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Introduction

In view of the integral part that communication plays in all aspects of modern society, it is not surprising that the government plays a substantial role in the development and maintenance of the current United States systems of communication. While the public is generally aware of government regulation of the postal service, the telephone network, broadcasting, and cable television, many people do not realize that government policies affect all media, including billboards, citizens band radio, and textbook publishing.

Government policies deal with every aspect of communication, including the production, transmission, and receipt of messages. Federal regulations govern broadcast and satellite transmission technologies, and federal copyright and antitrust laws significantly affect the software industry. At the same time, state and local government public education policies determine how much instruction individuals should receive in basic communication skills. State libel, obscenity, and privacy laws protect individuals against undesired communication. In addition to operating public libraries, local governments may also mandate and finance public access cable TV channels or even community computer bulletin boards.

Conflicts often occur among the various federal, state, and local officials responsible for maintaining and regulating systems of communication. In fact, there is often intrajurisdictional disagreement, particularly among the many and diverse federal communications policymakers. Tensions also arise between the champions of different media industries because, inevitably, the development of a new industry does significant harm to existing industries. Examples of such battles are abundant: telephone industry opposition to the carriage of electronic mail by the post office, broadcasting industry opposition to the entry of cable television, cable industry opposition to telephone company carriage of video programming, and newspaper industry opposition to telephone company carriage of electronic yellow pages. The diversity and complexity of both communications technologies and the U.S. democratic system make communications policymaking an often paralyzing task.

This Directory attempts to give policymakers and students of policymaking a better understanding and appreciation of the broad communications policymaking arena. It offers a relatively comprehensive description of all the major communications policymaking forums—what they focus on and their relationship to other forums—as well as the major directors of and participants in those forums. The Directory observes that while most communications policymaking is undertaken by government bodies, the rationale for many policy decisions is developed
by those in academia, trade associations, and industry. Part I focuses on federal bodies; Part II reviews state and local forums; Part III touches on international bodies; and Part IV reviews academic institutions, journals, foundations, conferences, seminar programs, and advocacy groups. The Appendices provide a detailed list of the sources of information discussed in the text of this Directory.

I

The Federal Government

Due to the increasingly expansive nature of most systems of communications, policymaking often requires a broad national, if not international, perspective. Hence, the federal government is assuming an increasing degree of leadership in the formulation of communications policy. Unfortunately, forging a national consensus on issues can be enormously complicated when so many federal communications policymaking institutions are scattered throughout the legislative and executive branches and independent agencies. In addition, the usually deferential judicial branch recently asserted its prerogative, allowing one judge to assume continuing control over the administration of the AT&T Modified Final Judgment.1 Neither the separate branches nor their institutions, however, are inclined to defer to the supremacy of the others. The result is a lack of consensus within even a single branch of the federal government.

A. The Legislative Branch

The authority of Congress to establish communications policy is relatively well settled. Although multiple House and Senate subcommittees formulate communications policies, it is usually clear which subcommittee has primary jurisdiction over which issues. The relevant committees and subcommittees then rely on a few Congressional support agencies to provide them with reports and analyses of policy options.

1. Congress: House and Senate

Congress' power to legislate national communication policies is based on its Constitutional power to regulate interstate commerce.2 Its two most significant actions in this area have been 1) the establishment and subsequent expansions and modifications of the U.S. Postal Service,3

---

2. See U.S. CONST. art. I, § 3, cl. 3.
and 2) the passage of the 1927 Radio and 1934 Communications Acts, which led to the creation of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The only major limitations on the power of Congress to regulate communications are the first amendment, which prohibits Congress from abridging freedom of expression, and the tenth amendment, which reserves unenumerated powers to the states, denying Congress the power to legislate on intrastate matters.

Within Congress, almost any committee or subcommittee could focus on an issue of communications policy, due to the critical impact of communications on so many areas of social, political, and economic life. (See Box A) Nevertheless, the primary responsibility for dealing with communications legislation rests with two subcommittees. In the House, it rests with the Committee on Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance. In the Senate, it rests with the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation's Subcommittee on Communications. The most influential players in these forums are the heads of these two committees, the chairpersons of their two subcommittees, and the heads of the subcommittee majority staffs.

Over the past few decades Congress has passed substantial legislation in the communications field, such as the 1984 Cable Communications Policy Act and the 1967 Public Broadcasting Act. Repeated failures to rewrite the entire 1934 Communications Act, or to reach a consensus on any number of smaller issues, however, has led some members of Congress and critics to characterize Congress as virtually powerless in the area of telecommunications policy. Nevertheless, Congress exerts a substantial impact on the communications policy process in many ways. It sends messages to the FCC in letters to the Commissioners and it holds hearings on communications issues and on the confirma-

---

6. See U.S. Const. amend. I.
7. Id. amend. X.
11. See Gelhorn, The Role of Congress, in Communications for Tomorrow: Policy Perspectives for the 1980s 445-62 (G. Robinson ed. 1978); Ferejohn & Shipan, Congress and Telecommunications Policy Making, in 1 New Directions in Telecommunications Policy 301 (P. Newberg ed. 1989) (Criticisms have even come from members. For example, Senator Ernest Hollings has complained that "[t]here is no doubt that we have a runaway animal in the FCC," and Representative Al Swift has added that "Congress is an extremely powerful, but muscle bound, giant who sometimes has trouble getting up off its inertia to do anything.").
BOX A

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES & SUBCOMMITTEES
With a Significant Interest
in Communications Policy Matters
(and an example of subjects they cover)

SENATE
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcomm. on Communications
(broadcasting, telephone, FCC)

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcomm. on Antitrust, Monopolies, and Business Rights
(the monopoly power of cable TV systems)
Subcomm. on Patents, Copyrights, and Trademarks
(home copying with digital audio tape (DAT))

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Subcomm. on Rural Development and Rural Electrification
(rural telecommunications development)

Committee on Government Affairs
Subcomm. on Federal Services, Post Office, and Civil Service Banking
(electronic funds transfer (EFT) rules)

Committee on Foreign Affairs
Subcomm. on Terrorism, Narcotics, and International Operations
(foreign broadcasting)
Subcomm. on International Economic Policy

HOUSE
Committee on Energy and Commerce
Subcomm. on Telecommunications & Finance
(broadcasting, telephone, FCC)

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcomm. on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Administration of Justice
(digital audio tape (DAT))
Subcomm. on Economic and Commercial Law
(antitrust issues)

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service
Subcomm. on Postal Operations & Services

Committee on Government Operations
Subcomm. on Governmental Information, Justice, and Agriculture
(government printing office, freedom of information act)

Committee on Agriculture
Subcomm. on Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development
(rural telecommunications)

JOINT
Committee on Printing
(printing & distribution of government publications)
tion of Commissioners.\textsuperscript{12} Congress has also shown its displeasure with FCC actions by withholding approval of FCC budget requests,\textsuperscript{13} failing to hold confirmation hearings, and refusing to consider legislation supported by the agency.\textsuperscript{14} Congressional committees also occasionally issue general policymaking background reports,\textsuperscript{15} as well as publish their hearings and reports on specific bills.

2. \textit{Congressional Support Agencies}

In its efforts to formulate communications policies, Congress depends on policy analysis from its support agencies, particularly the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA). OTA’s Program on Communications and Information Technologies (CIT) provides congressional committees with long term studies of issues such as home copying, government dissemination of information, and electronic privacy.\textsuperscript{16} The agency does not make specific recommendations on matters, but does provide careful analysis of options and their consequences.

In addition, OTA’s sister agencies also provide analyses of particular issues. Such agencies include the General Accounting Office (GAO),\textsuperscript{17} the Library of Congress’ Congressional Research Service


\textsuperscript{13}Congress to the Rescue, \textit{Broadcasting}, May 22, 1989, at 34 (probable that the FCC would have been forced to furlough its staff for three and a half days in 1989).

\textsuperscript{14}Note Hollings’ refusal to hold confirmation hearings for Susan Wing and Brad Holmes. \textit{Chances Bleak for Wing, Holmes}, \textit{Broadcasting}, May 30, 1988, at 25; \textit{see also} \textit{Fairness Doctrine Law Still 'Quid' to Broadcasters' 'Pro Quo,' Broadway, May 8, 1989, at 36 (discussing Dingall’s refusal to consider legislation favorable to broadcasters until the fairness doctrine is restored).


\textsuperscript{17}GAO occasionally audits and evaluates the management practices at government agencies involved with communications policy, such as the FCC and may even audit private sector pricing, such as in the cable television industry. \textit{See U.S. General Accounting Office, National Survey of Cable Television Rates and Services} (Aug. 1989).
(CRS), and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). Two other groups focus on copyright issues. The Register of the Copyright Office (within the Library of Congress) advises congressional committees on copyright issues and aids in negotiations of international treaties. The Copyright Royalty Tribunal (CRT), composed of five Commissioners appointed by the President, sets rates for and allocates revenues from the four compulsory licenses created by Congress. It also interprets license provisions that Congress has left vague.

B. Independent Agencies

To handle some of the more detailed issues that require constant attention and special expertise, Congress created two specific communications agencies: the FCC and the United States Postal Service (USPS). Congress also relies on a third agency, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), to deal with communications issues involved in trade.

1. Federal Communications Commission (FCC)

Congress created the FCC in the 1934 Communications Act, “to serve the public convenience, interest, and necessity,” and in doing so it delegated very broad and expansive powers to the agency. Five Commissioners, including no more than three from any one political party, are nominated by the President for five-year terms, subject to confirmation by the Senate. While the President also designates the chair, the


19. CBO may become involved on matters which may significantly affect the budget, such as HDTV, e.g., CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE, THE SCOPE OF THE HIGH-DEFINITION TELEVISION MARKET AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR COMPETITIVENESS (July 1989).


agency is not bound to support administration positions and occasionally refuses to do so.\textsuperscript{25}

The FCC Commissioners may raise issues on their own initiative, while other policies are suggested by studies of the Office of Plans and Policy (OPP),\textsuperscript{26} or by the main Bureaus according to stakeholders' requests. The Commissioners may act through Rule Making, Notices of Inquiry (NOIs) or Notices of Proposed Rule Makings (NPRMs), adjudication, or even speeches.\textsuperscript{27} The primary policy "shops" are the Policy and Programming Division, within the Common Carrier Bureau, and the Policy and Rules Division, within the Mass Media Bureau. The newly established Office of International Communications\textsuperscript{28} has not yet established a distinct policy shop. The Commissioners and their dozen internal bureaus and offices (see flow chart) also serve as enforcers and adjudicators of rules and regulations.

Because they can be overruled by congressional legislation and, more importantly, because they depend on congressional funding, the FCC Commissioners have traditionally been very sensitive to the wishes of Congress.\textsuperscript{29} Nevertheless, they have opposed Congressional will on occasion when they believed that the President or the courts would support their decisions. A recent example of this independence was the FCC's decision to invalidate the fairness doctrine.\textsuperscript{30}

Many have complained that the FCC has been captured by the industries it regulates.\textsuperscript{31} However, this may only reflect the superior quan-

\textsuperscript{25} For example, FCC Chairman Mark Fowler supported the repeal of the financial interest-syndication (fin-syn) rules until President Ronald Reagan intervened. Editorial, \textit{Free the Networks, and Competition}, N.Y. Times, Apr. 15, 1990, § 4, at 12, col. 1.


\textsuperscript{28} \textit{See} Walda Wanger Roseman Named Director of New Office of International Communications, FCC News, Jan. 12, 1990.

\textsuperscript{29} Ferejohn & Shipan, \textit{supra} note 11, 308-12.


tity and quality of information that industries are able to present to regulators to justify their positions. Despite the existence of OPP, some complain that the agency does not have the funding to carry out the necessary long range broad policy planning.\(^3\) Another criticism is that the predominance of legal and administrative backgrounds of the FCC Commissioners leads the FCC to view regulatory activities in a legal and administrative mold, rather than in broader social and economic terms.\(^3\)

2. **Postal Rate Commission and Board of Governors**

The 1971 Postal Reorganization Act\(^3^4\) transformed the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) from a cabinet-level department to an independent agency which is managed by a Board of Governors and the Postal Rate Commission (PRC). The President appoints all five members of the PRC, who then recommend rates and classifications for approval by the Board of Governors. The President also appoints nine members of the Board who select a Postmaster General as the tenth member. These ten Board members then appoint the Deputy Postmaster General as an eleventh member. In addition to regulating postal rates, the Board also sets policy for USPS entry into or out of new services, such as electronic mail,\(^3^5\) and the permissible areas of entry by private delivery services.\(^3^6\)

3. **Federal Trade Commission (FTC)**

By agreement among federal agencies, including the FCC and the Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) exercises "primary jurisdiction over all matters regulating unfair or deceptive advertising in all media, including the broadcast media."\(^3^7\) Thus, the FTC establishes policies for advertising directed at children, as well as evaluating whether the claims made in advertisements are supported by sufficient empirical data.\(^3^8\)

\(^3^2\) See E. Krasnow, supra note 9, at 15 (citing complaints about funding for long-term planning); U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, The Communications System from a Regulatory Perspective (contractor report authored by Vincent Mosco) fig. 4 (between pp. 15-16) (Dec. 1986) (quoting more general funding complaints).

\(^3^3\) Robinson, supra note 31, at 379-81; see E. Krasnow, supra note 10, at 41.


\(^3^5\) See Bovard, Zapped by Electronic Mail, Across the Board, June 1985, at 42-47.

\(^3^6\) See, e.g., 39 C.F.R. § 320.6 (1989).

\(^3^7\) FCC Public Notice No. 41503 (1972), cited in D. Brenner & M. Price, Cable Television and Other Nonbroadcast Video § 6.08[2], at 6-82 n.5 (1988).

C. Executive Branch Agencies

Responsibility for advocating and implementing the administration's communications policy agenda rests with a myriad of different yet related groups. The primary agencies involved are the Departments of Justice, Commerce, Defense, and State, although others may participate in particular issues. Unfortunately, competition among these groups often frustrates national efforts to present a single unified position.39

The coordination of executive agency actions has sometimes been handled by working groups established by a Senior Interagency Group (SIG). In 1980, a SIG was established for Communications and Information Policy, co-chaired by representatives from the Departments of State and Commerce, but it is defunct today. When these groups cannot resolve their differences themselves, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) usually acts as the final arbiter.40

1. Department of Justice (DOJ)

The Department of Justice (DOJ) formulates communications policy primarily through its Antitrust Division, specifically the Communications and Finance section within the Regulatory Affairs group. This section is responsible for investigating complaints about anticompetitive behavior of communication firms, evaluating mergers, and pursuing antitrust lawsuits. Past DOJ lawsuits led to the divestiture of the major Hollywood film distributors from their theaters (in 1948) and of AT&T from its local operating companies (in 1984), and also derailed the establishment of the "Premiere" pay-TV network (in 1981).41 Like the FCC, the Justice Department can only enforce laws passed by Congress, yet like the FCC, it also has a great deal of discretion over whether to bring a


40. For example, OMB seems to have been responsible for blocking the Commerce Department from offering strong support for HDTV. See Burgess & Richards, Commerce to Drop Role in HDTV, Wash. Post, Sept. 13, 1989, at C1, col. 6.

lawsuit. Still, its permissive policies in the 1980s\textsuperscript{42} antagonized some members of Congress and even the courts.\textsuperscript{43}

The DOJ also influences policy by commenting on proceedings in other forums; in recent years it has been required to make recommendations on all waiver requests submitted by the Regional Bell Holding Companies (RHBCs) to Judge Harold Greene of the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia.\textsuperscript{44}

2. Commerce Department

Commerce Department communications policies are usually coordinated by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), although a number of other groups within the Department are also concerned with different aspects of communications.

a. National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)

Established in 1978\textsuperscript{45} to replace the Office of Telecommunications Policy (OTP),\textsuperscript{46} the NTIA is responsible for fostering the development and growth of communications industries, as well as the industries' customers and clients. It also has primary responsibility for managing the use of the electromagnetic spectrum by the federal government. In recognition of the importance of telecommunications to the U.S. economy and the agency's role as chief telecommunications policy advisor to the President, Congress recently blocked an effort to remove NTIA one level from its current status. Executive branch effort had sought to force the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information (and thus NTIA) to report to the head of the Commerce Department's Technology Administration, rather than directly to the Secretary of Commerce.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{42} For example, it declined to oppose a number of media mergers. See, e.g., White, \textit{Antitrust and Video Markets: The Merger of Showtime and the Movie Channel as a Case Study}, in \textit{Video Media Competition: Regulation, Economics, and Technology} 338-63 (E. Noam ed. 1985).

\textsuperscript{43} Pytte, \textit{'Baby Bell' Regulators Struggle for Power}, CONG. Q., Aug. 26, 1989, at 2209, 2214.

\textsuperscript{44} The AT&T divestiture requires the DOJ to participate in a triennial review, and as part of its 1987 review, the Antitrust Division of the DOJ commissioned Peter Huber to produce \textit{The Geodesic Network: 1987 Report on Competition in the Telephone Industry} (1986).


\textsuperscript{46} See Miller, \textit{The President's Advocate: OTP and Broadcast Issues}, 26 J. BROADCASTING 625 (1982).

\textsuperscript{47} Television Digest with Consumer Electronics, Sept. 11, 1989, at 3; \textit{Commerce's Restructuring Plan}, BROADCASTING, Nov. 14, 1988, at 72, cols. 1-2.
NTIA makes frequent studies of both broad and narrow communications policy topics.\textsuperscript{48} It occasionally makes proposals to the FCC on issues such as alternatives to the fairness doctrine and the provision of video dial-tone by telephone companies. It also comments on most FCC proceedings and provides testimony on such issues to Congress. Most of NTIA's policy analysis is produced by the Assistant Secretary's office or the Office of Policy Analysis and Development (OPAD). On matters involving the radio frequency spectrum, NTIA's Office of Spectrum Management (OSM) serves as the manager of spectrum use by federal agencies. When devising spectrum policy, OSM collaborates with the FCC and also relies on two advisory groups: the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC), the Frequency Management Advisory Council (FMAC).

b. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)

Once known as the National Bureau of Standards, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) develops and recommends federal information-processing standards. It also participates in developing voluntary industry standards for computer and network technologies, primarily through its Computer Systems Laboratory. NIST proposed the Government OSI Profile (GOSIP) standard for federal procurement, which became official in 1989,\textsuperscript{49} and developed the Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS).

c. International Trade Administration (ITA)

The International Trade Administration (ITA) develops communications policies with regard to international tariffs and other trade restrictions on telecommunications equipment and services.

3. Department of Defense (DOD)

The Department of Defense (DOD) is the single largest user of the U.S. communications system. Its large budgets for procurement and research and development enable it to exercise considerable influence in the policy arena. The thirty million dollars that the Defense Advanced Re-


\textsuperscript{49} Jackson, GOSIP Guidelines Released, Communications Week, Aug. 29, 1988, at 6; Jackson, Federal Agencies Brace for GOSIP, Communications Week, Nov. 6, 1989, at 60, col. 2.
search Projects Agency (DARPA) initially designated for HDTV research in 1989 is an example of the DOD's influence.\textsuperscript{50}

The DOD appears to have four principal goals in the communications area: 1) to manage its affairs in a competitive environment; 2) to insure the integrity of the communications network for military command; 3) to rebuild the telecommunications system in case of a massive nuclear war; and 4) to support military operations in the midst of and following a limited conventional battle.\textsuperscript{51} Through its Office of the Chief Regulatory Counsel, the DOD submits comments in both federal and state regulatory and judicial proceedings that affect such uses to insure that the quality of the network is not compromised. The Office of the Chief Regulatory Counsel represents the Defense Communications Agency (DCA), the National Communications System (NCS), and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (C\textsuperscript{3}I), although it often acts indirectly through the DOD itself, the General Services Administration (GSA), or local counsel.\textsuperscript{52}

4. State Department

As the department responsible for foreign relations, the State Department generally assumes primary authority over U.S. participation in all international communications forums and policy, primarily those of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU). For example, its Office of Radio Spectrum Policy coordinates U.S. participation in World Administrative Radio Conferences (WARCs), and its Office of Telecommunications and Information Standards does the same in the area of international communications standards. While the State Department also develops policies on trade in telecommunications equipment and services, it generally defers to the expertise of other agencies,\textsuperscript{53} and thus invariably selects government officials from the FCC or NTIA, or designates private firms to participate in international forums, rather than participating directly itself. The Office of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, through its Bureau of International Communications


\textsuperscript{52} U.S. CONGRESS, OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT, DEFENSE INTERESTS AND UNITED STATES POLICY FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS (contractor report authored by Martin H. Edmonds) (June 1988) [hereinafter DEFENSE INTERSTS].

and Information Policy (CIP), acts to insure that the State Department's positions are presented in FCC proceedings (with letters, rather than formal comments). The Office of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs handles issues of telecommunications trade and transborder data flow through its Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs.

5. **Other Executive Branch Agencies**

To the extent that communications issues arise within their jurisdiction, other executive agencies are also involved in the communication policy process. For example, the Department of Agriculture's Rural Electrification Administration (REA) is involved in the financing of rural telephone service; the Department of the Treasury is involved in the operation of electronic funds transfers (EFT); and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and the White House Office of Science & Technology are all participating in discussions about HDTV policies. Executive branch agencies are also major users of telecommunications services and radio spectrum and, as such, are important voices in relevant policy debates.

D. **The Courts**

In theory, the role of the courts is simply to interpret the policy decisions that have been made by legislative and regulatory bodies to insure that such decisions are substantively consistent with the U.S. and other relevant State constitutions, and to insure that all relevant procedural standards have been satisfied. Nevertheless, not only are there many instances where laws involving communications seem to conflict, but many difficult policy issues have been left unresolved by the legislature. Courts must deal with these issues virtually without direction. The most notable examples of unsettled communications issues are those that have arisen with respect to copyright law.\(^5\)

Thus, judges who review most decisions of the FCC, particularly those on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals, have a significant role in

\(^5\) See, e.g., Sony Corp. v. Universal Studios, Inc., 464 U.S. 417 (1984); Fortnightly v. United Artists TV, 392 U.S. 390, 402-03 (1968) (Fortas, J., dissenting) ("This case calls not for the judgment of Solomon, but for the dexterity of Houdini. We are here asked to consider whether and how a technical, complex, and specific Act of Congress, the Copyright Act, which was enacted in 1909, applies to one of the recent products of scientific genius and promotional genius, CATV . . . . Applying the normal jurisprudential tools—the words of the Act, legislative history, and precedent—to the facts of the case is like trying to repair a television set with a mallet.").
communications policy decisions. While judges rarely maintain a continuing role in particular policy issues, Judge Harold Greene of the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia has become a major exception with respect to communications policy. Technically, Judge Greene is merely interpreting the antitrust law according to the AT&T consent decree, but the substantial discretion he enjoys under the Tunney Act probably makes him the single most powerful decisionmaker in U.S. communications policy today.

The diagram on the following page illustrates the universe of broadcast regulation, with the three major policymakers comprising the outer triangle.

II

State and Local Governments

Powers not granted to the federal government are retained by the states. Thus, states play a number of significant roles in communications policy, particularly regarding the regulation of telephone service and public education. States may also delegate significant powers to local governments, although the courts have required that such delegations be clear and explicit if they are to be protected by the state action exemption to the antitrust laws. Policymakers from different states also work together on common issues through the Transportation, Commerce, and Communications Committee of the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), as mentioned below.

A. State Legislatures

All intrastate communications that are not subject to federal control are subject to regulation by the individual states. The states began to regulate telephone service in the early 1900s. The 1934 Communications Act then explicitly denied the FCC jurisdiction with respect to spe-
 Specific areas of intrastate telephone service. The states generally delegated full responsibility for such regulation of telephone service to public utility or public service commissions (PUCs or PSCs), although recently some state legislatures have passed sweeping deregulatory legislation and others have established social contracts. Since 1988, state legislatures have also been aided by a separate Communications Committee of the National Conference of State Legislatures. When cable television began to develop, most states left regulatory responsibility to the relevant local governments, but eleven states chose to regulate cable on a statewide basis. The 1984 Cable Communications Act, however, preempted a significant amount of regulatory authority over cable systems.

B. State Public Utility or Public Service Commissions (PUCs or PSCs)

State public utility or public service commissions spend only a part of their time on communications issues. All are comprised of an odd number of up to seven commissioners. In thirty-seven states they are appointed by the governor; in eleven others, they are elected by voters; in the remaining two states, they are elected by the state legislature. The commissions are generally empowered to establish franchises and balance ratepayer interests against company finances. They previously had the support of the FCC on these priorities until the FCC altered its goals and placed a greater emphasis on efficiency. To present a united front, state commissions often act through their National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), and NARUC's Communications Committee, which has a staff and meets three times a year. Groups of states served by the same regional Bell [telephone] holding company (RBHC) have also established working groups to prevent the RBHCs

---

63. E.g., Vermont. U.S. CONGRESS, OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT, STATE REGULATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS (contractor report authored by Paul E. Teske) 200 (July 1987) [hereinafter TESKE REPORT].
64. See D. BRENNER & M. PRICE, supra note 37, § 3.01[4], at 3-14 to -18.
65. This section is based on the TESKE REPORT, supra note 63.
66. Id.
67. These laws do not typically specify goals of efficiency, economic development, deregulation, or even universal service, although the latter has evolved into an important objective. Id. at 184.
68. See Noam, supra note 61, at 950.
from taking inconsistent positions when dealing with the different states. The states have formed five joint conferences for discussing policy and other issues. Some of the more significant institutions in which the state regulatory commissions participate are presented in BOX B and are listed in Appendix B.

**BOX B**

**State Regulatory Commissions and Policy Institutions**

- National Association of Regulatory Commissioners (NARUC)
  - Committee on Communications
  - Staff Subcommittee on Communications

- Federal-State Joint Boards & Conferences
  - Joint Board on Alaska & Hawaii Rates, Dkt. 80-1376
  - Joint Board on Amendment of Part 67 (new Part 36), Dkt. 80-286
  - Joint Conference on Open Network Architecture (ONA), Dkt. 88-2

- **NARUC Affiliates**
  - Great Lakes Conference of Public Utility Commissioners
  - Mid-America Regulatory Commissioners
  - North East Conference of Public Utility Commissioners
  - Southeastern Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners
  - Western Conference of Public Service Commissioners

- **Regional Bell Oversight Committees**
  - Ameritech Regional Oversight Committee
  - Southwestern Bell Oversight Committee
  - US West Regional Oversight Committee

As more and more issues require cooperation between the FCC and state PUCs, the FCC has established federal-state joint boards and conferences. These enable state and federal representatives to work toward compromises as they seek to accommodate state and federal goals. NARUC is responsible for selecting the state commissioners to participate in the joint boards.

**C. State and Local Cable Television Franchising Authorities**

In most communities with cable television service, the cable franchise is regulated by a local franchising authority with limited powers. In eleven states, however, the legislatures granted authority for franchising to a state agency and six of those states actually preempted

---


70. See D. Brenner & M. Price, supra note 37, § 3.01[3], at 3-8.
In five of those six states, and two of the other five, the PUC or PSC handles cable regulation, and in the remaining four, separate state cable regulatory bodies handle such regulation. Although the 1984 Cable Act preempted much of their power, state and local governments are still responsible for overseeing the use of the public, educational, and government access channels, as well as establishing reasonable improvements to demand when the cable operator seeks to renew its franchise. Municipalities generally express their position on national policy issues through the Communications committee of the National League of Cities, which actually negotiated with the cable industry to create the 1984 Cable Act.

III

International Institutions

A. The International Telecommunications Union (ITU)

The International Telegraph Union was formed by twenty countries in 1865. It merged with an organization created by the International Radiotelegraph Convention in 1934 and was renamed the International Telecommunications Union (ITU). It now has a constituency of one hundred sixty-five member nations who help to regulate, plan, coordinate, and standardize worldwide communications. The ITU traditionally has acted through two primary committees: the International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT), which covers all telecommunications except radio, and the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR), which covers radio, although there has been discussion recently of combining them into a single unit. The ITU also employs several other bodies for various specialized tasks.

The CCITT and CCIR generally adopt non-binding recommendations for technical standards, but the desire of countries to interconnect
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76. See J. BITTNER, BROADCAST LAW AND REGULATION 91 (1982).
generally makes them binding on almost all nations. The supreme body of the ITU, composed of representatives of all of the ITU member nations, meets in a plenipotentiary conference approximately once every seven years.\textsuperscript{78}

1. \textit{The International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT): All Telecommunications Except Radio}

The CCITT is responsible for setting standards for telegraph, telephone, and other various wireline [nonradio] systems, \textit{i.e.}, all telecommunications except radio systems, networks, and services. It operates through scores of study groups and working parties meeting almost continuously. The CCITT has adopted more than 2000 standards, including its X.25 standard for interfaces between data terminal equipment and public data networks, as well as its standards for integrated services digital networks (ISDNs).\textsuperscript{79} Members meet at the World Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference (WATTC).

2. \textit{Radio Spectrum Management}

The field of radio is covered in three different forums.\textsuperscript{80} First, there is the International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR). It is responsible for developing and adopting standards in the form of recommendations for radio systems and networks and satellite orbital allocations. The CCIR holds plenary sessions approximately every four years, with the last one held in 1990. Second, the Administrative Radio Conferences (for the World (WARC) or a particular Region (RARC))\textsuperscript{81} forge treaty agreements between members regarding plans and procedures for how particular frequency segments and orbital slots may be used. The next WARC, scheduled for 1992, will focus on the allocation of high frequency broadcasting and frequency bands. As telecommunications technology and its applications evolve ever more quickly, the formal treaty mechanisms are diminishing in importance. Finally, there is a five member International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB). Together with its Secretariat, the IFRB records and disseminates notices of the intended

\textsuperscript{78} Interview with Anthony Rutowski, assistant to the Secretary of the ITU, in Airlie, Va., Oct. 2, 1990; see J. Bittner, supra note 76, at 93.


\textsuperscript{81} The three regions are as follows: Europe, Africa, and North America; the Americas; and Asia and Oceania. 47 C.F.R. § 2.104 (1989). The next WARC is currently scheduled for 1992. See In re ITU WARC for Dealing with Frequency Allocation in Certain Parts of the Spectrum, \textit{Notice of Inquiry}, 4 FCC Rcd. 8546 (1989).
uses of the spectrum and orbitals by international radio systems, especially satellites.

3. Network Development and Policy Analysis

A Telecommunications Development Bureau (BDT) and a Center for Telecommunications Development (CTD) conduct programs for planning domestic and regional telecommunications networks, improving the management of networks, obtaining financing, and analyzing economic policy. This is done by Geneva-based staff, as well as outside contractors. Additionally, the ITU conducts biennial symposia focusing on policy, technical, regulatory, and economic research.

B. The International Organization for Standardization (ISO)

The ISO is the world's primary body for developing information system standards with a process similar to that of the ITU bodies. As telecommunications systems have evolved into specialized information systems, the work of the two organizations has become increasingly integrated. Many new standards are adopted jointly by the ISO-ITU. One of the best known of the ISO standards is its seven layer open system interconnection (OSI) model. The ISO also works with the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC), particularly the Joint Technical Committee on Information Technology (JTC1).

IV Other Institutions

A. Domestic Standards Bodies

U.S. standards are coordinated through a voluntary system by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). ANSI is a private nonprofit agency, although its membership includes about 30 government departments and agencies as well as about 1,000 private companies and 250 industrial and trade organizations. Rather than actually setting standards itself, ANSI's role is to accredit and monitor more than 400 groups, including independent standards bodies and certification and testing organizations. ANSI is also responsible for representing the U.S. in the ISO and IEC forums.
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86. Id.
Some of the more significant standards bodies accredited by ANSI include the Computer & Business Equipment Manufacturers Association (CBEMA)-sponsored X3 Committee, the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE), the Exchange Carrier Standards Association (ECSA) T1 Committee, and the Electronic Industry Association/Telecommunications Industry Association (EIA/TIA). CBEMA’s “X3 Committee” is the principal U.S. organization in the information technology standards area. The IEEE deals with both information and communications technologies through its separate computer and communications societies. ECSA was formed in 1983, after the AT&T divestiture, and its T1 Committee has the general mandate to develop and maintain technical standards relating to the interconnection and interoperability of telecommunications networks. Finally, the TIA was formed in 1988 and acts as the telecommunication arm of the EIA. It is responsible for establishing standards to maintain compatibility and performance of communications related products. The Bell companies joint research group Bellcore also undertakes substantial work on telecommunications standards.

B. Communications Policy Journals

While editors of communications policy journals have no formal power over communications policy, they clearly influence the agenda and decisions of communications policymakers through the selection of topics and articles they publish. Although the pluralist theory of policymaking often neglects the early stages of policy formation (e.g., journal articles and seminar and conference discussions), these are the forums where it is easiest for stakeholders to participate in the policymaking process and where proposals are most susceptible to modifications. A number of journals are devoted almost exclusively to communications policies. Others cover communications policies as part of a more general focus. The journals generally publish articles written by and for lawyers or economists or other communications scholars with expertise in those areas. The major communications policy journals are listed in Box C. These and other journals are included in Appendix D.
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C. Communications Policy Research Centers

The influence that communications policy research centers have on policymaking is similar to that of policy journals. Such research centers can help influence policymaking agendas or decisions through the issues they choose to focus on in research or seminars. Any university with a department of communications is apt to have scholars who examine communications policy issues, particularly if there is a degree program focusing on communications policy, but a number of institutions have formally established centers devoted to communications policy research. Most of them conduct a seminar series as well as having researchers on staff. The major centers are listed in Box D. These and other centers are included in Appendix D.

D. Annual Conferences & Seminar Series

Communications policies are also discussed and formulated during the sessions and intersession dialogues carried on at annual communications policy conferences and smaller, more frequent seminar series. The primary conferences and seminar series are listed in Appendix D.
BOX D

MAJOR COMMUNICATIONS POLICY RESEARCH CENTERS

Center for Telecommunications & Information Studies (CTIS)
Columbia Univ. Graduate School of Business, New York, N.Y.

Gannett Foundation Media Center
New York, N.Y.

Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics, and Public Policy

Harvard Program on Information Resources Policy
Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.

Annenberg Washington Program in Communications Policy Studies
Northwestern Univ., Washington, D.C.

Center for Advanced Research in Telecommunications (CART)
Interdisciplinary Telecommunications Program
Univ. of Colo., Boulder, Colo.

International Center for Telecommunications Management
Univ. of Neb., Omaha, Neb.

Center for Communications & Information Sciences and Policy
Univ. of Pa., Philadelphia, Pa.

E. Foundations Funding Communications Policy Research

Communications policy research is influenced by those with the financial resources to encourage, foster, and support research on policy issues that they are most concerned with. The foundations that are most involved in funding communications policy research are listed in Box E and Appendix D.

F. Advocacy Groups

Finally, communications policies are formulated, reviewed, and promoted by advocacy groups. These include individual firms affected by communications policies, but generally the positions of firms are presented by the industry's trade association. A list of major trade associations involved in communications policymaking is presented in Appendix D. A second group of advocates is the self proclaimed “public interest” group. In addition to those listed in Appendix D, most states have public counsel's offices that represent consumers in state forums.

Two other categories of participants who are heavily involved in communications policymaking are economists and lawyers. The mem-
bers of these groups are not individually listed here because their numbers are so large. Not only are there numerous names, but no single source of such names exists. One relatively comprehensive list of these individuals is the mailing list used by the Telecommunications Policy Research Conference (TPRC) to solicit papers for their annual conferences. A useful source of lawyers involved in this field is the Federal Communications Bar Association's (FCBA's) annual directory. Not all lawyers involved in communications policymaking are members of the FCBA, however, and many of those individuals listed may not deal with policymaking. Many of the top legal scholars in this field can also be identified from listings in the legal journal indices under communications policy topics.

No particularly good single list of economists involved in research on communications policy issues exists. Other than the economists on the TPRC list, who certainly comprise a large portion of those most involved in this area, one can also consult NARUC's annual directory of consultants. Another less frequently updated source is the American Economic Review directory, published every four years. Many of the economists who list themselves under category 610 (industrial organization and public policy) or under category 630 (industry studies) are involved in communications policy research.

V

Conclusion

While great effort was made to compile a comprehensive directory with the most up-to-date information, it is likely that some entities were
inadvertently omitted and that many recent developments will have already made some of the entries obsolete by the time this is published. In future months, additional changes will continue to occur. Ideally, this Directory will soon be available online and continuously updated. In any case, readers who have corrections or additions should send them to Mark Nadel in care of this journal.
I

Legislative

A. Senate Committees & Subcommittees

Committee on Commerce, Science & Transportation  
Chair: Ernest Hollings  
Subcomm. on Communications  
Chair: Daniel Inouye  
Counsel (Common Carrier): John Windhausen, Jr.  
Counsel (Mass Media): Antoinette Cook

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcomm. on Antitrust, Monopolies & Business Rights  
Chair: Howard Metzenbaum
Subcomm. on Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks  
Chair: Dennis DeConcini

Committee on Foreign Affairs
Subcomm. on International Economic Policy  
Chair: Paul Sarbanes
Subcomm. on Terrorism, Narcotics, & International Operations  
Chair: John Kerry

B. House Committees & Subcommittees

Committee on Energy and Commerce  
Chair: John Dingell  
Counsel for Communications: David Leach
Subcomm. on Telecommunications & Finance  
Chair: Edward Markey  
Counsel for Telecommunications: Gerry Salemme  
Counsel for Mass Media: Larry Irving

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcomm. on Courts, Intellectual Property & the Administration of Justice  
Chair: William Hughes
Subcomm. on Economic & Commercial Law  
Chair: Jack Brooks

Committee on Government Operations
Subcomm. on Government Information, Justice & Agriculture  
Chair: Robert Wise
Subcomm. on International Operations  
Chair: Mervyn Dymally
C. Other

Congressional Budget Office (CBO)  
Natural Resources of Commerce Division  
Unit Chief for Commerce: Elliot Schwartz  
Copyright Royalty Tribunal (CRT)  
Chair: Mario Aguero  
General Accounting Office (GAO)  
Library of Congress:  
Science Policy Research Division  
Assistant Chief: Jane Bortnick  
Register of Copyrights (Library of Congress)  
Register: Ralph Oman  
Office of Technology Assessment (OTA)  
Communications & Information Technologies (CIT)  
Program Manager: James Curlin

II
Independent

A. Federal Communications Commission (FCC)

Office of the Chairman  
Chairman: Alfred C. Sikes  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Chief: Richard Firestone  
Policy and Program Planning Division  
Chief: James Schlichting  
Office of International Communications  
Chief: Walda Roseman  
Mass Media Bureau  
Chief: Roy Stewart  
Policy and Rules Division  
Chief: Douglas Webbink  
Office of Plans and Policy  
Chief: Robert Pepper

B. Other

Board of Governors of the U.S. Postal Service (USPS)  
Postmaster General: Anthony Frank  
Federal Trade Commission (FTC)  
Bureau of Consumer Protection  
Division of Advertising Practices: C. Lee Peeler  
Postal Rate Commission (PRC)  
Chairman: George W. Haley
III
Executive

A. Department of Justice (DOJ)

Antitrust Division
Assistant Attorney General: James Rill 202-633-2401

Regulatory Affairs
Deputy Ass’t Att’y General: Alison Smith 202-633-2404

Section on Communications & Finance
Chief: Constance Robinson 202-272-4247

B. Department of Commerce

International Trade Administration
Assistant Secretary of International Economic Development 202-377-3022

National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST)
Computer Systems Laboratory 202-975-2000
301-975-2822

National Telecommunications & Information Admin. (NTIA)
Office of the Director 202-377-1840
Assistant Secretary for Communications & Information: Janice Obuchowski

Office of Policy Analysis & Development (OPAD)
Director: William Maher 202-377-1880

Office of Spectrum Management (OSM) 202-377-1850
Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC) 202-377-0599
Frequency Management Advisory Council (FMAC) 202-377-1850

C. State Department

Bureau of International Communications & Information Policy
Director: Bradley Holmes 202-647-5727

Office of Radio Spectrum Policy
Director: Richard Shrum 202-647-2592

Office of Telecommunications & Information Standards
Director: Earl Barbely 202-647-5230

D. Other

Department of Agriculture
REA Legislative & Public Affairs
Larry Casey 202-382-1007

Rural Electrification Administration (REA) 202-382-9540

Department of Defense (DOD)
Office of Chief Regulatory Counsel
Carl Smith 703-692-6957

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) 202-545-6700
Defense Communications Agency (DCA) 703-692-0018
Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) 703-695-0348
National Aeronautics & Space Administration (NASA) 202-453-8400
National Science Foundation (NSF) 202-357-9592
Office of Management & Budget (OMB) 202-395-3914
Budget Examiner: Ronald Jones
White House Office of Science & Technology 202-456-7116
Assistant to the President: D. Allan Bromley

Fax: 357-7745

202-395-3914

202-456-7116
APPENDIX B: STATE INSTITUTIONS

I

Multistate Groups

A. National Conference of State Legislatures
   Staff Contact: Becky Brady

B. National Governors' Association (NGA)
   Committee on Transportation Commerce & Communications
   Group Director: Charilyn Cowan
   Fax: 624-5313

C. National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC)
   General Counsel
   Admin. Director: Paul Rodgers (D.C.)
   Fax: 898-2213
   Committee on Communications (1941)
   Chair: Patricia Worthy (D.C.)
   Fax: 638-2330
   Staff Subcommittee on Communications (1942)
   Chair: Marsha Smith (Idaho)

D. Federal-State Boards & Conferences
   Joint Board on Alaska & Hawaii Rates, Docket 83-1376
   Susan Knowles (Alaska)
   Staff Chair: Ronald Choura (Mich.)
   Fax: 882-4640
   Joint Board on Amendment of Part 67 (new part 36), Docket 80-286
   Thomas Beard (Fla.)
   Staff Chair: Ronald Choura (Mich.)
   Fax: 882-4640
   Joint Conference on Open Network Architecture (ONA), Docket 88-2
   Thomas Beard (Fla.)
   Staff Chair: Mark Jamison (Iowa)
   Fax: 281-5329

E. NARUC Affiliates
   Great Lakes Conference of Public Utility Commissioners
   Conference Manager: Ronald Hawkins (Md.)
   Fax: 333-6066
   Mid-America Regulatory Commissioners
   President: Patricia Qualls (Ark.)
   Fax: 682-1451
   New England Conference of Public Utility Commissioners, Inc.
   Executive Director: Ralph Gelder (Me.)
   Fax: 622-7694
   Southeastern Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners
   Executive Director: Susan Callaghan (Tenn.)
   Fax: 341-3668
   Western Conference of Public Service Commissioners
   Coordinator: Sandi Barsell (Cal.)
   Fax: 557-3474
### F. Regional Bell Oversight Committees

- **Ameritech Regional Oversight Committee**  
  Staff Chair: Ron Choura (Mich.)  
  - Phone: 517-334-6240

- **Southwestern Bell Regional Oversight Committee**  
  Paul Peterson (Mich.)  
  - Phone: 314-751-7491

- **US West Regional Oversight Committee**  
  Joe Miller (Idaho)  
  - Phone: 208-334-3427

### II. State Commissions

(*including Cable TV Regulations*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Commission</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Public Service Commission</td>
<td>205-242-5209</td>
<td>240-3079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, Montgomery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Public Utilities Commission*</td>
<td>907-276-6222</td>
<td>276-0160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, Anchorage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Corporation Commission</td>
<td>602-542-3076</td>
<td>542-4870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Public Service Commission</td>
<td>501-682-1794</td>
<td>682-5731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock, Little Rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>415-557-0647</td>
<td>557-1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>303-894-2070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Denver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Dept of Public Utility Control*</td>
<td>203-827-1553</td>
<td>827-2613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Britain, New Britain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Public Service Commission*</td>
<td>302-736-4247</td>
<td>736-4849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover, Dover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia Public Service Commission</td>
<td>202-626-5100</td>
<td>638-2330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Public Service Commission, Div. of Administration</td>
<td>904-488-4733</td>
<td>487-0509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee, Tallahassee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Public Service Commission</td>
<td>404-656-7491</td>
<td>487-2341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Atlanta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Department of Commerce &amp; Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>808-548-6200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATV Division, Honolulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>808-548-3990</td>
<td>548-4376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu, Honolulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>208-334-0300</td>
<td>334-3762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, Boise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Commerce Commission</td>
<td>217-782-5778</td>
<td>782-1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Springfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission</td>
<td>317-232-2701</td>
<td>232-6758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Indianapolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>Fax Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State Utilities Board</td>
<td>515-281-5979</td>
<td>281-5329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Corporation Commission</td>
<td>913-296-3355</td>
<td>296-3596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Public Service Commission</td>
<td>502-836-3940</td>
<td>836-7279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Public Service Commission</td>
<td>504-342-4427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>207-289-3831</td>
<td>289-1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Public Service Commission</td>
<td>301-333-6000</td>
<td>333-6495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Community Antenna TV Commission</td>
<td>617-727-6925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Dept. of Public Utilities</td>
<td>617-727-3500</td>
<td>723-8812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Public Service Commission</td>
<td>517-334-6422</td>
<td>882-5170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Cable Communications Board</td>
<td>612-292-2545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>612-296-7124</td>
<td>297-1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Public Service Commission</td>
<td>601-961-5400</td>
<td>297-5469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Public Service Commission</td>
<td>314-751-3234</td>
<td>751-1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana Public Service Commission</td>
<td>406-444-6169</td>
<td>444-7618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Public Service Commission</td>
<td>402-471-3101</td>
<td>471-0254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Public Service Commission*</td>
<td>702-687-6001</td>
<td>687-6110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>603-271-2431</td>
<td>271-3878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Board of Public Utilities</td>
<td>201-648-2026</td>
<td>648-2836/4298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Board of Public Utilities Office of Cable Television</td>
<td>201-648-2670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Public Service Commission</td>
<td>505-827-6940</td>
<td>827-6973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Commission on Cable Television</td>
<td>518-474-4992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Public Service Commission</td>
<td>518-474-2510</td>
<td>474-7146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Utilities Commission</td>
<td>919-733-4249</td>
<td>733-7300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Public Service Commission</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota Public Service Commission</td>
<td>701-224-2400</td>
<td>224-2410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>614-466-3016</td>
<td>466-9546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Corporation Commission</td>
<td>405-521-2261</td>
<td>521-6045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Public Utility Commission</td>
<td>503-378-5849</td>
<td>373-7752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission</td>
<td>717-783-1740</td>
<td>787-4193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>401-277-3500</td>
<td>277-6805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Public Service Commission</td>
<td>803-737-5100</td>
<td>737-5199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>605-773-3201</td>
<td>773-3686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Public Service Commission</td>
<td>615-741-3668</td>
<td>741-2336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Public Utility Commission</td>
<td>512-458-0100</td>
<td>458-8340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Public Service Commission</td>
<td>801-530-6716</td>
<td>530-6796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Public Service Board</td>
<td>802-828-2358</td>
<td>828-2342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State Corporation Commission</td>
<td>804-786-3608</td>
<td>787-3796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission</td>
<td>206-753-6423</td>
<td>586-1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia Public Service Commission</td>
<td>304-340-0300</td>
<td>340-0325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Public Service Commission</td>
<td>608-266-2001</td>
<td>266-3957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming Public Service Commission</td>
<td>307-777-7427</td>
<td>777-5700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## III

### Multi-City Groups

National League of Cities  
Transportation & Communications Committee  
Policy Analyst: Anna Ferrara
APPENDIX C: INTERNATIONAL

I. International Standards Organization (ISO)
   Geneva, Switz.
   Michael Smith 41-22-734-1240

II. International Telecommunications Satellite Organization
    Washington, D.C.
    Director General: Dean Burch 202-944-7800

III. International Telecommunications Union (ITU)
    Telecommunications Development Bureau 41-22-730-5115
    Center for Telecommunications Development
    Geneva, Switz.
    Pekka Tarjanne

   Consultative Commission on Radio Communications (CCIR) 41-22-730-5800
   Geneva, Switz.
   Richard Kirby

   Consultative Commission on Telegraph & Telephone (CCITT) 41-22-730-5851
   Geneva, Switz.
   Theodore Irmer

   International Frequency Registration Board 41-22-730-5788
   Geneva, Switz.
   Gary Brooks

IV. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
    Geneva, Switz.
    Arpad Bogsch 41-22-730-9111
APPENDIX D: OTHER INSTITUTIONS

I
Domestic Communications Standards Bodies

American National Standards Institute (ANSI) 212-642-4900
New York, N.Y.

Computer & Business Equipment Management Association (CBEMA) 202-737-8888
Manager of Communications: Maryann Karinch Fax: 638-4922

Electronic Industry Association/Telecommunications Industry Association (EIA/TIA) 202-457-4912

Exchange Carrier Standards Association (ECSA) 301-564-4505

Institute of Electrical & Electronics Engineers 212-705-7900

II
Communications Policy Journals

(including address, year first published, number of issues per year, and editor with a description of topics covered for those journals in Box C)

Cable TV & News Media 212-741-8300
David M. Rice, Michael Botein

Canadian Journal of Communication 403-220-7578
McGill University, Montreal, Quebec Fax: 282-6837
University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta (1974)
Gertrude Robinson

Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal 212-790-029
Benjamin Cardozo Law School
New York, N.Y. (1982, 2/yr)
Benjamin Cardozo Law School students
Scholarly articles on communications and entertainment law.

Channels: The Business of Communications 212-545-5100
New York, N.Y. (1981, 2/mo.)
Merrill Brown

Columbia Journalism Review 212-854-1881
Columbia University School of Journalism
New York, N.Y. (1961, 6/yr)
Suzanne Levine

Communications and the Law 203-340-0447
Westport, Conn. (1978, 2/mo.)
Judge Theodore Kupferman
Scholarly articles on communications law.
Communications Lawyer
AB&A Forum Committee on Communications Law
David Leibowitz & Marcia Cranberg
Short articles and debates on communications law.

Communications Trends
Annenberg School of Communications (USC)
Los Angeles, Cal. (1989)

Computer Law Journal: International Journal of Computers, Communications & Information Law
USC Law Center
Los Angeles, Cal. (1978, 4/yr.)
USC Law School students
Scholarly articles on information law.

The Computer Lawyer
Prentice Hall Law & Business
Los Angeles, Cal. (1984)
Miles Gilburne

Federal Communications Law Journal
UCLA Law School
Los Angeles, Cal. (1947, 3/yr)
UCLA Law School students
Scholarly articles on communications law.

Free Speech Yearbook
Speech Communication Association
Southern Illinois University Press
Carbondale, Ill. (1961, 1/yr.)
Raymond Rodgers
Scholarly articles on first amendment issues.

Gannett Center Journal
Gannett Foundation Media Center
Everette Dennis & Huntington Williams III
Medium length articles on a single theme (per issue) involving mass media for the general reader.

Hastings Communications & Entertainment Law Journal (COMM/ENT)
Hastings College of the Law
San Francisco, Cal. (1977, 4/yr)
Hastings Law School students
Scholarly articles on communications, entertainment, high technology, sports, music, and art law.

Information Economics & Policy
Stanford University
Palo Alto, Cal. (1983, irregular)
Roger Noll
Scholarly articles on communications economics.

IEEE Spectrum
Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
New York, N.Y. (1963)
Donald Christiansen

202-429-7254
202-872-6700
213-740-0916
213-740-2313
213-740-9244
213-740-7979
213-552-2500
618-453-2281
212-280-8392
415-565-4731
Fax: 565-4814
415-723-2297
212-705-7555
Intermedia
International Institute of Communications
London, Eng. (1972)
Rex Malik

Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media
Broadcast Education Association
Washington, D.C. (1956, 4/yr)
Alison Alexander
Scholarly articles on broadcasting law, economics, advertising, and audience impact.

Journal of Communication
Annenberg School for Communication (U Penn)
George Gerbner & Marsha Siefert
Scholarly articles on communications stressing social aspects.

Journal of Broadcasting
Broadcasting & Electronic Media
Washington, D.C. (1956, 4/yr)
Alison Alexander
Scholarly articles on broadcasting law, economics, advertising, and audience impact.

Journal of the Copyright Society
Columbia University Law Center
New York, N.Y. (1953, 4/yr)
William Patry
Scholarly articles on copyright law.

Journal of Media Economics
California State University
Fullerton, Cal. (1988, 2/yr)
Robert Picard
Scholarly articles on media economics.

Journal of Media Law & Practice
The University
Glasgow, Scot. (1980, 4/yr.)

Journal of Regulatory Economics
Rutgers University Graduate School of Management
Newark, N.J. (1989)
Michale Crew

Jurimetrics Journal of Law, Science & Technology
Arizona State University College of Law
Tempe, Ariz. (1959)
Mark Hall

KMB Video Journal
KMB Associates
Block Island, R.I. (1984, 12/yr)
Mike Beilis
Videotaped discussions of communications policy topics.

National Regulatory Research Institute Quarterly
Columbus, Ohio (1980)
David Wagman

Information and Research Unit, Department of Economics
St. Lucia, South Melbourne, Aust. (1983, 2/yr.)
Donald M. Lamberon

Public Utilities Fortnightly
Arlington, Va. (1931)
### III

**Communications Policy Research Centers**  
(alphabetized by institution, with the director of the center and year founded)

#### A. Primary Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bellcore</td>
<td>201-740-9870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston, N.J. (1982)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley Roundtable on The International Economy (BRIE)</td>
<td>Berkeley, Cal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Cohen &amp; John Zysman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brookings Institute</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Crandell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Sirbu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications Law Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harvey Zuckman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanton Haskell Center for Public Policy &amp; Telecommunications &amp; Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Birenbaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Bill of Rights Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rodney Smolla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Noam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>Bronx, N.Y. (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donald McGannon Communications Research Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Capo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everette Dennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telecommunications Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Sterling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Cambridge, Mass. (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harvard Program on Information Resources Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Oettinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University Kennedy School of Government</td>
<td>Cambridge, Mass. (1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics, &amp; Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marvin Kalb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indiana University
Telecommunications Program
Bloomington, Ind.
Walter Gantz

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Media Lab Communications Research Program
Russell Neuman

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Research Program on Communications Policy
Cambridge, Mass. (1973)
Harvey Sapolsky

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management
Research Program in Telecommunications
Jerry Hausman

Michigan State University
Communications Technology Laboratory (CTL)
East Lansing, Mich.
Carrie Heter

Michigan State University
Institute of Public Utilities
Harry Trebing

Michigan State University
Program on Telecommunications
East Lansing, Mich. (1958)
Barry Litman

National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC)
National Regulatory Research Institute (NRRI)
Columbus, Ohio (1976)
Douglas Jones

New York Law School
Communications Media Center
New York, N.Y. (1977)
Michael Botein

Northern Telecom & the Aspen Institution
Institute for Information Studies
Nashville, Tenn. (1987)
John Hindle

Northwestern University
Annenberg Washington Program in Communication Policy Studies
Newton N. Minow

Northwestern University
Telecommunications Science, Management & Policy
Evanston, Ill. (1988)
James Webster
Ohio State University
Center for Advanced Study in Telecommunications (CAST)
Columbus, Ohio (1988)
James E. Meeks

San Diego State University
Center for Communications
San Diego, Cal.
Herman Land

Stanford University
Program on Regulatory Policy Center for Economic Research
Palo Alto, Cal. (1950s)
Steven Chaffee

Temple University
Program on Telecommunications Management & Policy
Herbert Dordick

UCLA Law School
Communications Law Program
Los Angeles, Cal. (1937)
Dan Brenner

University of Colorado
Center for Advanced Research in Telecommunications (CART)/
Interdisciplinary Telecommunications Program
Boulder, Colo. (1989)
Joseph Pelton

University of Colorado School of Journalism & Mass Media
Center for Mass Media Research
Boulder, Colo. (1988)
Dr. Michael Tracey

University of Florida
Brechner Center for Freedom of Information
Gainesville, Fla. (1977/85)
Bill Chamberlin

University of Florida
Public Utilities Research Center
Gainesville, Fla. (1971)
Sandford Berg

University of Hawaii
East-West Center
Honolulu, Haw.
Marcellus Snow & Mehenloo Jussuwella

University of Illinois
Institute of Communications Research
Champaign, Ill. (1946)
Howard Maclay

University of Mississippi
Center for Telecommunications
University, Miss. (1985)
Stacy Holmes
University of Nebraska
International Center for Telecommunications Management
Omaha, Neb. (1989)
James Alleman

University of Pennsylvania
Annenberg School of Communication
Dean Kathleen Jamieson

University of Pennsylvania
Center for Communications & Information Sciences and Policy
Kenneth Laker (Acting Director: David Farber)

University of San Francisco McLaren School of Business
Telecommunications Management and Policy Program
San Francisco, Cal. (1986)
Heather Hudson

University of Southern California
Annenberg School of Communication
Los Angeles, Cal. (1989)
Dean Peter Clarke

University of Texas
Center for Research on Communications Technology & Society
Austin, Tex. (1985)
Fred Williams

University of Virginia
Thomas Jefferson Center for the Protection of Free Expression
Charlottesville, Va. (1990)
Robert O'Neil

Woodrow Wilson Center
Media Studies Project
Lawrence Lichty

IV
Conferences & Seminars

A. Annual Conferences

Broadcast/Cable Interface
Broadcasting Magazine & Federal Communications Bar Association
Don West & Richard Wiley
202-659-2340

IEEE Global Commission (GlobeCom)
IEEE Communications Society
site varies (1970, Dec.)
Carol Lof
212-705-7018
IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC) 212-705-7018
IEEE Communications Society
site varies (1962, June)
Carol Lof

International Communications Association (ICA) 214-233-3889
site varies (1947, Spring)
Don Ware

International Telecommunications Symposium 402-554-2647
International Center for Telecommunications Management
University of Nebraska, Omaha, Neb. (1989, Oct.)
James Alleman

Michigan State Williamsburg Conference 517-355-1876
Williamsburg, Va. (1967, Dec.)
Harry Trebbing

NARUC Technical Educational Conference (TEC) 517-355-1876
Alternating years since 1976
Washington, D.C. (Feb.)
San Francisco or Los Angeles, CA (July)
Harry Trebbing

New Directions for State Telecommunications Regulations 801-581-5809
University of Utah/Utah State PSC
site varies in Utah (1985, Jan./Feb.)
Claire Turner

Pacific Telecommunications Conference 808-941-3789
Pacific Telecommunications Council
Honolulu, Haw. (1978, Jan.)

Practicing Law Institute (PLI) Communications Law Program 212-765-5700
New York, N.Y. (1972, Nov.)
Lyn Oliensis & James Goodale

Telecommunications 202-429-7010
Federal Communications Bar Association & Practicing
Law Institute
Richard Wiley

Telecommunications Policy Research Conference (TPRC) 202-452-9033
Airlie House
Airlie, Va. (1972, Oct.)
Dawn Higgins

Temple University Symposium on Telecommunications 215-787-5151
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pa. (1988, Fall)

University of Missouri/Missouri PSC Annual Conference 314-882-6396
site varies Mo. (1974, Apr.)
Richard Williams

B. More Frequent Seminars

American Bar Association Forum on Communications Law 312-988-5579
Chicago, Ill. (1979, irregular schedule)
Chair: Patricia Reilly

202-429-7285
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Institute Program on Communications &amp; Society</td>
<td>202-637-6677</td>
<td>637-9195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1976, irregular schedule)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director: Charles Firestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Telecommunications &amp; Information Studies</td>
<td>212-854-4222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University Graduate School of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Conn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Communications Bar Association</td>
<td>202-833-2684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C. (1936, monthly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Balinsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannett Foundation Media Center</td>
<td>212-280-5726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, N.Y. (1984, irregular schedule)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everette Dennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Media Institute</td>
<td>202-298-7512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Programs &amp; Communications: Sharon Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT Communications Forum</td>
<td>617-253-5265</td>
<td>258-7858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Mass. (1973, weekly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Sapolsky &amp; Rena Themistocles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Law School Communications Media Center</td>
<td>212-431-2160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Law School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, N.Y. (1977, monthly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Botein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annenberg Washington Program in Communication Policy Studies</td>
<td>202-393-7100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman: Newton N. Minow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program on Information Resources Policy</td>
<td>617-495-4114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Mass. (1972, biweekly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Oettinger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Satellite Consortium</td>
<td>202-863-0890</td>
<td>863-0897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President: Dr. Louis R. Bransford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V

Foundations Funding Communications Policy Research
(including director and year initiated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benton Foundation</td>
<td>202-857-7829</td>
<td>857-7841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Director: Larry Kirkman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Expression Foundation</td>
<td>213-598-3444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach, Cal. (1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannett Foundation</td>
<td>703-528-0800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, Va. (1935)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President: Charles Overby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI

Advocacy Groups

A. Some of the Major Trade Associations

American Newspaper Publishers Association (ANPA)
Senior Vice President: W. Terry McGuire
703-648-1061
Fax: 648-1237

American Telemarketing Association (ATA)
Director: Chris Deschermier
203-965-5193
Fax: 324-1780

Association of Data Communications Users, Inc. (ADCU)
Computer Software & Services Industry Assoc. (ADAPSO)
Senior Director of Gov’t Relations: David Peyton
612-881-6803
703-522-5055
Fax: 525-2279

Association of Independent Television Stations
Vice President of Legal & Legislative Affairs:
David Donovan
202-887-1970
Fax: 887-0950

Association for Maximum Service Television
President: Magita White
202-462-4351
Fax: 462-5335

Cellular Telecomm Industry Association (CTIA)
Director of Federal Relations: Jo-Anne Basile
202-785-0081
Fax: 785-0721

Committee of Corporate Telecommunication Users
President: Walt Anderson
202-457-0900
Fax: 775-2496

Communication Workers of America (CWA)
Executive Vice President: Barbara Easterling
202-728-2300
Fax: 659-1094

Community Antenna Television Association (CATA)
President: Steve Effros
703-691-8875
Fax: 691-8911

Competitive Cable Association
Counsel: Sol Schildhause
202-797-7500
Fax: 328-2423

Competitive Telecommunications Association (Comptel)
Vice President & General Counsel: Ginny Morelli
202-546-9022
Fax: 546-1847

Computer & Business Equipment Manufacturers Assoc. (CBEMA)
Manager of Communications: Maryann Karinch
202-737-8888
Fax: 638-4922

Direct Marketing Association (DMA)
Senior Vice President of Gov’t Affairs: Richard Barton
202-347-1222
Fax: 785-2231

Independent Data Communication Manufacturer Assoc. (IDCMA)
Attorney: Herbert Marks
202-626-6600
Fax: 626-6780
Information Industry Association (IIA)  
Senior Vice President: Ken Allen  
Fax: 638-4403

International Communications Assoc (ICA)  
Director of Telecomm Public Policy: William Pomeroy  
Fax: 296-6518

International Teleconferencing Association  
Manager: Jodi Moon  
Fax: 821-3263

Magazine Publishers Association (MPA)  
Executive Vice President: George Gross  
Fax: 296-0343

Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA)  
Sr. Vice President For Gov't Relations: Fritz Attaway  
Fax: 293-7674

National Association of Broadcasters (NAB)  
Exec. Vice President of Gov't Relations: James May  
Fax: 429-5343

National Association of Business & Educational Radio  
President: Jay Kitchen  
Fax: 836-1608

National Association of Public TV Stations (NAPTS)  
Vice President: Richard Grefe  
Fax: 202-626-3160

National Assoc. of Telecom Offices & Advisors (NOTOA)  
President: Susan Herman;  
Past President: Paul G. Berra

National Cable Television Association (NCTA)  
Director of Public Information: John Wolfe  
Fax: 775-3675

National Federation of Local Cable Programmers (NFLCP)  
Operations Manager: Reginald Carter  
Fax: 202-829-7186

National Newspaper Association (NNA)  
General Counsel: Robert Brinkmann  
Fax: 331-1403

National Telephone Cooperative Association (NTCA)  
Director of Gov't Affairs: Shirley Bloomfield  
Fax: 298-2320

North American Telecommunications Association (NATA)  
President: Edwin Spievack  
Fax: 296-4993

Organization for the Protection & Advancement of  
Small Telephone Companies (OPASTCO)  
General Counsel: Lisa Zaina  
Fax: 659-4619

Radio Television News Directors Association (RTNDA)  
President: David Bartlett  
Fax: 223-4007

Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA)  
Executive Vice President of Gov't Affairs & Business:  
Hilary Rosen  
Fax: 775-7253

Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press  
Executive Director: Jane Kirtley  
Fax: 202-666-6312

Satellite Broadcasting & Communications Association  
President: Charles Hewitt  
Fax: 549-7640

Utilities Telecommunications Council (UTC)  
Associate General Counsel: Jeffrey Shelden  
Fax: 872-1331

Telecommunication Industry Association (TIA)  
Director of Gov't Relations: Patrick Williams  
Fax: 457-4939

Telocator  
President: Tom Stroup  
Fax: 467-6987
United States Telephone Association (USTA)  
Vice President: Ward White  
Fax: 835-3187
Videotex Industry Association  
Administrative Assistant: Suzanne Nicolas  
Fax: 495-4959
Wireless Cable Association  
President: Robert Schmidt  
Fax: 223-1288

B. Some of the Major “Public Interest” Groups

Action for Children’s Television (ACT)  
President: Peggy Charren  
617-876-6620
Accuracy In Media (AIM)  
Chairman: Reed Irvine  
202-371-6710
ACLU Communications Committee  
Contact: Barry Steinhardt  
212-944-9800
American Council of the Blind  
Executive Director/Natl Representative: Oral Miller  
202-467-5081
Black Citizens for a Fair Media (BCFM)  
Chair: Emma Bowen  
212-563-3168
Citizens Communication Center  
Associate Director: Angela Campbell  
202-662-9535
Citizens for a Sound Economy  
General Counsel: Philip Mink  
Legal Counsel for Legal & Regulatory Reform Project: Michele Isele  
202-488-8200
Consumer Federation of America (CFA)  
Legislative Director: Gene Kimmelman  
202-387-6121
Consumer Interest Research Institute (CIRI)  
President: Mary Gardiner Jones  
202-333-6035
Media Access Project (MAP)  
Executive Director: Andrew Schwartzman  
202-232-4300
National Association of State Utilities Consumer Advocates (NASUCA)  
Public Counsel: Jack Schieve  
Executive Director: Deborah Berlyn  
202-727-3908
National Black Media Coalition  
Chair: Pluria Marshall  
202-387-8155
National Consumers League  
Deputy Director: Mary Ponder  
202-639-8140
Public Interest Computer Association  
Program Manager: Richard Civille  
202-775-1588
Telecommunication for the Deaf  
Executive Director: Al Sonnestrahl  
301-589-3786
Telecommunication Research & Action Center (TRAC)  
Staff Associate: Jacki Graninger  
202-462-2520
United Church of Christ Office of Communications  
Program Director: Anthony Pharr  
202-331-4265
C. Other Sources for Policymakers

Annual Economic Review  
American Economic Association  
Nashville, Tenn.  
Prof. Orley Ashenfetter

Federal Communications Bar Association (FCBA)  
Washington, D.C.

NARUC’s Publications  
Washington, D.C.

Telecommunications Policy Research Conference  
Washington, D.C.