe, the costs of the pipe don't change and that's the problem. Yes, we can take the content and put it on other platforms, but we bought a business model that says this is the amount of revenue that has to come in to maintain the pipe and that's the situation we're in. We can't lay off the engineers and the people who make the pipe work and that is why looking at other models, if they produce less revenue to sustain the pipe they're not the answer.

MR. MONTERO: The paradox is the fact that it's frequently this increasingly depreciating pipe that's the one asset that the lender wants to look at it because if you go to him and you said I want a loan, what's the collateral? What can I secure this loan with? It's an internet site. It's content. That's all well and good, but I want a piece of real estate, a studio and a tower, and to the extent that I get an FCC license so that at least I have something

that I can sell if you don't pay your loan off. 1 Frequently for the broadcaster it is those 2 3 tangible assets that enable what little money 4 that's coming in to come in. 5 MR. JONES: And the most tangible asset of all of those is the stick value of the radio 6 station and that's being devalued by the 7 investors. 8 MR. MONTERO: Right. The signal. 9 10 MR. JONES: They no longer recognize the 11 stick value at the same rate that they did just 5 12 years ago. 13 MR. BLACKWELL: At what point does that 14 cause you to reevaluate what's being put through 15 the pipe? 16 MR. WINSTON: The problem is it's not a 17 content issue, that's the problem. 18 MR. BLACKWELL: It never becomes one? 19 MR. WINSTON: I don't think that you can 20 say to X radio station in Washington, D.C. you're playing these songs and you're generating this 21 22 much advertising revenue from this much audience.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

If you stop playing these songs and play this content over here, your revenue is going to go up because there's no model to support that. Radio has been doing X number of things on different formats for X number of years. They've tried a variety of different formats. Certainly if you're an Hispanic station or a black station, you've only got expertise in that particular format so you can't say the content needs to change radically in a way that I'm not an expert in dong. So if the content is going to stay the same and the revenues are going to decrease and I still got to pay the same amount to run the station, the problem is my fixed cost plus what I owe to the bank because the bank and I got together and we said this is what we can expect in revenues, this is the costs we've got, this is what the loan is going to run. So when the revenues change and those fixed costs don't change, then you and the bank are at loggerheads. MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Suppose you could

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

you have expanded eyes and ears because you now are on different platforms and you're expanding either your demographics or your reach within a certain demographic because now your station is accessible on a cell phone? One of the digital applications that has been talked about here at the agency is FM chips in the cell phone. I think Mario mentioned that as well. It's been talked about mainly in the context of public safety and homeland security and I think abroad in Europe and Asia it's a common thing. But that may be something that is another platform if you can go to the advertiser or if you can go to the bank and say we have X amount of ears plus we're now accessible by X amount because of this new pipe or new platform.

MR. WINSTON: I'll make just one comment and then I'll turn it over to the experts. What has happened from what my members tell ms is that the value that the advertiser places on that additional platform, when all the stations created websites and they ran out to advertisers and said

1 you're going to get X number of listeners that Arbitron says I have, but I'm driving those 2 3 listeners to my website and then you're going to 4 get all these views on the website. advertiser said there is no track record of me 5 getting a benefit from driving your listeners to 6 7 the website so until I see a financial benefit from that, I am not willing to pay or I'm only 8 willing to pay a fraction of what I pay for a 9 10 radio spot because I have a history of seeing benefit from that. So what's happened is how do 11 12 you get the revenue to catch up with the 13 investment in those new technologies and that's 14 been the problem. We can invest or we could 15 invest, we got the additional problem now that instead of hiring people we're laying people off, 16 so Zemira talked about you need smart young minds 17 who are internet savvy and the bank is saying you 18 got 25 people on payroll, you're running X deficit 19 20 every month, I want the payroll to be 18 people and you say but I want to hire two people to do 21 internet work then they're going to say you'd 22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

better reduce it down to 16 people. So you got
this tug of war between how you generate new
income at a time when you don't have the revenue
to cover the investment in doing that.

MR. JONES: Keep in mind -- are doing less than a half a million uniques and it's hard to monetize that to any significant degree.

MR. FLORES: Speaking as an old radio guy because I've been in radio almost 30 years, the radio advertising business has always been the The internet and all these other things as steak. they come around have been the sizzle. The sizzle has gotten more important than the steak, unfortunately. So when the question was asked all of these economic stresses that we have on our business, does that affect the content? Yes and I'll tell you how it affects the content. It affects the content because where we had a morning show that had 14 people driving content and making sure that the five or six people who were on the air were provided for, now only maybe we have seven people. Maybe our total personnel has gone

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

from 750 in all of our stations to less than 500.

That affects something down the line. You would like to think that your on air isn't affected, but I think you're foolish to think that it won't be.

It affects you somehow.

We're not unlike the housing market where many people bought houses valued at X amount of dollars on the hope that it was going to continue to increase in value because most of us were drunk with that. In the 1980s our stakes rose 10 to 15 percent as our revenues rose and the value that banks were putting on your properties were 20 times cash flow, 18 cash flow. That model has changed completely and now we're stuck with people looking at us and saying you might get eight times cash flow but the cash flow has been decreased a lot. Now you have FM radio stations that are being sold in a market for \$70- to \$60 million where 10 years ago you were looking at \$250- to \$260 million.

MR. MONTERO: That goes to your point that you were saying earlier because you said that

broadcasters got lazy because so many of them made so much money doing nothing other than maybe buying and flipping a stick at like you said 17 to 18 times cash flow in the late 1990s, when they took a year or two break in 2000 and 2001 they were like let's do it again. And now they were buying at the top of the market and then when the bottom fell out because everybody figured prices are never going to do down so I can't care how much that house is worth now, it's always going to go up, let's buy it high because it's only going to go higher, and then the bottom fell out.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: I think Mario has a comment here.

MR. ARMSTRONG: A question and then a comment. What we're hearing, and it's absolutely true, I do get a chance to meet with radio stations and have consulted some media folks in the past and I've worked with other organizations to help them try to figure out ways that they can navigate this economic turbulence that we're in and leverage technology to help. But James was

1 dead on target and so was Zemira with the issues. The question that I have for James, Zemira and 2 3 Frank then I'll have a comment real quickly is 4 we're seeing the number continue to go this way and it's not showing really any signs of going up, 5 maybe slowing down but certainly it continues to 6 show signs of doing down. Does everyone agree 7 with that? 8 9 MR. MONTERO: Which number? Valuations? 10 Audience? 11 MR. ARMSTRONG: Revenue. Let's just 12 stay with revenue for a second. My question is do 13 you think that the advertising industry can be changed, the mentality of how they purchase radio, 14 15 can that be changed? 16 MR. WINSTON: I'll let the chief revenue take it or the senior vice president over here. 17 18 MR. JONES: There was a Forrester study 19 done just recently where it took 204 of the top 20 marketers in the United States and asked them where they're taking their money. Sixty percent 21

of them said that they were taking their money

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

from traditional radio or traditional media and moving it to new media. That's a huge number, 60 percent. So as tough as it is today, there is no short-term meaning in the next 3 to 4 years or the next couple of years where we see a sea change back to traditional radio. Marketers have bought into the fact that that's the place to be. So we have to change that. What we would like to do is have it change with the owners who have invested to much in the medium today. It will change. tragedy could be that we don't change in time for the existing owners and they end up losing their operations and then all these groups and stations going into receivership and then the new guy or gal comes in, buys them at cents on the dollar and then they execute and turn it around and that's the worst-case scenario.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I'm so glad that you painted that picture because I think that's proof in the pudding. I think what we're still dealing with us what we used to have and what we're trying to hold onto. I understand the financial issues,

1 but right now we're dealing with a country that 2 has some of the best talent laid off. Some of the 3 best talent is available for hire at reduced 4 rates. People want to work and they can wear multiple hats. We aren't talking about people who 5 have one defined line of doing work, people who 6 are used to being able to straddle across multiple 7 disciplines and leverage technology across that. 8 So I really am begging the industry to refocus on 9 the fat in the payroll if they really are serious 10 about reinvesting, look at how you can hire people 11 12 who are laid off now either as a consultant, no 13 benefits, freelancer or part-time. I know countless organizations that do this well for 14 15 technology reasons, not necessarily in the radio 16 business but in the media business. Let me tell you, I know organizations that don't even have a 17 person in their office handling their social media 18 strategy and it's working and they're pennies on 19 20 the dollar if you will by now having to try to find someone and bring them in-house. That's one 21 22 point.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Number two is how many stations, and James brought this up and this was so critical, because you asked how do we prove when the websites were like we're going to flood the websites and people are going to flock to this and we all know that that really didn't take off. didn't take off the way it was supposed to. Now we have banner blindness where people don't even want to click on banners to some degree within websites that are doing well. So here's the thing. I went out to several sales calls with people trying to pitch my content to sponsors with radio folks, people nameless, and they positioned the web as such a secondary, I don't even know if it was secondary, I think it was just like --

Tertiary. MR. JONES:

MR. ARMSTRONG: It was like, by the way, after you do all that we could throw this in. That mentality has to shift. We are feeding the advertisers and the brands, we can throw this in, and when we do that we devalue the exact property that we're trying to sell.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Lastly I'll say this. I go to some of these stations and I ask the person running the business. Have you ever looked at your web analytics? Some of them don't even know what I'm talking about. They got a website they invested in, it was supposed to do X, it didn't, they refocused back to what they were used to making money on so they left that alone, and now they haven't been tracking to James's point what the website has been doing for the last 3 or 4 years to now say holy smokes we're doing better on the web, I don't know, could be, better on the web than we are actually on-air. And if analytics are key to getting advertisers to spend money, the web analytics and mobile analytics, you cannot refute that proposal when you put it. At that point it becomes whether or not the ad agency sees value in working with you, period, end of story. Because if you put apples to apples down and the money is budgeted as it is, they're going to spend where they're going to get the biggest bang for their buck has been my limited experience, certainly not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

the same, and I definitely respect Frank and James and Zemira, they have more experience in that, but I'm talking about my new experience.

MR. FLORES: Let me speak to you about your new experience and how I feel about that. You have to look at the timeline, the timeline of where the internet came about as far as radio stations are concerned. The advent of the internet and us having web pages and so on and so forth came about when we were doing exceedingly It came about in the 1980s. We were making well. money hand over fist. What happened with this? We saw this new little toy, ad do you know what we called it? Value added. And that's the anchor and the albatross that's sitting on most radio stations and their websites. They've sold that to the advertising community as something that's an option, a throw-in, value added, no dollars associated with it.

We are now trying to catch up to that.

Some of the innovative things that we've tried to
do, I'll give you an example. We've looked at an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

industry that's dying which is the record industry. They're dying so much they're looking for us to pay the bill which is funny to me, but that's a whole different story. That's a whole different panel and I'm not going to get into We've looked at that and we asked is there a way that we can help? What's affected the record business more than any other business? internet. So what we did on a couple of occasions is that we've taken a major star who has a record release and done a webcast on it on all our radio stations where people have a chance to talk to the artist and we run that on our radio stations. now you have web and you have radio and that's one way you try to integrate this thing to a sagging business trying to go back them and saying we're not the ones who killed you but we can try to help you out.

MR. ARMSTRONG: That's brilliant.

MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: That's great and that's exactly the kind of innovation and creative thinking that we're talking about. We have come

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

to the end of our time here. I'm sure there's lots more that could be said. I am just thankful for all of your comments and your expertise to talk about this. It's very vital and imperative for minority radio to thrive and to be viable as an industry. As we said in the beginning, this is an opening conversation. We didn't expect that we would solve all of the problems here, but we certainly have talked about some of the etchings of what radio will begin to look like in the future. We want to continue this conversation. We hope that this is an incentive for all of you to think about ways that you can marry traditional radio, as Mario has pointed out, the traditional value, the legacy of radio and marry that with the new technology so that it goes forward and that 10 years from now we're talking about a vibrant industry.

We also talked about things that possibly we could do as regulatory agencies in the government, if there are statutory things that are in the way. There are partnerships and

collaborations that need to be thought about that need to be advanced. There are new ways of thinking. There is an educational mindset that maybe needs to take place within perhaps traditional media, new ways of thinking about doing the same thing.

There are lots of challenges out there.

The industry has to be Darwinian. It is adapting, it is changing and I think that it has a bright future. And I thank all of you for all of your comments. We look forward to you continuing with us in our mission as we advocate for you.

MR. WADE: I think you said it very well. From the Department of Commerce I have been challenged and want to think through thanks to this conversation about what is the role of government as a catalyst? What is this public-private partnership? Because I'm confident that that's precisely what it's going to take to help make this transition. As an agency when you talked about earlier where we're investing heavily through our census, how do we make these

1 decisions? Are we really getting the value added for the investments? What will they look like in 2 3 the future across the government? So I'm 4 challenged to think as well and remain open to your thoughts and ideas on the government's role 5 in this process as well. It's been very 6 7 beneficial. 8 MS. FLEMING-WILLIAMS: Last but not 9 least of course we want to thank our new chairman, 10 Chairman Genachowski, for supporting what we do, our new commissioners and our new Director of OCBO 11 12 Thomas Reed. 13 (Whereupon, the PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

1 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the

Commonwealth of Virginia

19 | Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012