

**THE KAISER FAMILY FOUNDATION**

**PUBLIC SERVICE ADVERTISING FORUM**

**A TIME SLOT IS A TERRIBLE THING TO WASTE: CURRENT PSA TRENDS AND PRACTICES**

**FEBRUARY 21, 2002**

**WASHINGTON, DC**

**MS. VICKY RIDEOUT:** We are absolutely thrilled to have with us one of the top journalists in broadcasting today. I think you all know that Michel Martin is an Emmy award-winning correspondent and frequent guest anchor for the ABC news program "Nightline." Actually, you may have known her as Michel McQueen, but she recently married and, in a rather bold move for a public figure, has changed her name to Michel Martin.

At "Nightline," she's covered everything from government budget battles to earthquakes in Turkey to the Embassy bombings in East Africa to the attacks on the World Trade Center. She's also contributed to a number of really important documentary specials on the network, including one on the Anita Hill/Clarence Thomas controversy, and another one on AIDS that was anchored by Barbara Walters. And I think a lot of us have been especially impressed with the special reports that she has produced and anchored at "Nightline" as part of the wonderful series, "America in Black and White."

Please join me in welcoming Michel Martin.

**MS. MICHEL MARTIN:** Good morning. Can you all hear me?

Vicky mentioned that I work at "Nightline." That means nighttime, which means I'm not usually speaking in complete sentences at this hour of the morning. So, you all will have to help me out. We're going to spend as much time as we can on questions.

I'm told that there are microphones. Where are the--who has the microphones? Where are they? Is there anybody in the room? Maybe they're not here yet. But, when we turn to questions, which will be very soon, there will be four microphones wandering around, and if you'd wait until a microphone comes to you, because the session is being recorded for your use, so it's so that you can have a resource later on.

One of the panelists, when we were preparing for our session today, asked me what I thought about the whole question of PSA's, and I confessed to her that, "I don't." Really don't. I'm one of those people who has the TV on all day long, as you might imagine. It's usually turned to one of the cable news stations--okay, with an occasional peek at HDTV, I admit that--and I note the things that affect me and the things that don't. But in this discussion, I'm really a viewer. I'm kind of a consumer, and I'm very interested in what kinds of messages work and why they work, and--but, you don't have the luxury of not paying attention to this area, so that is another reason

why we're not going to spend a lot of time on preliminaries, and we're gonna get right to the subject, to the degree that we can.

So, we're gonna--I'm gonna bring the panelists up one by one. I'm gonna let you know who they are. We're gonna talk a few minutes amongst ourselves on the trends that we see, some of which we've discussed already. And then, we're going turn to you, so please don't be shy. Utilize this time. It is your time. Utilize it effectively for your purposes. We're going to save a few minutes at the end for closing thoughts from each of our contributors, because I'm gonna--I have a sense that there will be some specific things that they may want to share with you so that you can really maximize your time here.

So, just--so, with no further adieu, I'm going to bring up Jim Goodman. He is President and CEO of Capitol Broadcasting Company. It's a North Carolina-based diversified communications company that includes radio, satellite, Internet and broadcast television outlets. The company owns five broadcast television stations, including an independent, an affiliate to CBS, Fox, UPN and the WB. Mr. Goodman joined the company in 1968 and, under his management, Capitol Broadcasting has expanded into satellite, the Internet and high-definition television. Mr. Goodman has been honored by broadcasting and cable with their Digital Pioneer Award for his efforts with putting HDTV on the air. He's also received the Jim Baton Media Award for bringing the Kid's Voting program to Wade County, North Carolina, and Mr. Goodman served on President Clinton's Committee on Public Interest Obligations for digital broadcasters, which is known to many people in the business as the Gore Commission. So, Mr. Goodman, where are you? Come on up. Go to the far--.

Next, we want to see Tom Nunan. Where are you, Tom? He's on his way in? Okay, then let's skip him and go to Judy. Is he back there? Tom Nunan, is that you? I can't really--no? Okay, then let's go to Judy McGrath, who's President of the MTV Group and Chairperson of Interactive--that's probably not your title. It's probably Chairman, right? Is your title Chairman, or--Chair--well, I think it should be Chairperson--of Interactive Music. She oversees the two cable networks, MTV, Music Television, and MTV2, as well as the online properties, MTV.com, VH1.com and SonicNet.com. Under Ms. McGrath's leadership, MTV has grown from a maverick cable channel to a maverick global brand. Many programs--among the many programs that she's developed include the Video Music Awards, the MTV Music--sorry, MTV Movie Awards, Total Request Live, The Real World, Beavis and Butthead, MTV Unplugged--don't act like you don't watch them, 'cause I know you do. You know you do.

You say your teenagers watch them, but I know it's really you. Ms. McGrath is also responsible for launching MTV's renowned public service efforts, including "Choose or Lose" voter registration campaign, and the Emmy award-winning "Fight For Your Rights: Take A Stand Against Violence" campaign. It's also interesting to me as a newsperson just how news breaking some of these public events programs have been. So, please welcome Judy McGrath. Judy, where are you?

All right. Is Tom here? I was gonna sort of seat the broadcasters together, but now--okay. Well, let's keep going. We'll keep going, and we'll give him a big raspberry when he comes in. Alan Levitt is the Director of the National Youth Anti-Drug media campaign at the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy, which is, I think, commonly known as the Drug Czar's

office. In 1998, the ONDCP launched a five-year, 1 billion--that's billion with a B--paid television ad campaign discouraging drug use among young people, the largest integrated social marketing program ever undertaken by the U.S. government. As part of the effort, stations accepting paid advertising match the ad buy with in-kind donations of media space on related issues, either in programming or in pre-approved PSA's from other organizations. Mr. Levitt is a career government senior executive with 30 years of experience in professional communications role. Prior to joining ONDCP, Mr. Levitt was the Special Assistant to the Director of the Sentence--Center for Substance Abuse Prevention at the Department of Health and Human Services. Mr. Levitt, come on up.

Esta Soler is the Founder and Executive Director of the Family Violence Prevention Fund. It's a national organization working to develop innovative responses to domestic violence. Established in the early 1980's, the FVPF--what's up with these acronyms--has created model policy, advocacy, prevention, education and training programs that have been replicated in all 50 states and many foreign countries. In 1994, the group launched a public service campaign called "There's No Excuse For Domestic Violence," which ultimately received as much as \$100 million in donated media, including \$40 million in airtime on cable and broadcasting television. Ms. Soler has also served on the Presidential Commission on Crime Control and Prevention, and the National Advisory Council on Violence Against Women, and she is the co-author of the book, Ending Domestic Violence. Esta Soler, please come on up.

And why don't I bring on Ruth Wooden. I'll tell you a little about Tom Nunan for whenever he gets here. He can just jump right in. Ruth Wooden served for 12 years as President and CEO of the Advertising Council, where she's a leading advocate and spokesperson on the issue of public service advertising. She was responsible for senior management of more than 30 annual campaigns produced by the Council, including seat belt safety, drunk driving prevention, colon cancer prevention and the United Negro College Fund. Who can forget, "A Mind Is A--?"

**AUDIENCE:** --"Terrible Thing To Waste."

**MS. MARTIN:** Yes. Under her leadership, the AD council focused the majority of its attention in the late 1990's on issues related to the well-being of children and families. Ms. Wooden currently serves as Senior Counselor at--that sounds awfully therapeutic. What's a Senior Counselor do? It's a sort of, you know, help people feel--at Porter Novelli, working on issues of social marketing, social advertising, strategic philanthropy and cause marketing. Prior to joining Porter Novelli, Ms. Wooden served as President and CEO of the National Parenting Association, a non-profit research and advocacy organization in New York. She currently serves on the Advisory Committees for America's Promise and the Office of National Drug Control Policies. Ruth Wooden, come on up.

And I'll tell you a little bit about Tom Nunan so when he gets here. He's the former President of UPN television network, where he saw all aspects of entertainment programming, including development, scheduling, business affairs--is that you? All right. Good to see you--advertising, marketing. Under his leadership, UPN developed key niche programming--is that how you say that word, niche or niche? You can tell I started as a print person. Niche? Niche? Niche? Niche. Try and avoid that word if you have to. Anyway, UPN became prominent--became known as the fifth network. Mr. Nunan attracted talent ranging from Oscar-winning Barry

Levinson to radio personality Howard Stern. The success of his programming led to the largest up-front advertising growth spurt in UPN history. Mr. Nunan also oversaw the development and launch of UPN's first public service campaign on the issues of healthy relationships and sexual decision-making. Prior to joining UPN, Mr. Nunan served as Senior Vice-President at NBC, where he directed prime time series for NBC Studios Executive Vice-President for Prime Time Development for Fox Broadcasting Company, and Executive Director for TV Movies at ABC. Tom Nunan, come join us. Nice to see you.

And while we--let's just jump right in. Jim Goodman, why do PSA's at all? I mean, given that--as Vicky Rideout told us, there's--the regulatory demands are actually pretty loose, and they're loosely defined. You could define them in any number of ways. So, why do PSA's at all?

MR. JIM GOODMAN: Well, let me get started on that this way, just to--there's a difference between local broadcasting and cable networks. I'm not saying one's good or bad, or I'm not saying. But, there's a difference. And when it comes to local television stations, and that's what I run, we have an obligation to serve the public interest, and part of that is to do local public affairs spots and local public affairs programming, although there is no longer a requirement that they do that, and the truth is there's not even a reporting mechanism such that anybody can see what we do. You have to do a study, 'cause there is no--there's no available record-keeping or any information from local broadcasting stations as to what they do. So, you do it because you think you should do it. You feel like you have a responsibility to the community that you serve.

Now, there is--this is sort of a call to arms here, and I'll stop in a minute. It has not been decided what the public interest standards are going to be for the new digital stations. There is a rulemaking at the Commission that says what should the public interest obligations be of digital broadcasting? So, this is not over. They've taken them all away in analog. There aren't any. But, we can still fight this as it relates to the new digital television stations. But, we run PSA's because we think we should.

MS. MARTIN: What do your shareholders think?

MR. GOODMAN: Hmm?

MS. MARTIN: What about your shareholders? I'm guessing your shareholders think that they would like you to be making some money. So, how does that fit into your obligation to be a profit-making enterprise?

MR. GOODMAN: Well, there--see, we're back to the difference between cable networks and satellite networks and local broadcasting. The reason we get the license, which we get for free--remarkable, if you think about it--is that we agree to serve the public interest, and that is the payment we make, in just very cold terms, to the government for letting us use that license. Now, I know that's a--we say we're in a deregulated environment, and no regulation. But, to me, that's not regulation. That's the deal. I mean, that's a contractual agreement that you will do something in return for being given the license. I don't consider that regulation at all and, further--and I'll stop. I warned her about this.

On the Gore Commission--out of the Gore Commission, we said that there should be minimum public interest standards for all stations. Now, we could not agree as to what they should be.

But, we said there should be. The report actually that I added to it, and I think I had a majority on the panel, was that there should be a requirement that local stations--I'm just working on local stations, now, not working on anything else--there should be a requirement that there be a certain number of public service announcements and a certain amount of locally produced public affairs programming in required day parts as in return for the license, that--local television now is so much a part of the community that it's about the only way I can think of that the public service organizations in the community can reach the community. And we have 1,600 television stations because they wanted to have local coverage, not national coverage. They are essentially local.

So, there should be a requirement, and we believe that they do a certain number of local PSA's, a certain amount of local public affairs programming. Nobody would say what they have to do, what they would have to cover, but they would dedicate a certain amount of time to that. And I think we can get that if we all get together and work on the rulemaking that's now at the Commission. I don't think it's over yet.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. Judy McGrath, do you mind if I skip you for a second? I wanted to go to Tom Nunan, just because you have fewer hours. You have even fewer hours of programming to work with. So, same question to you: why do PSA's at all?

MR. TOM NUNAN: Well, it's--as a national broadcast network, it's a key agenda for any master broadcast network to have a public service campaign, and the rules are pretty loose with respect to what that public service campaign should be, you know, if at all. We took our time when I was at UPN with respect to what that campaign should be, and it really happened completely by chance that we ended up doing anything at all. It was lot of division within our executive ranks about what the campaign should be. Everyone had sort of their own personal and political interests and, ultimately, I prevailed, basically, with the campaign that we went forward with.

MS. MARTIN: Yeah. But why, is the question I think I'm asking is why? I mean, given that nobody's lost a license because they didn't do PSA. There are lots of ways to define the public service requirement. Why do them?

MR. NUNAN: It is a matter of conscience on the national level, too. The other networks are doing it. I think, to be perfectly candid, UPN was also seeking a degree of credibility, and I think it brings with it, beyond the positive effects you hope to have with the public service campaign, it brings a degree of credibility with your peers at the other networks.

MS. MARTIN: Okay, interesting. Judy McGrath, when I think about PSA's, I think--and some of them are great and really creative. But really, we think about "eat your peas," you know. "Eat your peas. Be good. Eat your peas." And that's not what MTV stands for. I mean, maverick is the right word. MTV isn't about "Eat your peas." It's about, "Throw your peas against the wall." So--.

MS. JUDY MCGRATH: --I have the best show.

MS. MARTIN: How--so, how do--how does your--and I think a lot of people were struck by the amount of time that MTV has devoted to public service. So, how does that fit into your identity as--given your mission, your viewers?

MS. MCGRATH: Well, you know, interestingly, I don't think of "Eat your peas." I think of Madonna wrapped in a flag, you know, for Rock The Vote. But, you know, taking a page from you, I think the deal we have is a deal with teenagers and young adults, and that is the only deal that we really have to take seriously. We, you know, have sort of a relentless commitment to getting inside their heads and their closets and their lives and their rooms, and I think, you know, when you have the luxury of being involved with young people, you also have a responsibility to be relevant to what interests them, and credible. And if you're--you know, the things that we're known for, Jackass and Britney Spears and all that stuff that's really important to them, we take very seriously. And while we're doing that, we also take seriously the sort of--the issues that are on their minds and the struggles they have.

I had a weak moment, a weak non-MTV moment a couple years ago when I was thinking, "Gee, why can't we come up one of those feel-good public interest type of things like Save the Music, or Kid's Choice, or Save the Environment. Wouldn't that be great?" And then, we did research, and we said, "What is it that you're really, you know, most interested in? What do you need to know more about? Who do you want to trust on an issue that's really important?" And sexual health was off the chart. I mean everything else paled by comparison. And it was, you know, information about STD's, information about AIDS, information about everything, how to say no, how to say yes. And, I mean, it was undeniable. We had to go there.

You know, sometimes we do it--there really isn't a debate with the executives in my company. Most of the time we just kind of go forward and do it. But, I think if you can stand up and say, "This is what our audience wants and needs and cares about," and you can find great partners like Kaiser or experts that can help you do it, and you hand it over to the creative people who absolutely love this stuff, I mean, they look at this as a gift. You know, how can I come up with something really impactful? They don't even--I don't even think they say the word PSA. It's moved beyond that. It filters into your programming, your Web site, your digital channel, whatever it is. And how can I be more creative at communicating, you know, what I think somebody--what I know a young adult wants to know?

And the last thing I'll say about that is we had kind of a huge score last week with, you know, Secretary Colin Powell, God bless him, who answered a very direct question from a young woman in Brazil who said she was Catholic and concerned about the Catholic church's position on condom use. And although from the control room I could see he did that sort of grimacing thing, like, "You know, I really didn't want to have to answer this question," but he did and, you know, it's--we're continuing to get attention for that.

And in my mind, that serves the public good. It fits in with the campaign. We very purposefully said we're not gonna do a forum only about the Middle East, which is on everybody's mind, but we're gonna make sure we get this issue that young adults care about in there. We're gonna find a young person who can ask a question that they really care about, and they're gonna look a public figure in the eye and say, you know, I dare you to not answer me, if you will, in kind of a respectful way, and that happened. So, you know, that's what makes MTV meaningful, successful 20 years later. It absolutely contributes to our bottom line, and, you know, I mean, I think it's critical to who we are.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. I'm gonna skip Alan and Esta for a second and go to Ruth, just because you've worked--because for that opening piece, because you work with people who buy ads as well as people who beg for ads. And I wanted to ask, you know, you've heard our broadcasters say that they love to do these, they're good--people love them for doing them. What's your experience in this? Is it--what are the trends as you see them?

MS. RUTH WOODEN: Well, I think--.

MS. MARTIN: --They just love it when they see you coming, don't they?

MS. WOODEN: Yeah. One of my--I think one of my contributions to this panel today is to help provide a historical perspective, because what Kaiser did was gave us a really good snapshot in this research today of what's going on today. But, I've been involved with public service since 1984, when I worked as a volunteer at an advertising agency on an AD Council campaign, and then went to the AD Council for 12 years.

What I'm struck by in listening to the broadcasters, and Judy will tell you we have never met, so I'm--this is not an ad for MTV. But, what Judy described, in my view, was the process of how to look at public service as a service to your viewers. This is good for Judy's business, and I think that what we see often in these partnerships with media, whether they happen locally or whether they happen nationally, or whether they're good arrangements for paid PSA's are, in effect, partnerships between the media company and the sponsor, whether it's in donated media or whether it's in paid media. And I think what happens is we frequently, in the non-profit community, look at media as sort of the enemy. We've got to get over their gatekeeper. They, in fact, can be our best partners in this.

So, I think that--the biggest trend that I have seen in, I guess, my nearly 20 years in this field--I guess there's been two, one of which is that, despite the fact that there's no data to prove it, indeed, public service advertising has probably declined as a percent of all advertising. It goes up and down. But, I think one of the things that we have to remember is, partially, that's because of increases in other non-programming issues. It isn't that advertising has increased so much. But, for a lot of the networks, they have had to become a major advertiser themselves.

What's really increased has been promotions. You saw that number up there. 5 percent of the hour goes to promoting the networks. I may be wrong on this, but I know it was true at the last Olympics. I believe NBC is probably the biggest advertiser on the Olympics today, and the biggest beneficiary is probably Julia Louis Dreyfuss' new show. But, that is the biggest change in non-commercial--non-programming time, and that is just a function of the business model out there. They have to build their audiences.

The second big trend that I've seen has been the trend toward paid advertising, and I had my own history with that, and Alan will--I'll let Alan tell the story about how we developed the match concept. But, you know, I think we're gonna have to come to grips with the fact that, for the public service directors, if you--I think the most important finding in this chart is to look at that chart on what they said influenced public service directors to put a PSA on the air. All the top ones, with the exception of local, and we can talk about that later, they're all about partnerships that return revenue, or whether the sponsor has already purchased time. And that is by far the single most important issue, and I believe that public service has got to find a way to put money

on the table. Doesn't have to be a lot, but we have to put some money on the table to generate support.

MS. MARTIN: Just--nice segue way to Esta Soler and Alan Levitt, because Esta Soler, you've got little bit of money to put on the table and, Alan, you've got a lot to put on the table. So, the two of you have--like, talk amongst yourselves.

MS. ESTA SOLER: Well, let me just say--.

MS. MARTIN: Well, I--that's why I seated you together, because I was hoping that you could--you know, maybe some osmosis. But, I'd like to know, Esta, what have you noticed in the, I guess, 15 to 20 years that you've been--you've primarily worked with donated time. So, what have you noticed in how your environment has changed over the years, or has it not? Do you think you're working harder to get the same amount of placement as you were when you started?

MS. SOLER: Well, I--you know, when Vicky was showing all the different findings, I was just dreaming about getting the filter time, in addition to the donated time. So, I think it's been a real challenge. You know, the overarching question I think, though, is why PSA's, which is the question that you asked. And for us, they work. If they're--if we have quality PSA's, we really can change behavior, and we know that. And you all know it, and what we have to figure out is how we can get quality time. I mean, I think for us the bottom line is quality time, and, you know, maybe that's another kind of bumper sticker, like don't throw the peas. But, we really do need that, and if we don't get that, then we--what we have to do is figure out all kinds of creative ways of getting in the back door. And I think we have to do that, as well, but I think you've got to get in the front door and the back door, and it's not okay to say all of the social issues that are making people's lives miserable only get to go in the back door. And I think that's really the challenge of how the groups that are working on so many important issues get both front door access, as well as back door access.

Now, we--we're actually one--.

MS. MARTIN: --What do you mean by back door? Do you mean like midnight to 6:00 a.m.? What do you--what are you saying?

MS. SOLER: --No, well--well, I think that there are a couple ways in which you can do that. I--let me give you one example. And by back door--maybe that's not the right way to quote back door. But, it's using the opportunities that are out there to maximize your placement.

We had an opportunity a couple years--last year, actually, when Eminem--everybody knows Eminem--not the candy--Eminem was nominated for not only Best Rap Album, but Best Album. And we were very concerned about the fact that there was going to be a lot of airtime, and some of the songs were quite--yeah, you're shaking your head. They were hard. They were hard and, for some people, they were reprehensible, and they talked about the issue that we're working on in a very bold way, in a way that was very difficult for a lot of people who are victims of violence. So, what we did was we wanted to educate the world and the community about what was on those songs, engage in a public conversation. We weren't saying, "Take him off the air," so--okay. 'Cause then, we wouldn't even get in the back door.

But, what we were able to do is we said to CBS, we said, "He's gonna get lots of time. We want you to also play one of our ads so that the ad that shows that there is help out there--it's a balance." And so, that's what I'm talking about in terms of the back door. I think it's using opportunities that are out there. It takes a lot of time. It's not a simple matter. It took us weeks to get CBS to agree to it, and it also worked that we were in AD Council campaign, and we're an AD Council Campaign actually thanks to Ruth Wooden. I must say that. Because once they decided whether or not to choose a campaign, the fact that it was vetted by the industry helped to fit in that door. So, that's what I'm saying.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. I want to bring Alan Levitt in. But, Judy, does that work? Did that work, that--you're putting on something that we think is objectionable, so we want you to balance that out with a counter-message. Does that work?

MS. MCGRATH: Well, yeah. I mean, I think, you know, on MTV we created a lot of programming around Eminem where we had the debate on air. We try not to take an authoritative or parental position because I think that's deadly. And so, although he didn't make any videos for some of the songs in question, there's no doubt that the album itself is very harsh. He has a new one coming that I'm gonna hear next week. So, he's not the only one, either. I mean, there are many artists who are on--contemporary artists today who are on MTV whose records, you know, travel in a lot of areas that I think make some people uncomfortable, and you wonder if they lack context, you know when you hear it.

But, nonetheless, when we played the videos and did the programming, we also did specials on hate lyrics. We talked to people about, you know, how they felt about these songs and this artist. We have a long relationship with GLAAD, and we called on them, and it was a very tough time. It was contentious. And if there was--you know, I mean, I think, you know, balance is probably a hard thing to achieve, but we tried to make sure we gave a forum to every voice on the topic. And in the end, like, having the debate rather than full-scale banning of an artist seemed to us, you know, the way to go.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. Alan Levitt, some would argue that you have an embarrassment of riches. How do you--?

MR. ALAN LEVITT: They're for everybody else.

MS. MARTIN: Not that it's your money, personally. I'm sure you wish it were. But, how do you allocate that resource? And the other thing I find fascinating about the question of these ads, 'cause I remember that is the one time I was forced to think about PSA's, because we did a story about that buy, and one of the big questions on the table was, "What do you really get for that \$1 billion? Does it really work?" So, how do you allocate the resource? What do you--how do you decide what works?

MR. LEVITT: Well, first of all, I want to correct one thing. This is not an advertising campaign. We have an integrated social marketing campaign. Probably only about 400 million of the--we have 180 million a year. Maybe 90 million of that a year is television. And we--.

MS. MARTIN: --Get that--only 90 million, 50 percent. Works for me.

MR. LEVITT: It's not much. When you look at an ad for ER, which probably cost a half-million dollars for one 30-second ad, and you need to have a certain reach and frequency of your messages, it's not much. Basically, the public service paradigm--the traditional public service paradigm would not work for the kind of campaign that we have, in eight languages, focusing on parents and kids at different age levels and different ethnic backgrounds. So, we needed to have very laser-like targeting. And even in the heyday of three networks when there was lots of public service, it wouldn't work.

And I think one of the issues about the structure--the new structure of the media business and all the fragmentation and why MTV plays so much messages on sexual health, it probably plays much fewer messages on colon cancer detection, or messages that are not their niche audience. And I think that's something that we all should pay a great deal of attention to, because there's no "one size fits all" PSA, or very few of them. Certain messages--certain issues may be more conducive to that. But, when you have a massive behavior change campaign, the structure and media consumption habits of the audiences that you're trying to reach just mandate you need more laser precision.

MS. MARTIN: How do you decide how to allocate the resource? I mean, how did you decide that X amount goes to television versus other vehicles of social marketing, as you put it?

MR. LEVITT: We--the media buyers and planners and the behavior people that we--that have--that do the research for this campaign decide that. We do a great deal of effort with the entertainment industry. Yesterday at MTV in Los Angeles we had a session for 25 writers on Ecstasy. We brought in first person. Do a lot of that--kinds of background. Cheap and very effective, got a lot of media outreach, do lot of partnerships with corporations, and a huge Internet component.

MS. MARTIN: How do you know when you've succeeded, given that your goal is to change behavior across the population? I mean, how do we know that it's your work as opposed to, you know, more jobs at Starbucks, or something like that? I mean, how do we know it's you as opposed to other factors in the society working to achieve that same behavior change?

MR. LEVITT: When Congress allocated this money, they mandated a--evaluation of the campaign specifically because of that issue. And so, we're spending probably close to \$80 million over five years to evaluate, did this--we know that inhalants--use of inhalants have gone down the last couple years. Was that because of our campaign? We think yes, and that's because National Institute of Drug Abuse has funded a project with the Annenberg School of Communication and WESTAT (sp) to track this. Every six months, we have these lengthy research reports about the campaign.

MS. MARTIN: I'm gonna go to questions very soon. Where are the microphones? Let me see--where are they? There's one, there's two--can you all see them? There's one, two, three, four. The two ladies in the back, why don't you move a little bit closer to the center of the room just so that other people can see you two? I'm gonna pose a question to the group, and then we're gonna go to questions very soon. But, you know, Jim Goodman's posed a challenge. He says that he thinks there ought to be a regulation, that there ought to be a minimum--repeat it for me.

What do you think there ought to be? It ought to be over a weekly period or a monthly book, or--?

MR. GOODMAN: That there should be minimum public interest standards, and that should include public service announcements and local public affairs programming.

MS. MARTIN: What do the rest of you think about that, particularly you, Judy McGrath? You're not--you don't have a local program, per se. But, what do you think about minimum standards? What's your take on that?

MS. MCGRATH: Well, I think if you mean minimum standards in terms of commitment to airtime in an increasingly, you know, 500 channel, whatever it is--we've all heard the--you know, I think it's a good idea. The kind of--what constitutes being in the public good makes me a little nervous. Is that being documented, you know? It's sort of a--you have to be careful that, you know, sort of a--like, if UPN knows their audience and they decide something is in the interest of that group, you wouldn't want to see any regulatory groups say, "That's not in the public good." So, that doesn't--I don't know--.

MR. GOODMAN: --No, that's--.

MS. MCGRATH: Yeah, I think--oh, absolutely. I think--listen, I work for a mighty corporation that's very profitable, and we try--you know, some of us try to use our superpowers for good. But, that isn't always the case. So--.

MR. GOODMAN: No, and as it relates to--just let me mention this for a second. Everybody wants to talk about the new 800 channel, everything's changing, everything's different. The truth is most of the time, 50 percent or more of the viewing to a cable system is to local stations. Local stations are really important, and most people, research will tell you, is like 10 to 12 cable channels. Nobody watches 800. They have their 10 or 12 favorite, and the local channels are where you really get audience, big audience. So, I know there is some effort to say localism isn't important anymore because we have all these channels and things are so different. I don't--I actually see local channels as more important than they've ever been, rather than less, which is why we need to pay attention to the public interest requirements for these new digital licenses.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. Ruth Wooden, I saw you wanted to get involved.

MS. WOODEN: Yeah. In terms of minimum standards, I'd like to propose something that has to do with the definition of a PSA. I was talking with Bev Schwartz earlier from Fleischman-Hilliard, and we laughed because we're old enough to remember when PSA meant just donated time. That was the definition. And I will grant you--and as I said earlier, I think there are--a lot to be said for some of the paid campaigns out there.

For example, the truth.com that--the notion about anti-smoking campaigns displacing PSA's, in my view, is a misnomer. There were not PSA's for smoking before paid campaigns. They were a very small part, and you can guess why that is. But, in fact, they were really required to buy time, otherwise they are not on the networks. We were asked that all the time at the AD Council. "Why don't you do anti-smoking campaigns?" And my first answer was always--and it was truthful--"No one asked me." And then, people say yeah, yeah, yeah, and I'd say, "They know

that if they do, they're not gonna get on the air." So, there are--there is a case to be made for paid PSA's. I still jar when I turn that term.

I would propose that any minimum standard be from the definition of a PSA, that PSA must include, must include a sponsorship to report directly to the 501C3. I do not think that corporate PSA's are PSA's. If Phillip Morris wants to do a PSA on domestic violence, Esta's organization actually has to be in it. (inaudible) So, I think if we physically had a definition of PSA include supporting the non-profit interest deliverers of this service out there, we'd all be better off.

MS. MARTIN: Tom, tell me what you think about that.

MR. NUNAN: Well, I think that (inaudible) all a certain flexibility in recent (inaudible) sponsorship attached requirement. Most of the people in the organization are fairly open-minded about the public service that they provide, not just with entertainment but that television specifically is such an intimate part of their home, and they know it. And they know that they're entering these people's living rooms and bedrooms and bathrooms and kitchens, wherever the TV is, and having an enormous impact.

So, I don't think you're gonna see, you know, major corporate lobbying against these sorts of campaigns. I may be sounding naïve to many of you out there but, you know, having firsthand experience with this, while I'm not at the local level, I think that everyone expects--people that are running the networks right now grew up with much more aggressive PSA's in their own homes. So, the fact that it's gotten as loose as it is now, I think most of us are fairly surprised about it.

MS. MARTIN: Alan Levitt, you wanted to say something, and then I'd like you all to jump in.

MR. LEVITT: There's another element that we haven't addressed, and is not addressed in here, and that is the decisions that are made by the media outlets to play or not to play. There's--I mean, I think that from our perspective, the networks have been very generous as far as what we're doing, not just in developing the PSA's and giving us free time, but also in programming areas. But, there is a level of--or, an element of disingenuousness in the decisions that are made about whether or not to play an ad, both for paid ads and PSA's. And we have, you know, dozens of focus groups and the experts in organizations that, you know--who are the best in this issue or that issue, whether it's tobacco or alcohol, or--and we'll send it to the network, and the--usually it's a--program practices its standards, it'll say, "Well, that's not really right for our audience," or, "We don't believe it."

Or, worse, when we're--we've had some ads that we've paid--paid ads basically telling parents to get off the telephone, get off the e-mail and start talking to your kids or--you know, you have a kid in the background doing homework and the mother's just talking on about recipes, or the father is doing e-mails, playing a game on the computer. And those are rejected. Why? Well, it's not appropriate. Well, is it also because the telephones and computer companies are major advertisers on--in the media? So, there's that element, too, and the best laid plans that you have for public service, paid or not, could go awry because of that.

MS. MARTIN: Jim Goodman, some disingenuous about--disingenuousness about actually accepting some of these ads. True?

MR. GOODMAN: I don't--I hadn't seen that really at the local level. I mean, they're--it ends up being a person. As a matter of fact, I was telling you I checked yesterday before I came up, we did--in Raleigh, in our--in WREL we get about 12 national PSA's a week in the mail. The network--we're a CBS affiliate and a Fox affiliate in Raleigh.

When the network runs a PSA that has a phone number in it, they'll tell us about it ahead of time so we can give it to our switchboard in case somebody misses the phone number. But, we don't know what the network's gonna do most of the time, only if they have a phone number in it. We will take those national spots and try to somehow connect them with a local group, you know, can we put a local tag on it or a local super or something, kind of good to have sort of a call to action. You know, if you want to do something about this, call. So, we'll try to tie the national PSA into a local group. But, as the research said, I would--we would really rather do it--have a local PSA than a national PSA.

MS. MARTIN: Why?

MR. GOODMAN: Well, it's our viewers. It's our community. It's our people. It's our neighbors. It's our friends.

MS. MARTIN: Could it also be that--I mean, no offense. I'm not trying to be offensive, but I am trying to push you a little bit. Could it be because you think the messages are going to be a little bit more kid gloves? Not really push the envelope?

MR. GOODMAN: I haven't seen--I don't--I'm trying to remember something--I just don't recall that.

MS. MARTIN: Could you please stop, you know, beating your wife, as opposed to stop beating your wife or you're gonna go to jail? I mean, could it be that--?

MR. GOODMAN: I think we would like--I think the more direct, the better.

MS. MARTIN: Esta wanted to get in.

MS. SOLER: Well, just a couple issues. One is, obviously, we would support, as I'm sure a lot of people in the audience would, some sense of minimum standards, because more time is important. But, there's another issue that has to do with the--I think somewhat has to do with the double standard that does exist, and that's been addressed a little bit in what you were talking about.

And when we did our first campaign, and Ruth will remember this, I mean, one of the ways we get out there is we take the storyboards to the networks, and none of the networks that are represented here are in question, so it's all safe. I don't know exactly who's in the audience, but I'm sure it's okay, too. But, we--Ruth is a little nervous. We took a little--we took our storyboards and, obviously, we're working on the issue of violence in the families, domestic violence, and so there was a depiction of violence. And one of the networks said to us, "You know, we think this is a really important issue. The way you crafted it shows too much of the violence." And this is a network that in any hour will show more murders and rapes, etc.

Now, be that as it may, what happened--I mean, the subtext to it is that we were able to create an ad that I think, ultimately, was much more powerful because our creativity of the advertising went in, and it was a win-win. But, there is a double standard out there, and I think for us as people who are trying to figure out all these challenges of getting some time, and then figuring out what we can actually get on the air is really a question.

MS. MARTIN: You're saying it's a double standard with paid versus donated time, or there's a double standard with entertainment programming versus the kind of--?

MS. SOLER: No, no, there's a double standard between what is carried on the entertainment area and what is--what we are allowed to carry on whether it's paid or public service. There is a different standard.

MS. MARTIN: You mean there's hypocrisy. I'm shocked.

MS. SOLER: Well, but--I'm not talking about any of the people at this table.

MS. MARTIN: Questions? Do you all have questions? Okay, wake up. I see one here, I see-- I'm--it's hard for me. The lights are low. I see one here, I see one here, I see some in the middle. So, why don't we alternate this side of the room, and you're kind of in the middle, so why don't you be here? And while we're getting a mike to you, why don't I take the first one closer--where's--the gentleman there, and so we'll go back and forth on the side. So here, and then here. Go ahead. Sir, the mike behind you, behind you. The closest exit could be behind you.

MR. GLENN MONES: Thank you. I'm glad to--.

MS. MARTIN: --I'm sorry, would you identify yourself?

MR. MONES: Oh, sure. Glenn Mones. I'm the Director of Marketing and Communications for the National Hemophilia Foundation. Some people know me from--recently as the National Media Relations Director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, but I've switched.

I'm glad to hear about the--Mr. Levitt, about the discussion of the social marketing campaign, because I think the bottom line of a lot of this is is, you know, you can't look at this issue of PSA's in isolation. Where does this fit into a bigger picture? You know, how are we addressing the way people are affected by multiple messages, multiple channels, that--hopefully working in confluence?

I'm interested in the relationship between what's in the PSA's, what's in news programming and what's in entertainment programming. You know, something is on the news on Tuesday, and "Law and Order" is doing a show on Thursday that reflects, you know, that story. And then, maybe, come the next Tuesday, there's a PSA relevant to the same issue. What role do you all play in making those things work together? What is the role that it--you know, it plays in the decision-making process, and how can those of us that would like to see those work together influence it, as well? Can--you know, can we be suggesting that an issue that is only in a PSA so

far is worthy of coverage, or should be a theme in an entertainment show? You know, how does it all work?

MS. MARTIN: Who would you like to answer that question, 'cause if everybody--then we'd only have time for two questions. But, I'd like to get as many as possible. So, who would you like to address that?

MR. MONES: I guess the people representing networks are probably the most applicable.

MR. NUNAN: Well, I can--we've been approached--UPN has been approached, NBC's been approached by various special interest groups who are interested in just that question, "How can we get our message more integrated, more customized, outside of the traditional PSA?" And frankly, the Kaiser group has been the most effective working with producers in giving them ideas, in my experience, with respect to the special interest groups who come forward.

The truth of the matter is, and I'm--there are a number of things I'd like to get out, and I'll try to be as brief as possible. But, the truth of the matter is most of these groups just aren't getting the proper access to the right people, and where Kaiser's been effective is that they seem to really understand the entertainment industry. They really understand the Chief Executives they need to get to, and then they need to--and they also understand how to get to the show runners who actually run the shows. Where--so, you can have an impact with respect to the entertainment programs.

Producers, just like these executives in town, are fairly open-minded. They're fairly liberal. They want to get good messages across if it makes sense to their shows, and they're really open to it. So, it is possible, but you've got to get to the show runners of the actual TV shows, the Executive Producers who make these TV shows, the "Law and Orders", the "Will & Grace's", the "Friends", etc.

On the executive level with respect to the ONDCP, would--one of the issues Alan brought up earlier, what's interesting is that you talk about story boards and getting in front of the right executives, making sure that they're approving the right things. I had experiences both at NBC and ABC where exactly what you described occurred, where they--there was a lot of money, there was a lot of effort and, somehow or another they didn't close the loop inside the company, either in the Sales department or Broadcast Standards and Practices, to make sure that that--every constituency was okay with what was going out over the air. So, frequently, you will deal with the news department who's dealing with colon cancer, let's say, or domestic violence.

And for whatever reason, the sales department hasn't gotten in synch with the rest of those people, and it takes some really great leaders at the very top of these organizations to make sure that we're together on these issues, because you can--and frequently, these organizations--public service organizations will take no for an answer. They feel like they're already imposing, so they'll just say, "Well, okay, I guess that one didn't work out." And the truth is is that if it is a more coordinated effort across all of the departments, Programming, Sales, Marketing--pardon me--Advertising, Broadcasting, Broadcasting Standards, it should be able to work out.

The one place where I don't think you'll have any real effect is if you go to the News Directors and say we think you should do such and such. I think you'll go right into a brick wall.

MS. MARTIN: I can affirm that, yeah. I mean, I want to hear from Alan Leavitt on this, and I do want to move to you, because I know that you're next. But, I want to talk to you about this old question of, sort of, planting story lines, 'cause I'm not in entertainment, at least I don't think that I am. At least I don't think of myself as being that way. I must say that if somebody came to me and said, you know, you need to do X story because Sales said so, because the executives said so, I'm falling on the floor. I'm kicking and screaming. I'm throwing a major tantrum. I am throwing a major two-year old tantrum until it goes away. And so--and I'm not, you know--so I'm--how does it--and you're the government, who--you're representing the government, so I think there's a little bit of an issue there, too.

MR. LEVITT: I think one of the trends that I've seen, at least in my career, is that at least for broadcast television, for program--episodic programs, they're much more accurate as far as depiction of real social issues. A program like "ER", when Neil Behrer (sp) was producer, even now will go to a dozen or 15 organizations for a single episode, NGO's or universities to get it right, and sometimes it's meetings as well as, you know, phone calls. But, I think that one of the more effective things that we have found is these background briefings for writers and producers. We're not pitching them. We're not saying, "Do more stories on drugs," or, "Do more stories on good parenting practices." We're bringing parents there. We're bringing experts, we're bringing undercover officers, youth and parents to have a first-person dialogue. So, we've done about 11 of those.

We also have a Web site called drugstory.org, where you could get in touch with 100 experts. There's an easy technique that almost anybody can do, developing a Web site, then publicizing it. So, you're gonna get tons more information on that, and access to your experts or different issues than you will having a phone call and pestering somebody. You know, we're all going to the same assignment editor, the same scriptwriter, the same PSA Director. That's another thing that I'm pushing is, you know, "Collaborate or die," you know, or fail in your public service efforts. And it--we shouldn't look at it as just public service efforts. Its efforts to get our messages heard and understood by specific audiences, and it's much more than just television PSA's.

MS. MARTIN: Okay, sure--and somebody over here, I want to go--where's my next victim? Back there. We'll go there, and then we'll go back to this side of the room. So here, and then there. Go ahead.

MR. JOSH BERNOFF: Hi. I'm Josh Bernoff from Forester Research, and I was very much struck by the statistic of the 12 tapes coming in, because I'm sure on average 11 or 12 of them end up in the trash, and that seems extremely inefficient. I'm gonna pose this to Judy, because you're really in the position of--at least through the AD--when you were at the AD Council, in the position of saying, "Well, here are some of the campaigns that we think you should pay attention to." But, it seems like there are these dozens and dozens of organizations that want to connect with media outlets, and then there are now hundreds of media outlets, television stations, cable networks, that are saying, "Gee, I wonder if there's a message out there--public service message out there that's compatible with our audience." Shouldn't there be some sort of clearinghouse to connect these groups with each other so that, you know, Lifetime can find

somebody who's doing PSA's that are women's issues, or ESPN can find some PSA's that are appropriate for their audience, etc.?

MS. MCGRATH: I think he made my closing statement.

MS. MARTIN: I think you meant Ruth, actually.

MR. BERNOFF: Yeah. Yeah, I'm sorry.

MS. WOODEN: Thank you, Josh. You know, I think we have lost sight of the fact that not only has the media environment changed, but the non-profit environment has changed dramatically. There's way too many of you looking for too little time. And this is a painful thing to watch in the not-for-profit section, because I know you're all out there beating the doors down every day to raise money to get heard, to get out there. But, if this environment were the for-profit environment, we would find an opportunity to consolidate and collaborate for more clout.

And if there was one wish that I had in the public service arena, it would be the development of common purpose coalitions on behalf of critical social issues that would put collaboration at the center, and that the issue that's driving from this effort, not the identification of your individual organization. These are not brand campaigns, they're issue campaigns. And if more of you collaborated--and I would frequently get this at the AD Council. These wonderful organizations would come, and they'd have like two cents, and I'd say, "Go out and find like-minded partners to collaborate with you," and sometimes they did and sometimes they didn't. I mean, I think this is actually, frankly, a real role for the Foundation community to help create these coalitions, fund their operations, help make collaboration work, because it's hard to make it work, and it requires staffing and time. But, I mean, there's a good example of it I've seen out there in one of my really important issues is international relief. I was on the Board of CARE for many years. And recently, I've seen print PSA's sponsored by a coalition of groups in international relief, in environment and family planning--about family planning overseas, and I believe it was funded by one of the Foundations. It might have been Robert Wood Johnson. But, that was a really-- I'm sorry, was it--Packard? Thank you. Robert Wood Johnson's in the audience, so--but, this is a good idea for you, too.

But--and I actually know that you are--you do that frequently. But, this is, I think, a way--you need to get clout in the marketplace, whether you're going for donated time or you're going for paid time, and I think it's time for some consolidation in the public service field to get that clout.

MS. MARTIN: Okay, this lady back here, and then who's on this side? I have somebody else on this side. There's a lady in turquoise that wanted to ask a question on this side. Was it you? Did you have your hand up before? No? Who on this side? I just want to know where I'm going next. Who wants a question over here? This gentleman over there? Okay, go ahead.

MS. SUZANNE YOUNG (sp): Hi. I'm Suzanne Young with the March of Dimes, and my question is about the implications, particularly locally, when we buy time. You know, non-profits like ours occasionally do unearth some cash and are able to make a local buy. But, we've always thought that's a double-edged sword with very complicated local relationships and TV stations who are claiming right now to be starving in terms of ad sales. We wonder if we spend money with one, do we damage or destroy our relationships with the others? And I think the

question--I think the implications are different on a national basis, but I would be interested in your thoughts about, particularly Jim and Tom, I guess as local stations, are we cutting our own throat if we buy with your competitor? Will you ever run, you know, our PSA's again, at least until everyone's memory fails about that one buy? But, what are the dynamics now, particularly in the local market where everyone knows what everyone else is doing if we spend money with one and not the other?

MS. MARTIN: Jim, did you--?

MR. GOODMAN: Yeah. That's--what you have to do is try to not think about that. Frequently, a group will come in and ask the station to support its campaign after leaving the newspaper and buying a big schedule. Sometimes we feel like they're paying everybody else, but expect us to give it. But, we can't think--we can think that, but we can't act like that. I mean, we have to put that aside, and I don't think we do. I mean, it's a--I don't think--I think if you buy a schedule, probably your PSA will have a little more attention paid to it than others, and we--that's just--.

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: (inaudible)

MR. GOODMAN: Yeah, I don't think that makes any difference. I mean, I think we'd be mad about it, but I don't think it'd make any difference.

MS. YOUNG: We'd still be able to get airtime--.

MR. GOODMAN: --Actually, what you try to do is have--we have a person that decides on public service announcements, and they're in a different building from the sales department. I mean, I've done everything I can do to keep them separate. They're really not supposed to know that.

MS. MARTIN: Internet--you don't have in your office e-mail, your--?

MR. GOODMAN: No--yes.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. This gentleman here, and who else is gonna be over here? Where am I going next? There's--back of the room. That lady on the end, I guess, and--go ahead. And could we know who you are, please?

MR. JOHN PINTO (sp): Sorry. My name's John Pinto. I'm with PETA, and I'm actually fairly new to PETA. I know that there are a lot of issues that are somewhat uncomfortable for a lot of people that we've put out there, and the question that I have is that I noticed that in the time allotted to PSA's, and this is not a setup by any stretch of the imagination, that zero percent is given to animal rights, and zero percent is given to violence.

And my question is is--like I said, I'm new to PETA and I'm trying to make some of these messages a little bit more mainstream. When you have an issue, just to give an example of violence in schools, and you say all the school shooters were at one time animal abusers, and you're trying to get that message out to youth, and I see the zero percent of time that's given to both of the issues that you might actually be able to tie into that, how do you suggest actually going ahead and reaching out to a network such as yours, and how do you, I guess, make the

qualifications of what issues are going to be covered when it comes to free time, when it comes to PSA's? I realize that it's based on your interest, a lot of it. But, are there exceptions made? Are there ways to kind of get through somewhat of a wall there?

MS. MARTIN: Who did you want--address your question to?

MR. PINTO: I'm sorry, to Judy.

MS. MARTIN: Judy, okay.

MS. MCGRATH: Well, you know, interestingly, to the question of, you know, forming coalitions, that's probably--maybe it's my lack. But, it's the first time I've heard someone tie, you know, teen violence and animal abuse together. And part of that point is we are sort of overwhelmed sometimes with, you know, people pressing us for airtime, you know, for sort of single issues. And much as I would love to, you know, entertain a lot of that, because it is relevant, it is virtually not possible. You know, we have, I think, probably--at MTV we have an extraordinary head of Public Affairs, Steve Freedman, who's sitting here, who is great at knitting together ideas, organizations, and trying to figure out how they relate to, you know, the people who watch MTV globally and what else is on the air. And, you know, I think it's sort of like Tom said. You need advocates, and you need to be as good as the Kaiser people are at sort of helping support and inform people.

That said, I think the whole game here is impact and, you know, when we try to pick at least a year--at least a year commitment to something that will get the major play. And when you pick an issue, like, for us, you know, sexual health or AIDS awareness, you do it sort of not in isolation. It's a global issue that's gonna get a lot of attention in a lot of other places. So, you know, your impact, aside from just your single small network is going to be knitted to a big issue. I mean, I feel like PETA's been very much out there in the world. I sort of connect it to the fashion world, I guess, you know, and I've been sort of impressed with the awareness of your name and what you do.

But, I think if you see zero time toward--you know, given to something, it's probably a priority based on an understanding of who your audience is and how much, you know, impact you can have at any given time.

MS. MARTIN: I want to stop there. Esta has had a lot of success in piggybacking off of news events that were a part of the cultural consciousness to get their messages out. So, how did you do that?

MS. SOLER: Well, I do think that the research changes year to year, and one picture that we saw showed a certain percentage of airtime going to certain issues. But, I think if you did it over time, you would see shifting, because I do think that networks and issue issues have different kinds of resonance--saliency at different points in time. And for us, our big news time was between '94 and '95. It was a big news time because there was a national teaching on domestic violence because of the events that occurred in Los Angeles with the arrest and then the subsequent arraignment and the trial of O.J. Simpson.

And at that point in time, we got significantly more play than almost any other issue, and Ruth is shaking her head because she was President of the AD Council at the time, and we worked together to make sure that we were working with all the networks so that when a domestic violence situation was on a particular news show, we got prime time placement at that point. Not news show, an entertainment--I want to be clear about that--an entertainment program.

So, we were able to do it. We were--what we did, though, and--.

MS. MARTIN: --Could I--let me just stop you there to clarify. Were you ready to go? Did you already have a program in place ready to go?

MS. SOLER: Well, actually, Ethel Klein (sp) was our researcher, is in the audience, and Lisa Letter, who is our public relations person, just--I see her. She was up there. We were almost ready to go, and we realized we better be ready to go. And because we had great partners, we accelerated it and we released it. We were going to release it in September. We released it in June, and I do think for advocates and advocacy organizations and social issue organizations, we have to be environmentalists.

We have to know what's going on in the environment and seize the time, because if we're not environmentalists, and I know some of you are environmental activists, as well, and I don't mean to, you know, borrow you. But, if we're not environmentalists, we're not inter-relating with what's happening in the world, and we're not providing either the service or the possibility of public education on the issue. So, we just use that, and our time during that period of time was extraordinary. It has since dropped very steadily, and we actually have new work that we're gonna present.

MS. MARTIN: Jim Goodman wanted to add this, and then I'm gonna go to the lady in the back.

MR. GOODMAN: Let me--back to getting the 12 spots a week and how do you decide what to run, here's how it's supposed to work, and it is that the local television station has an affirmative obligation. There's an obligation. Used to be a rule. This rule's gone, too--to survey the community, to talk to community leaders, to talk to non-profit leaders, to talk to just broad list of people, and come up with a list of the problems that are peculiar to that--to our community. I mean, what--you know, what are the problems in the Raleigh-Durham market? What are they? They're different than the problems in other markets, okay? So, by meeting with elected officials, charitable groups and everybody else, we advertise for input on this, we come up with a list of here are our problems, and the goal then is to target our public affairs effort to that list, and that's also a goal to target our news effort to that list.

I mean, we have the highest infant/juvenile diabetes rate in the country, we have the highest rate of sexually--I mean, we got all kinds of really significant things. And so, we--what we try to do then is focus on those. Now, that really disappoints a lot of people who bring--send in their PSA's and want us to do their particular campaign. But, I just--I got to the point that I didn't think we were accomplishing anything by running so many different spots. I used to be in master control. I came through engineering, and I'd be sitting there and we'd do a football game. The football game ran long. We needed a PSA. I'd reach up, grab a PSA. I didn't even know what it was. I mean, they used to just run sort of still and stuff, without any sort of plan that we're trying to move the ball forward. We're trying to change something. So, I like the

partnership notion, the coalition notion, and a bunch of people getting together and say, “Okay, we gotta do something about juvenile diabetes in this market,” or, “We’ve gotta do something about this in our local community, and have the local station work on that.”

MS. MARTIN: Okay, and I’m gonna go to this lady here, and I think that to be true to my word, to give all the panelists a last--a closing thought, I’m gonna make that be the last question. And then, I’m gonna start with you, Ruth, and go the other way. And so, if we could do it that way? Okay.

MS. JULIA COHEN: Good morning. I’m Julia Cohen with Youth Noise, and I just wanted to thank all the panelists and--for all your incredible work and your organizations’ work and effort, and for this discussion. Youth Noise is actually in partnership with the AD Council with many of the groups in this room. And my question is how do we together get the other broadcasters and networker--networks to use viewer attitudes--data about viewer attitudes to put more pressure on those who aren’t at the table, who aren’t at this conference, to use really the cause marketing data that Judy and, you know, MTV has to really prove that cause marketing affects their bottom line, that knowing their viewers’ concerns about issues and associating with those issues is actually really relevant to all the work?

MS. MARTIN: Who would you like to address that?

MS. COHEN: I guess Jim and John and Judy, probably.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. Well, so, Tom, I’m gonna pick on you first.

MR. NUNAN: Well, I don’t know what your efforts have been to date, but the reason that Kaiser prevailed with us and with me was because they gave the most impressive presentation, and they got to me. They didn’t call the Sales person, they didn’t call the Marketing person, they didn’t call the Broadcast Standards person, and I’m not putting down those departments. But, if you want to get high impact, you’ve got to paper, basically, the entire organization, be relentless with it, and insist on an audience with the highest person on the totem pole. Even if, ultimately, they do traffic you to another part of the company, if you’re keeping that person in the loop, and all this may seem, you know, blinding glimpse of the obvious to most of you, so you’ll have to forgive me.

But, if you’re keeping the top people at any one of these networks in the loop and following up with them, most of them are pretty good about following up with their people. And I know that just sounds pretty simple and direct, but that’s the way it worked with us.

MS. MARTIN: What was the official access point? What made you take the call or the meeting to begin with?

MR. NUNAN: Well in--and I would ask--add to that, part of the reason why the tapes just go in the trash can from most of the other public service organizations is because no one’s making an effort to come to see me in person, and no one’s--you know, they’re--Kaiser also really went overboard to insist that I meet with them, you know. So, when you’re sitting across from somebody and they show you a presentation that’s customized for your audience, all of a sudden it makes an enormous amount of sense. If I’ve got a colon cancer spot coming in just in the mail,

frequently in the wrong format, you know, no, I'm not gonna pay attention to it. It has nothing to do with UPN's audience, you know.

So--and also, I've got my campaign. If I feel really good about the fact that I've got my campaign and I want to get that one message across, I'm covered, and I know--it's hard enough just to get one campaign on the air, you know. Now that I'm calling our control guys and everything and saying, "Hey, you know, now I want to put on this thing for MDA, or I want to put on this thing for tobacco, or for whomever," it's very, very difficult. And so, that's why you've seen me nodding my head vigorously whenever there's talk of coalitions among you, because if you group together on some of these things, I think you're gonna have greater success with the bigger broadcast networks.

MS. MARTIN: Okay, Alan, do you want to jump in?

MR. LEVITT: I've found that we--we've given out about 570,000 radio and TV time slots to 64 organizations so far through the process that we contract with the AD Council, and we get dozens, hundreds of these PSA's in a year. And I've found not just through that process but from my own experience, that there's very little collaboration among you. There's--just go through this book and see how many people--how many organizations are very similar, and I think a lot of people are using PSA's for name recognition of their organizations as opposed to the concept or the issue that they're trying to get across, and I think that's something that you--that we all need to pay a lot of attention to because of the competition, and it just is a better communication strategy.

MS. MARTIN: Judy, unless you're burning to participate on this question, I was going to move to closing statements. Can we--do you want to do one? Okay. Judy--same--is that okay? Can we move to closing statements, or are you burning to let people know how they can get access to you?

Well, I want to thank you all for your attentiveness, and for your interesting questions. I'm sorry we didn't get to very many of them, which is sort of always the case. And with that, I'd like to ask our panelists if they have some closing thoughts. And particularly being mindful of some of the things we didn't talk about, like non-television ads and how to use the Web presence, and things like that. I know you have another session later on where you'll probably take up some of these questions. But, if you also think about the--sort of the new media environment and new technologies, and how we can be thinking about that, that would be helpful.

So, Ruth I'm gonna start with you, and then I'm gonna go down there.

MS. WOODEN: I'm gonna start by saying that I am a passionate advocate for the donated public service model, and I say that because I believe that the issues all of you are working on require so much time, so much long-term work that it's really, in the end, the most sustainable model. So, all the efforts that people like Kaiser, people who are doing the research evaluation, all of the tips that everybody has about getting access to the Public Service Director, those are all important. And what I would say to you is that you have to optimize that public service model, and the first thing I would say goes to what Jim talked about, is the notion that you have to be relevant to the local television market. 80 percent of PSA's happen on local stations. So, that certainly was great for organizations like the March of Dimes that have a chapter network, that

are trained, they go out, they call on the sales force. If you don't have that, partner with somebody who does, because you've gotta be relevant locally. That'll be the single most important thing you could do.

The second thing is partnering with the media. I think they are your partners, not your enemies. We've seen really good examples of that today, and there are ways that they can make this work for their business, and part of your job is helping position yourself that way. You need to collaborate with each other. I really, really think that--I mean, I know how hard it is to be out there, you know, fighting the good fight. But, if you collaborate, you're gonna have more clout in the media marketplace and, perhaps, in the funding marketplace.

Now, that said, my passionate advocacy for donated media notwithstanding, I think the research we saw today demonstrates that putting money on the table does not hurt the public service business. And so, I would encourage all of us in the non-profit sector to look at ways to create either buying consortiums or working with large buying surfaces, or whatever, to begin to look at that arena. I think that, in fact, is gonna be necessary, and I think it will help leverage PSA's as well as help leverage all of the issues.

Now, the logical suspect for putting a little money on the table are corporations, the government, foundations. There are sources. But, I think that, in fact, we need to think about the collaborations that would make those kinds of money resources available. Thank you.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. Ruth Wooden, thank you very much. Esta Soler?

MS. SOLER: Well, thank you. I'll be brief. I think bottom line is we need more time and we need more quality time. I think the double standard does exist, and it's very hard for people to get the issues on in the way that the issues actually do impact real people. I believe that partnerships, coalitions are absolutely critical. We don't have enough money, and we do have so many issues, and it does behoove all of us in the advocacy world to work together.

And finally, I think that TV, despite all the changing environments, TV is an important medium for us to get our messages out. It's effective, it can change lives, it can change behavior. We've seen it. If they're quality PSA's, they really do make a difference, and I would encourage everybody to take advantage of issues that are in the environment that you can use to leverage placement of good quality public service announcements. And I also would like to work with everybody in this room, in the industry and, Kaiser, I congratulate you for your good work in really trying to figure out how we can move our time from 3:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Thank you.

MS. MARTIN: Esta Soler, from the Family Violence Prevention Fund. Thank you very much. Alan Levitt?

MR. LEVITT: I think this is really about the wisest use of your communication dollars, and you need to look at it in big--from a larger perspective than just public service, because public service is not--public service TV ads is not for everybody. I found that, at least in my experience, that government agencies or NGO's, you have a few hundred thousand dollars at the end of the fiscal year, or you could--X amount of money. What are we gonna do with it? Let's do a PSA. Who's it for? Everybody.

There needs to be a lot more research in understanding what is the audiences that you want to reach, what are the messages that you want to convey? What are the message strategies? What are the message vehicles? And maybe a PSA is not it. Matt said something at the beginning of the session about adapting to the structure of the new media structure. We do a lot on Internet. We buy search words. If you type up marijuana or ecstasy on Yahoo!, maybe one of our banner ads will pop up. It may not be just an ad. It may be a click in or a click through. There's a whole new technology there that you have to understand, and that may be, depending upon your issue, the most effective use of your money.

I mentioned also about collaboration. I can't emphasize that enough. If you--we--when we do these entertainment outreach efforts to the entertainment industry, we normally partner with an organization like the Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, or another related issue, crime and violence. Focus again on the issue as opposed to the name of your organization.

MS. MARTIN: Alan Levitt, Director of the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. Thanks very much. Tom, what's your current title and position? Sorry, we didn't talk about that at the beginning.

MR. NUNAN: Oh, I'm--I'm my own company now. It's called Bull's-eye Entertainment, and it's--I'm the Chairman and the CEO, and it's--we have offices on the East and the West Coast, and we are marrying Madison Avenue and Hollywood more directly. It's--my company, I think, is hoping to be predictive about getting sponsorship in more interesting and unique ways as far as supporting programming is concerned, entertainment programming and motion pictures.

MS. MARTIN: Okay. Tom Nunan, formerly President of UPN, your closing thoughts?

MR. NUNAN: I just--I want to give you broadcast network--big broadcast network perspective, and briefly just give you as much unsolicited advice as possible in the brief remarks--closing remarks.

First thing is know your audience. Make sure when you're sending your materials in or, better yet, meeting with the executives that you are gonna meet with, that you know the public service campaigns that they already have going on, or that they don't have going on and, more importantly, who they reach, the Lifetime's versus the ESPN's, for example.

The second thing is, is to be relentless. Make sure that you're hitting every single constituency inside that network, and don't take no for an answer. There are timely issues where absolutely have to come forward and say, for example with the O.J. Simpson case, now's the time, here's the material, here's the tape. We should do this now. And you will get a good response. But, if you just send it to the head of Scheduling in a network and expect them to actually have the decision-making ability to put your PSA on, you're woefully mistaken. So, that's the next thing.

And then, lastly, make sure that you really think about customization with your spots. The trend very much is not with sort of the old-fashioned "The More You Know" spots that you see on NBC, where you see these big, puffed-up stars to look like just these immortals, you know, to audience members. And so, instantly they just turn off and use it as a signal to go to the bathroom or walk the dog. The--it's crucial that whatever message you're trying to get across is going to penetrate, and good executives will know that you've done your research, that you

know with certain audience groups humor works, with certain audience groups frank exposure to the issue through real people works. You know, with certain audience groups celebrities and athletes might work, although there's very little research to back that up. So, I would just urge you to be as progressive and customized as possible with your audiences. Where Kaiser was successful with UPN, as I said, you've got one thing in common. You reach a young audience. But, the rest of your audience is completely desperate. On Monday night, you've got black female--I'm sorry, you've got female African-Americans between 18 and 34, and on Thursday night you've got white males between 14 and 25 watching your network. We want to reach both sets, here's our plan to do that. And that was extremely impressive to me. It gave me the ammunition to go forward.

One last thing is it doesn't turn me off on a national basis that MTV's doing sexual health campaign. In fact, it gave me confidence that I was headed in the right direction, 'cause a place like MTV, you know, they really have gotten it right. So--and so, it wasn't an issue asking--when somebody asked earlier, like, well, does it hurt if you're duplicating, you know, campaigns on a local or a national level? No, not if--it can actually add some prestige to it.

MS. MARTIN: Great. Tom Nunan, Bull's-eye Entertainment, former President of UPN. Thank you. And Judy McGrath, President of MTV.

MS. MCGRATH: I think that if I were to be so bold as to speak for cable, I would say this: what I hear from my colleagues and what I think is happening, what I see is this sort of 360-degree approach to this. And by that, I mean the traditional PSA, as you've heard people talking about, you know, is certainly viable. But, I think what people are looking for is a Web component and a new idea for grass roots element, a way to localize, you know, ideas that are--that take the message outside of just that sort of one allocated spot.

And I'll give you just one example from something we did. We had a long campaign about taking a stand against hate and discrimination, and we made a TV movie about Matthew Shepherd's murder. And when we were talking about it, the guy who's the Graphics Director said, "I have this great idea. We should go black for however many hours it takes and scroll victims of hate crimes." And so, we did. It went for 17 hours. We ran just sort of short stories and pieces, and--you know, leading up to the movie, and we had all this other stuff happening. We had inserts in CD's we put out, we called the record companies, we talked to cable operators. You know, we thought very broadly about all the people we touch, and we probably gave up about at least \$2 million of ad time in that 17 hours. And believe me, nobody thought about it in those terms because the win in sort of connecting in a bigger way than just doing a TV movie was incredible. I mean, you know, we got hundreds and hundreds of thousands of kids calling and requesting, you know, information, which we were ready to send them, and 800 numbers. And so, I mean, I would say to you think broadly. You know, it isn't a letter and a cassette with a 30 second spot anymore.

The other thing that we see in research all the time is, you know, people say, "So, what can I do, or what am I supposed to do?" And I think you really do need to be able to provide some actionable piece here, whether they take you up on it or not. You know, the sexual health things we've done with Kaiser, you know, sort of like 80 percent of the people who saw them said they learned something about STD's, and 30 percent of them went and got tested. And I mean, those

are really extraordinary numbers. They ordered, you know, the book, It's Your Sex Life. The bought the CD that had the insert in it. So, I mean, I think you really have to grab people these days in a very comprehensive way, and I think that's sort of, you know, the trend, if there is one, you know, in my industry.

And with that said, I would certainly salute all of you passionate advocates out there. You know, whatever the issue is, I think you need to keep at us so that we will, you know, remember to incorporate all of your thinking and expertise and knowledge, which is considerable, into, you know, all of the valuable airtime we control.

MS. MARTIN: Judy McGrath, President of MTV Group and Chairman of Interactive Music, thank you. And last but certainly not least, Jim Goodman, President and CEO of Capitol Broadcasting Company.

MR. GOODMAN: Okay. It seems to me that we are at a very crucial time, probably the most crucial in broadcasting history as it relates to the future of public service advertising. It is essentially gone as a requirement of local broadcasters, and is going down. That's a fact. And we have the new digital television stations, and the Commission has before it a proceeding that asks people what do you think the minimum public interest requirement should be of broadcasting stations. We--if you want public service time, you'd better start fighting for it.

I mean, this is a--I'm trying to get everybody psyched. I'm looking for--I mean, we'd need the, you know, common cause in campaign finance reform. Who's the common cause, where is common cause about the ability of local organizations to run public service time on television stations? Who is that? We gotta do something about that. We got--we can do it. But, if we don't get it in the rules for digital stations, it is gone. It is no longer on the list of important things that broadcasters do. It's below ratings and profits and promotion and everything else. I know that. Everybody knows that. I mean, it's just the way it is.

Now, please remember that broadcasters are different from cable. We're licensed to serve the local community. We have an obligation to serve the public interest, and also remember that, as broadcasters, we're no longer together. We've got networks leaving the NAB, we've got the larger companies trying to own all the stations. Some of the station groups opposing that--I can't even get the NAB to endorse the concept of bringing back the NAB code, a voluntary--so, it's essentially become a business organization, how's the business regulated, now who are we as broadcasters.

So, you guys need to get up after the session today, after this is over, and work on talking to the FCC about the importance of public interest advertising. Give them this report. Kaiser ought to give them this report. This is really important. I mean, I'm really afraid that if we don't get it in these digital--standards for digital public TV stations, it's gonna be gone. And so, get out there and make it happen.

MS. MARTIN: Jim Goodman, President of Capitol Broadcasting Company. I think he said, "Charge." And with that, thank you all the panelists for your time and for your expertise. It was very interesting. And with that, we're gonna bring Vicky right out back to send you to your next thing.

MS. RIDEOUT: I just want to thank Michel Martin for doing a fabulous job, and thank all of our panelists for their contributions. And Jim, the good news is we have all of the current members of the Federal Communications Commission are gonna be with us this afternoon. So everybody stick around and ask your questions, and that's I guess who you would charge, if you're gonna go charge. So, we're gonna take about a five-minute break, and then we'll be back for our second panel. Thank you.

END

© Federal Network, Inc.

[www.fednet.net](http://www.fednet.net)

202-393-7300