

8-28-1989

# Televising the Legislature: Serving Democracy in an Electronic Age

Assembly Committee on Utilities and Commerce

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caldocs\\_assembly](http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caldocs_assembly)



Part of the [Legislation Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Assembly Committee on Utilities and Commerce, "Televising the Legislature: Serving Democracy in an Electronic Age" (1989).  
*California Assembly*. Paper 306.  
[http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caldocs\\_assembly/306](http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caldocs_assembly/306)

This Hearing is brought to you for free and open access by the California Documents at GGU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in California Assembly by an authorized administrator of GGU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [jfischer@ggu.edu](mailto:jfischer@ggu.edu).

Informational Hearing  
of the  
Assembly Committee on Utilities and Commerce

"TELEVISIONING THE LEGISLATURE:  
Serving Democracy in an Electronic Age



DEPOSITORY

OCT 16 1989

RECEIVED

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GWEN MOORE  
Robert Jacobson, Committee Consultant  
Yvonne Wilson, Committee Secretary  
Hallie Mays, Committee Assistant

KFC  
22  
L500  
U84  
1989  
no. 8

0284-A

KFC  
22  
L500  
U84  
1989  
no. 8

MEMBERS

Jerry Eaves  
Bob Epple  
Frank Hill  
Lucy Killea  
Ted Lempert  
Willard Murray  
Pat Nolan  
Lucille Roybal-Allard  
Cathie Wright  
Vacancy

# California Legislature

## Assembly Committee

on

## Utilities and Commerce

**GWEN MOORE**

CHAIRWOMAN  
MEMBER OF THE ASSEMBLY  
FORTY-NINTH DISTRICT

Informational Hearing  
August 28, 1989, 1:30 PM  
State Capitol, Room 447

**TELEVISIONING THE LEGISLATURE:**  
*Serving Democracy in an  
Electronic Age*

**LAW LIBRARY**

OCT 31 1989

GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY



### Agenda

- I. Opening Remarks: Honorable Gwen Moore, Chairwoman
- II. Testimony

### Witnesses

Mr. Edward Allen  
Board of Directors  
C-SPAN

Mr. Warren Olney  
Co-Author  
KCOP-TV

Mr. Joe Camicia  
KQED-TV  
Public Broadcasting Station

Ms. Evelyn Pine  
Foundation for Community Service  
Cable Television

Professor Tracy Westin  
Annenberg School  
of Communications

Dr. Robert Main  
California Technology Project  
Cal State University, Chico

Mr. Paul Koplin  
Executive Director  
California Channel

Dr. Barbara O'Connor  
Dept. of Communications  
Cal State University, Sacramento

Mr. Dennis Mangers  
Acting Executive Director  
California Cable Television Association

Professor Dan Brenner  
Director, Comm. Law Program  
UCLA School of Law

Mr. Steven Mallory  
President  
Northern California News Satellite

Mr. Vic Biondi  
Executive Director  
California Broadcasters Assn.

#### MEMBERS

William Bradley  
Jerry E. Lee  
Bob Epple  
Nolan Frizzell  
Frank Hill  
Lucy Killea  
Ted Lempert  
Willard Murray  
Pat Nolan  
Richard Polanco  
Lucille Roybal-Allard  
Cathie Wright

# California Legislature

## Assembly Committee on Utilities and Commerce

**GWEN MOORE**

CHAIRWOMAN  
MEMBER OF THE ASSEMBLY  
FORTY-NINTH DISTRICT

Informational Hearing  
August 28, 1989, 1:30 PM  
State Capitol, Room 447

#### STAFF

William Julian  
Principal Consultant  
Robert Jacobson  
Principal Consultant  
Carolyn Veal  
Principal Consultant  
Yvonne Wilson  
Committee Secretary  
State Capitol  
P.O. Box 942849  
Sacramento, California  
94249-0001  
(916) 445-4246



### ***TELEVISIONING THE LEGISLATURE: Serving Democracy in an Electronic Age***

#### Introduction

In California, citizens can watch television news that covers every level of government, with one exception. That exception is state government and, in particular, the Legislature. The federal Congress and Administration are covered via popular broadcast and cable channels. Local government is covered by local cable programming. Education has its own broadcasting systems. But the Legislature remains largely unseen and unsung by the majority of Californians.

According to recent opinion polls, more than 70 percent of all Americans get most of their news from broadcast and cable television. Television's growing influence on the political process has been commented on by nearly everyone involved on one side of the TV camera or the other. Yet, in California, there is no regular television coverage of state government generally or the Legislature specifically. Ironically, in an age when fewer Californians than ever read newspapers or serious magazines, the

state's citizens are dependent for their state public affairs news on the newspaper and magazine reporters who comprise the capital press corps.

This hearing examines the prospects for television coverage of state government, with a special focus on the Legislature.

Television Coverage of Congress:  
The C-SPAN Experience

At the federal level, Congress has recognized the importance of the television medium by opening its proceedings to C-SPAN, the "Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network." C-SPAN, an independent, non-partisan and nonprofit corporation, provides Congress with access to hundreds of cable television systems throughout the United States. The House of Representatives began to transmit its proceedings via C-SPAN in 1979; the Senate followed in 1986. By 1988, nearly 22 million Americans -- an increase of 100 percent in four years -- regularly watched C-SPAN, with dedicated viewers (12 percent of the audience) watching over 20 hours of programming each month. C-SPAN viewers vote at nearly twice the rate of non-viewers.

C-SPAN, which now has an annual budget of over \$12 million and a staff of 140, provides over 3,200 cable systems with live video feeds from Congress and contextual programs (interviews, reports on general issues, regional public affairs stories, and so forth). C-SPAN arranges for the complete "package" to be transmitted by satellite to participating cable television stations. Ninety percent of C-SPAN's budget is derived from license fees (currently four cents per subscriber per month) paid by cable operators for the privilege of carrying C-SPAN. In 1986, C-SPAN added C-SPAN II, to provide for continuous coverage of the Senate.

Despite the worries of some congressional traditionalists, C-SPAN has not altered Congress's conduct of business in a negative way. Each house has rules to avoid inequities in access to, or abuse of, its television coverage. "Playing to the cameras" has proven a false expectation. If anything, according to many reports, Congress's business on the floor is now handled more expeditiously, as representatives and senators craft their presentations to be succinct and to the point.

### Television Coverage in the States

In nearly 40 states, citizens can watch television coverage of their legislatures. California is not among these states. In most states, coverage of public affairs, including state issues, is included in the charter of state-supported public broadcasting stations. California, however, is the only state that provides no assistance to public broadcasting. The Legislature has no leverage by which it can persuade public broadcasters to cover state public affairs.

The many states offering coverage of their legislatures employ a wide variety of formats. Some use simple news shows to summarize, on a daily or weekly basis, developments in the legislature. Others are more ambitious and combine gavel-to-gavel coverage with additional coverage of key committee hearings (for example, those dealing with acknowledged controversies). Some states prepare "magazine-style" and documentary programming; others combine television coverage with other electronic media, including audio teleconferencing ("call-in's") and computer bulletin boards.

Similarly, states use different means for producing and distributing legislative programming. Most states (as noted above) delegate this responsibility to their state-funded public broadcasting stations.

Increasingly, cable television stations are used as conduits for legislative programming; some cable stations now produce their own.

### Television Coverage of Local Government

Cable television makes truly local programming possible, and local governments have been quick to exploit this medium for public information purposes.

As a condition of their franchise agreements, most modern cable systems offer channels for municipal programming managed by the local government. Municipal channels are actually run by employees of the local government. Most of these channels broadcast public meetings, feature interviews with elected and appointed officials, and generally inform the citizens about affairs in the local jurisdiction. Often, this formal programming is complemented by coverage of local cultural affairs. When things are truly slow, a character generator is used to create a visual bulletin board of upcoming activities and events.

In lieu of, or in addition to, municipal channels, some cable operators run their own "local origination" channels. These are not focused on local government specifically, but often the producers of local origination channels do cover local government happenings.

Several enhancements have been made to both municipal and local-origination programming. Most notable among them is viewer feedback: Through the use of the telephone and, in a few cities, computer bulletin board systems, viewers can call or type in questions to participants in formal hearings, interviews, and ongoing workshops.



## Televising Education

The education community has been on the forefront in applying new technology to the educational mission. Satellite and microwave transmissions are commonly used by many educational institutions. Public broadcasting got its start as "ETS," the Educational Television Service.

In the last several years, educators have concentrated their efforts on putting technology to use specifically for the purpose of improving the delivery of education to large populations and remote locations. The name of this activity is "distant learning." In Los Angeles County, the Department of Education has built an impressive distant-learning facility that now reaches school districts around the state, and which is financially self-sustaining. An equally impressive distant-learning system is run by the California State University, Chico, which serves as a "hub" for educational transmissions throughout Northern California.

Together, these and similar educational enterprises demonstrate that educational television can effectively reach out to millions of Californians with programming of substance and value. Just as important, they provide evidence that Californians will watch unconventional television fare if it serves their "need to know" and helps them cope more effectively with real-life problems.

Robert Jacobson, Consultant  
April 24, 1989

### Questions of Interest to the Committee

1. Is televising the Legislature a sound concept? What are its possible benefits for the public and legislators? Are there significant drawbacks to be avoided if the Legislature is televised? Would televising the Legislature complement representative democracy, California-style?

2. What models of televising operations, in other jurisdictions, can be used by the Legislature to plan its own system? What has been the experience in these other jurisdictions? What technological and organizational considerations must the Legislature take into account if and when it begins to plan for its coverage via the television medium?

3. What is required to cover the Legislature for television and distribute this coverage around the state? How can this be most easily accomplished, economically and efficiently? What parties need to be involved in this process?

4. What is a reasonable timeline for televising the Legislature? If the Legislature were to decide on Date X to start televising itself, how many weeks and months would be required to work out organizational, technological, and distributional details? When might the Legislature be on the air?

5. Are there other technologies besides television -- for example, a computer bulletin board or a call-in audioconference system -- that should be considered for simultaneous implementation, to enhance interaction between citizens and legislators? Is there a way to coordinate television, other technological systems, and the internal information system currently used by the Legislature for more efficaciously meeting the information needs of citizens and legislators?

Assembly Committee on Utilities and Commerce  
State Capitol, Room 447  
Sacramento, California  
August 28, 1989

**TELEVISIONING THE LEGISLATURE:  
Serving Democracy in an Electronic Age**

CHAIRWOMAN GWEN MOORE: James Madison, the author of the Constitution once said, "A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both." It is remarkable that more than two centuries later popular information about the workings of California state government and particularly the Legislature is so hard to come by. Representative democracy works best when the people share with their elected representatives an understanding of the issues and how these issues are being resolved. It does not work well if the Legislature is isolated from its citizens by vast distances and press coverage that is inadequate to the needs of the largest most dynamic state.

Congress and most of the states know this and already televise their proceedings to the general public. Educators in California have shown that it is possible to use special TV networks to transmit educational information to geographically dispersed publics. Cable public-access and local-origination channels have demonstrated that technology can bring more specialized information to smaller

communities of interest. Many local governments meetings and proceedings are regularly broadcast over cable television channels.

Now, we are hearing about a proposal to use the powerful technologies of communication to bring the Legislature closer to the people and the people closer to the Legislature. Can it be done? Can electronic media build public understanding for our work "under the Dome" and bring legislators and citizens closer together?

Our witnesses are here to help us to answer these questions. Each is an expert in the use of media technology, its regulation, or its potential for political communication. We look forward to their ideas and recommendations.

I'd like to begin first with a panel of witnesses. Edward Allen, who is on the board of directors of C-SPAN. Dr. Pat Cabrera was supposed to be here, representing Los Angeles County Education, but she is unable to attend. The Committee would also like to hear from Dr. Robert Main. Dr. Barbara O'Connor, Professor Tracy Westen from the Annenberg School of Communications, and Warren Olney, political editor with KCOP-TV. If we establish a need, then we can talk about other aspects of the deal. Let's start with Dr. Robert Main. Tell us a little bit about what you're doing at Chico State, exactly what you do.

DR. ROBERT MAIN: I am professor at California State University, Chico and the College of Communications. I have been there for 13 years. Prior to that, I was with the army for 22 years, with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for public affairs. I was the

director of broadcasting at the Victoria branch. Radio and Television Service and performed other activities for the Department of Defense. At Chico, my teaching speciality is instructional technology. That is the application of communication technology to teaching and training. I am also at the present time the director of the assessment team for the California Technology Project. The California Technology Project is sponsored by the State Department of Education. It's goal is to promote the use of communications technology in the public school systems for education. My interest in this proposal is how it could be applied both at the university level and in the public school systems.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Why don't we hear from Dr. Barbara O'Connor? Welcome.

DR. BARBARA O'CONNOR: I'm glad to be here today. It's nice to be here, because I have been talking about this subject for what seems like most of my life. I have been waiting since 1968 to get something like the California Channel off the ground. We started addressing it when Jerry Brown was governor and I was chair of the California Public Broadcasting Commission. We got no interest on the part of the Legislature, so we abandoned it. Then, during the cable franchising in the early 80's, three of the cable companies that bid on the Sacramento marketplace proposed a "California Channel" as a part of their franchising activities. I happened to be working for Scripps-Howard at that time, putting together their cable bid. Since then, in a new life, I chair the State Educational Technology Commission for you

guys. We built and funded the Technology Project. I am acutely aware of the need out there for information about what's going on in the Capitol, in an instructional sense. I head the Institute for the Study of Politics at Cal State. I have been a professor there for 18 years in the Communications Department.

In addition, I was here last spring, at your request, to talk about the Intelligent Network Taskforce Report that we did for Pacific Bell. There is a large section in there about the need to avoid an information-poor, information-rich society. One of the key components of that is in information about government in California. I commend Tracy's study. He is the first one to put it down on paper and do a survey of the population's interest relative to this topic, and how little is being covered by commercial broadcasters. I will talk more about what I perceive to be the next steps when the Chairwoman asks me.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: All right. This is going to be a very informal hearing. Members, for our own purposes, if you want jump in at any point. I'm asking our witnesses to give an opening overview of their perception of the problem, and then we will talk specifically about the different plans that could make a difference in California.

Let's hear from Mr. Olney.

MR. WARREN OLNEY: My name is Warren Olney. I am the co-anchor at KCOP in Los Angeles, Channel 13. I have in the past been a political editor at KABC, KCBS, and KNBC in Los Angeles,

although I haven't covered state affairs for two or three years. I also was a bureau correspondence in Sacramento, first for McClatchy Broadcasting in 1966, KRON in San Francisco in 1967, and then for KCBS (which at time now was KNXT) in Los Angeles from 1969 until 1972. So, I have seen the bureaus come and go. As far as the Los Angeles market is concerned, I was here during the "Golden Age" of coverage. There haven't been a Los Angeles TV bureau here since the late 70's. KNBC was the last one to close. I think it was in the late 70's. I don't preceive that situation changing. The broadcast management in Los Angeles has determined, from a cost accounting, bottom-line standpoint, that they get more bank for the buck that way. There are not many stories that they believe will sufficiently interest enough people to maintain a bureau up here. Those that do can be covered on a ad hoc basis, story by story, as the need arises.

Fortunately, they have some very good correspondents who are able to do a good job under difficult circumstances. I don't believe that a full-time bureau will be salvaged by any of the stations or the commercial broadcasters down there within the foreseeable future.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: You are aware that your old TV station, KRON, was the last one? They pulled their bureau in April of last year.

MR. OLNEY: I'm not surprised. The bureau I headed lasted for only six months, as did the KXT bureau, which opened at the same time.

I am not here to oppose or support any specific legislation. The proposal that I have seen could be a useful tool. I don't envision reporters sitting down for days at a time to audit or monitor the capitol on an electronic basis. But it certainly is a tool that, if available could be used. At the moment, we have the Northern California News Service which is just beginning and doing a good job of providing stories we want to have covered. I'm a little concerned about the proposal that I have seen. It seems to me that, like C-SPAN [Cable-Satellite Public Affairs Network], it would be somewhat sanitized by virtue of control by the Legislature of what is broadcast. As a reporter, I am concerned about that. If that becomes the case, then there could be a conceivable loss of credibility on the assumption that the legislators will allow to be broadcast only those things that will cast them in a favorable light.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Let me make very clear there is no "proposal." In fact, we haven't decided whether we are going to do this or not.

MR. OLNEY: All right. I am only commenting on what I'm ...

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: We are just reviewing information. So, you are getting the first licks in.

MR. OLNEY: I would be delighted to see such a thing excel. As I said, I think it would be a useful tool. I don't think, under any circumstances that would it substitute for having full-time



coverage by the stations themselves in Sacramento. I wouldn't want to see it promoted on that basis.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: We will get back to you. Let's hear from Ed Allen, who is a former president of the National Cable Television Association and who has been a member of C-SPAN since its inception.

MR. EDWARD ALLEN: Madam Chairwoman, Members of the Committee and staff, I have been before this Committee several times, but always wearing a cable operator's hat. Today, while I am still a cable operator, I am here as a representative of the board of directors of C-SPAN. My function today would be to try to help you understand more about how C-SPAN operates, how it might be a model as is suggested by this remarkable piece of work, and how something might be done in the State Legislature.

Later I will go through the history of C-SPAN, but not right now. The effort in Sacramento is going to exactly parallel the effort that was put forth by C-SPAN 10 years ago. While new bureaus may only last 6 months, C-SPAN has lasted 10 years. It is a good model.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Let's hear from Tracy Westen, who has developed this study that you have before you, Members, probably the most comprehensive work independent of the Legislature.<sup>1</sup> Let it be clear that we did not fund this proposal. It

---

<sup>1</sup> A New Public Affairs Television Network for the State, Volumes I & II, Tracy Westen and Beth Givens, 1989. Copies are available from the Center for Responsive Government, 10951 West Pico Boulevard, Suite 300, Los Angeles, CA 90064.

was done by a special grant. It has just been released. Here to talk about it is the person who conceived it, along with Beth Givens, and who is also the administrator of the project, Mr. Tracy Westen.

MR. TRACY WESTEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Beth Givens, my coauthor, is in the audience. If you have additional questions, perhaps she can join us.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Ms. Givens, please come to the table and be a part of this discussion.

MR. WESTEN: I am on the faculty of the USC Annenberg School of Communications. Two years ago, we became aware that there has been, off and on, an interest in televising the activities of the Legislature. We concluded that one of the reasons why the proposals kept being raised and subsiding and raised and subsiding was that there were lots of questions that required answers. So, we put together a team of 12 graduate students. We received our funding from the Markle Foundation, the Benton Foundation, the California cable industry the Graboudy Foundation; and other California nonprofits. We tried to take an independent, objective look at the need for this, how it would work, what are the various models that were available, what have other states done, are what other countries have done. We tried to do the most exhaustive analysis of the problem possible. We wanted to make the research available to the Legislature, which we are happy to do today.

To summarize what we found: First, there is clearly a need for improved coverage of the activities of the State Legislature,

as well as other branches of government, including the Supreme Court and the Executive Branch. We went to a lot of effort, for example, to pick the leading television news stations in five markets: Sacramento, Fresno, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego. During one legislative session, we monitored eight days of news coverage, and then sat there for days, with stop watches, exactly measuring how much news coverage was given at the peak of the session. There was very little coverage. Out of 250 bills that were described as "significant" by the legislative staff, no more than 15 were talked about by any of the stations in the state. Now, that is at the peak of the Legislature's activities. During the rest of the year, it is reasonable to assume, even less coverage is given to the Legislature.

We then looked at what other states have done. We found that six states have gavel-to-gavel coverage of their legislatures. About 38 states have regularly scheduled programs, once a day or once a week, during the legislative session, sometimes an hour, sometimes two hours long which cover the activities of the legislatures. A lot of it is lengthy excerpts. Some of it is discussions, commentaries, and so forth.

We concluded that, although California, is in terms of economic clout, the sixth most powerful state in the world, it is close to the bottom in the extent to which it covers the activities of its state government.

We also conducted a public opinion poll to see if people were interested in televising the Legislature and whether they would watch. The results surprised us. It turned out that something like 70 percent of the people said they were interested. They would like to see it. They would watch it regularly once a day or once a week. In fact, something like 22 percent of the people who did not subscribe to cable television said they would be more likely to subscribe if this service were available.

This fits with surveys run in other states. There are several surveys in other states that show that about 22 to 24 percent of the state population watches regularly or periodically. C-SPAN's audience is up to about 22 million, which I think is close to a quarter or one-fifth of the entire national audience. In fact, when C-SPAN runs viewer call-in shows, the number one call-in market in the country is Los Angeles. The number two call-in market is San Diego. The number four or five call-in market is San Francisco. California has a stronger interest in C-SPAN than any other state. We think there is receptivity to it.

We think there is a need. In terms of its feasibility, there is no question televising can be done. Other states have done it. Other countries have done it. The equipment exists. It is relatively inexpensive. It is easy to operate. That's not the problem.

In terms of how to go about it, there are different models. We have looked at what the other states have done. We think the C-SPAN approach is the best approach. It allows the Legislature to

control the cameras and route the signals internally around the individual offices. In other states, like Oregon, they legislatures find that this improves their own operations. Then the signals are handed off to an outside nonprofit independent organization which buys the satellite time; purchases the uplink time, distributes it around the state, works with the cable operators, public stations and other outlets to distribute it, and is in the position to add programming of other governmental agencies; like coverage of the Supreme Court. We can build a true California Channel.

Our polls and our focus groups, which we have held all over the state, indicate that people want some gavel-to-gavel coverage. They want to watch what the Legislature is doing without filtering, but they also want additional programming. "What does it mean?" Some context: how this Legislature works, and so forth. This mixture, this kind of divided responsibility between the Legislature and an outside independent group seems to be what the people want. This is what works for C-SPAN. The Canadian system is working in that direction. They are now setting up the equivalent of C-SPAN so they can add this kind of programming. We think it is technically feasible. The cost, we think, is fairly low. We think this is the best approach.

To summarize, the time is right. There is a public need. Our proposal is supported by the cable television industry, foundations, and others in the state who are ready to contribute. All that is really needed is for an active interest discussion by the

Legislature. We hope that permission will be granted by the Legislature to start this very important process of communicating with the public.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: We would like to hear from the representative for KQED.

MR. JOE CAMICIA: Ms. Moore and Members, thank you. My name is Joe Camicia. I work at KQED in San Francisco. KQED operates KQED-Channel 9, KQEC-Channel 32, KQED-FM, and a city magazine called San Francisco Focus. We provide an instructional television service to 41 of the 58 counties in this state. Thousands of teachers and students have access to the instructional television program that we provide by microwave broadcast and through the mail, as tapes.

We see a natural synergy for instructional television and what's goes on in this Legislature, to keep the people abreast what happens up here. We support the concept, and think it ought to happen. We hope that it moves forward.

As a final note, I think everybody should have access to see what Dick Floyd does up here, on a regular basis. I hope we have a chance to see him.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Okay. Members, I only have two other witnesses. Why don't we have everyone come up here; can have a real cozy little discussion. Evelyn Pine is representing the Foundation for Community Service Cable Television. Welcome. Then, we have Dan Brenner from UCLA, also a member of the Corporation

for Public Broadcasting. We have a representative from Satellite News. And, we have Vic Biondi from the Broadcasters Association.

We are going to open this up. Members, if any of you have any questions, it can give us some direction.

Why don't we hear from the Satellite News, because they have some concerns that ought to be put on the table.

MR. STEVE MALLORY: My name is Steve Mallory. I'm with Northern California News Satellite. We are located across the street in the old Senator Hotel.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Give us a little background on your interest in today's hearing.

MR. MALLORY: I was a bureau chief and correspondent in Sacramento for KNBC News, 15 years ago. For the past 11 years, and up until a year ago, I was a foreign correspondent for NBC News based in Beirut, London, Moscow and Tokyo, doing coverage all over the world.

A couple of years ago, I got an idea to start a news service based out of the State Capitol. Technology, which you discussed, made that possible. There were people who needed to cover the Capitol. It was extremely expensive for television stations to do that. So, I went ahead and started the business.

Now I am seeing, in this report, that "television has abandoned the Capitol," "no one is concerned about it," and "news departments aren't interested in what goes on here --and there is no regular coverage of the Capitol." Quite frankly, the report is wrong.

Nothing could be further from the truth. We are pioneers in an area of television news coverage that does not exist anyplace else in the United States. We are a video wire service. We cover this Capitol and transmit to 14 stations throughout the state -- from San Diego to Eureka. Even Medford, Oregon, is interested. To say "there is no interest," just isn't true. To say "there is no coverage of the Capitol," just isn't true.

The conclusion has been made that there is no regular coverage of the State Capitol by broadcast. The news release today put out by this group, the California Channel, said "it is embarrassing, the coverage is so low." They are wrong. In fact they haven't even spoke to us. I have my doubts about their their ability to research this well. We are a private business that covers the Capitol, unbiased. We are not supported by anyone -- we are entrepreneurial, covering it as journalists looking out for the interests of Californians and ourselves. To say that Capitol coverage isn't there on a regular basis just isn't true.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: There is evidence that commerical broadcasters are not continuing the coverage they had. They have gradually removed most of the reporters that covered the Capitol on a regular basis. The Capitol is no longer a regular beat. Obviously, there may be some coverage, but as far as the commitment from the broadcasters themselves in maintaining bureaus and reporters, as they do it in other areas, I think that is from where the concern stems.



MR. MALLORY: The point is that technology has made it possible for them not to have bureaus here. We have the technology. We utilize the technology. We have reporters, camera crew...

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: You feel that the coverage of the California State Legislature is adequate?

MR. MALLORY: No. We need more. There is no question about it. We are expanding on a regular basis. Our subscriber list is expanding on a regular basis. All I am trying to point out is that saying that "there is no interest" or "it is not covered on a regular basis" is just not true. Stations from Los Angeles regularly come to the Capitol and use our facilities. KNBC is in the process of putting their equipment in our office. Their equipment is already here. They have regular reporters for the Capitol, and cover the lawmakers from their own districts at the Capitol.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: So, you take issue with the report as it is. We will give them a chance to rebut.

PROFESSOR WESTEN: Just a quick comment. Mr. Mallory is criticizing a statement we did not make. We are not saying there is no news coverage of the Capitol. You will occasionally see it. Our point was that, compared to other states, California's regularly scheduled coverage of the Capitol is virtually at the bottom. California's coverage is an embarrassment, compared to other jurisdictions. In other jurisdictions, members of the public can either watch gavel-to-gavel coverage of the legislature, whenever it is in session, which you cannot do in California or regularly scheduled

daily or weekly programs. We used to have that in California: The Sacramento Weekend Review. We don't have that any more. Our point is to focus on a certain kind of regularly scheduled program. In those terms, California is virtually at the bottom.

We decided to find out how much coverage the commercial stations did. We couldn't monitor every station in the state. That would be impossible. We picked the five major radio and television stations in those markets, sat there with video cassette recorders for eight days. We clocked the evening newscast and the late evening newscast. It was very, very low. There were many important bills that weren't even mentioned.

We are not saying there is no news coverage at the Capitol. I wouldn't disagree with that. But our data indicates, in terms of other states, that we do less than virtually anyone else.

ASSEMBLYMAN SAM FARR: I just wanted to thank you for sponsoring this hearing. I chair the Committee on Economic Development and New Technology and, with Assemblywoman Moore, have been vitally interested on this issue for many years. In fact, we visited the Parliament in Canada, where we saw a lot of the services that have been discussed in your report. We me back here and decided this issue needed public airing.

Since then, we have been to Washington and met and toured C-SPAN facilities. We ere addressed by Brian Lamb, the chairman of C-SPAN. It has been in operation for 10 years in Washington. It is interesting that California is the biggest user of it.

We have been a state that has always been proud of being on the cutting edge of technology. The cutting-edge technology that we need in this state is information technology. We have the resources and the ability. We just need to have the collective will. It requires a discussion like we're having today -- ironically, this is the first one -- where we can actually get down to the nitty-gritty. If you want to provide this service, how do you provide it most effectively? C-SPAN is an ideal model. I don't take issue with Steve Mallory's point, but your service is a service for sale. It would like suggesting, in the old days that legislators didn't really need newsletters because there were newspapers around. People could gather all the news they needed about the Legislature just by reading the dailies. The point is, this is apples and oranges. They are two totally different types of services.

I commend the chair on holding this hearing today. I hope that my colleagues will join us and realize that, if we work together, we can come up with, a much-needed system of which California can be proud. If you think about it, in most of our local communities, especially the small towns that I represent, they have gavel-to-gavel coverage of public meetings. You can learn more about an ordinance or stop sign installation than you can learn about state legislation.

California puts on the Governor's desk ten times more bills than Congress puts on the President's desk, and yet there is

very knowledge of about what is going into those bills. I think this is a technology that is long overdue on the Capitol.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Mr. Frizzelle?

ASSEMBLYMAN NOLAN FRIZZELLE: I want to bring up a couple of different issues I want to ask a couple of questions of Mr. Olney.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: If you're going to go to that, then I will let Mr. Mallory have a response to Mr. Farr. I don't want to get into a long back-and-forth discussion.

MR. MALLORY: You're right. I sell coverage of the Capitol. But, the Legislature in this state does not publish a newspaper or a wire service. This is an area that should be unbiased way separate from the Legislature. The private sector should be seriously involved -- not a nonprofit corporation, but the private sector. That is my point.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: I could add something to that, but I won't, because we will get into a back-and-forth discussion. I will do it later and allow you a chance to respond. Mr. Frizzelle?

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIZZELLE: Mr. Olney referred to the potential for some kind of censorship, restriction, or narrowing of the agenda by the Legislature. There is a potential, of course, for censoring or narrowing the things that are put out by the broadcast media themselves. Depending on the bias or point of view of any element, you end up being exposed to one or another type of agenda. Some of us are concerned about the mechanism, who establishes the

parameters. I like the idea that Mr. Westen was mentioning, having an essentially independent outside organization deliver the things that seem more pertinent to the marketplace. It seems like a viable thing. I think C-SPAN follows that format and has been very successful at it.

But, I am wondering: we have a give-and-take legislature, quite a bit more so than the federal Congress. How much legislation might actually be formulated in order to create a specific TV image? Might legislation or the laws or the thrust of the laws be modified to some degree just by the nature of public exposure to them? There are some issues we have to negotiate quietly, because as soon as we negotiate publicly, there is a tendency to create an adversarial relationship between people, pro and con. In certain circumstances, some issues might better not be exposed, but who decides that? Maybe you can address some of those ticklish dilemmas, Mr. Olney.

MR. OLNEY: I think I may be in a an argument here that I may not be qualified to conduct. I have perhaps jumped the gun by suggesting that any specific proposal been made. I referring only to the summary I have seen of the report that Tracy prepared.

My only point with respect to control by the Legislature was that it would necessarily limit what viewers and voters would see. I wouldn't want such coverage to be seen as a substitute for journalistic coverage which is as you point out, certainly subject to the whims whatever journalist is doing the covering. In regard to

what Steve Mallory said, the kind of thing that is being talked about here is not necessarily incompatible with commercial broadcast news coverage. I hope it wouldn't be. As Sam Farr said, they really are quite different. I don't see why one couldn't coexist with the other. In fact, I would hope that if a "California Channel" was established, it would create more interest and cause stations like those I have worked for to provide more coverage in response to demand from viewers.

As to your question about whether deliberations should occur in public or private, it seems to me that that is the case now. It wouldn't be affected very much by technological change. I don't know to what extent the availability of television coverage now determines whether legislative proposals.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIZZELLE: Generally, coverage is of floor sessions and only rarely of committees. Most of the pitched battles occur in committees. Oftentimes, things that are quite significant here are exposed in committees, unlike in Washington. Even though many bills get voted down and so forth, they may still have a kernel deserving of a public responses.

MR. OLNEY: I'm very well aware of that, having been a reporter here. It is one of the things we now miss, trying to cover from a distance. I think Steve Mallory's service is doing a good job in helping to fill that vacuum.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Ms. Wright?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CATHIE WRIGHT: Is the state is going to pay for this?

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: No. All we are talking about is some very broad principles. That is a good point to make.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WRIGHT: I'll tell you, if you are going to take millions of dollars out of the taxpayers' pockets and pay to cover us, I would much rather put it into mental health.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: First of all, I couldn't agree more. Let it be clear, Members who are listening to this, Gwen Moore is not taking any money from anyplace.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WRIGHT: They can do this without us paying for it. If you are talking about local stations in my own community, yes, they do televise the city council meetings. But it is on cable, and it is the public-service channel that does it. I tell you, it is awfully boring.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: I think that is what a lot of Members think. But there has been no discussion here about spending money to put on a broadcast. Why don't we hear from Ed Allen about how C-SPAN is financed? (I have hoped that Pat Cabrera, who is doing a terrific project for the County of Los Angeles on a shoe-string, could have been here. Both Sam and I had an opportunity to visit her studio. I hope we can do that again, to see how she has been able to do it with very limited resources.) Then, I am going to go back to Barbara and then to Vic Biondi, who may have

some comments he would like to make in response to some of the questions that have been raised.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BOB EPPLER: If we could, I also would like to have Mr. Allen address the issue of how coverage is decided at C-SPAN, because there is some allusion of picking and choosing.

MR. ALLEN: The commitment that C-SPAN made to the House of Representatives originally, and then subsequently to the Senate was that it would carry their floor proceedings gavel-to-gavel, unedited. It really is very difficult to sanitize anything. I'm not going to say it is totally impossible. We may not show reaction shots, for example. I suppose you can all that sanitizing, but that is really no different than your squawk boxes or radio, where you don't get reaction shots. That is up to the Senate and the House of Representatives, they set their own rules. Our first charge is gavel-to-gavel coverage of the two bodies when they are in session.

Mr. Frizzelle, you're correct in saying that a lot of the work takes place in committees. That is totally up to C-SPAN and the committee chairs. We have five remote crews. Assignments are made every morning for what we think is most interesting, in terms of our national audience. But always, always, we must have permission of the committee chair before we can go in. I might say there has only been one instance in 10 years where a committee chair has turned down the C-SPAN cameras -- and also the commercial -- network cameras, for that matter. There has only



been one instance. The decision on non-floor material is totally up to C-SPAN. This isolates C-SPAN from the legislative body.

I might make one comment in terms of Mr. Mallory's concerns, because I understand themselves. He has a private business. In Washington, in the 10 years that C-SPAN has been over existence, there are now more independent news services than there were 10 years ago. Most of them are housed in the C-SPAN building. Those who aren't in the National Press Building are in the C-SPAN building. So, there is room for both entities. I'm sure that Mr. Mallory's service is not prepared to do gavel-to-gavel coverage. There are just too many hours to devote to something like that. But there is room for both.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Let me ask one other thing while you are discussing C-SPAN. Could you set forth C-SPAN's organizational structure and how it is funded?

MR. ALLEN: Yes, very briefly. I promise not to bore you. Before C-SPAN could start, the House of Representatives (as you would have to do here at the Capitol) had to make the decision that they were going to put cameras in. They did it for the purpose of providing a more efficient internal communications system for the Congress members themselves. Rather than depending on a squawk box, they and their staff could observe what is happening, know when they should be present for floor vote, see the facial expressions of supporters and opponents on legislation, or whatever it might be. This has now been replicated in Canada. It

has been replicated in Australia. We are showing the House of Lords from London. If you think that some times things get a little raucous here, in November, we are going to begin showing the House of Commons, including the question-and-answer sessions with Prime Minister Thatcher. The cameras were asintended as an internal communications system for the use of the Congress members. Once that was created, then came the concept of taking the House "feed" and delivering it through cable television to the homes. C-SPAN started with four employees. It started with seed money of \$400,000 . It started with maybe 10 hours of programming -- maybe a little more than that if they were in session -- but 10 to 20 hours of programming a week. If the House was not in session, the tube was black. There was nothing on the air at all.

C-SPAN has progressed because of the demand that exists on the part of the people. We have 140 employees. We have a budget in excess of \$12 billion. We are programming two channels, 24-hours a day, including the full coverage of the Senate and House of Representatives. There are people we call "C-SPAN junkies" who can't get enough of it!

C-SPAN is financed primarily by the cable television industry. It was conceived, created, and financed by the American cable television industry. Typically, C-SPAN costs cagble operators about 2-1/2 to 4 cents per subscriber per month to provide the entire 24-hours on two channels. That's is about 90 percent of C-SPAN's financing. The balance of the financing comes from

foundations and from the sale of dubs and tapes of the product we produce. Is that responsive, Madam Chair?

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Very helpful. Just one last point: What is the organizational structure of C-SPAN, and where do the people on its board come from?

MR. ALLEN: When Brian Lamb conceived the idea, he took a year's leave of absence from his job as a Washington reporter for a cable trade publication, Cablevision. He went out and called on the major cable operators to give \$25,000 each for seed money. It is these same people who now sit on the board of directors. The board of directors has three non-cable operators, but they are allied to the cable industry through the programming services they perform. The rest, because C-SPAN funded by the cable industry, are cable television operators. C-SPAN is a nonprofit corporation. If we should ever decide to abandon it, we must give the assets to another nonprofit corporation. C-SPAN is owned, and I suppose to you can say, because of the make up of the board of directors, controlled by the cable television industry.

I want to be careful about the use of that word, "controlled," because it may cause some apprehension on the part of the professional journalist. While the board of directors of C-SPAN is cable television operators, there is a specific proviso in the bylaws that we keep our cotton-picking little fingers out of content decisions. The professional staff of C-SPAN makes all the content decisions. The

board cannot as a matter of law make any content decisions, just business decisions.

MR. VIC BIONDI: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm Vic Biondi, executive director of the California Broadcasters Association. You've created a small reunion here. I was in the press corps with Warren Olney, and Steve Mallory succeeded me at KNBC. Before that, I covered the Capitol for KCRA in Sacramento for 7 years.

I think you're seeing the 21st Century creeping up on this Legislature, including the cable industry's remarkable creation of C-SPAN, its use by the country, and the diversity of programming that is available. As Warren said, I think there is room for commercial television inspite of what people may think of coverage of government and politics. C-SPAN is obviously a major institution in this country.

I remember them, if we didn't get film on an airplane at 12:30, it wasn't news in Los Angeles. All of you remember that. Those days are gone. We wrote the story without seeing the film; we had no opportunity to see what we said ahead of time. Those days are over. I think what you are seeing is the explosion of technology. To somehow make the connection that, because we only cover a certain percentage of news at the height of the session, justifies giving government control over programming is ridiculous. I don't think there is any connection between what we put on the air and the role of a C-SPAN or other coverage of this Capitol. I would

strongly suggest that you be very protective so as to make this independent. It should not be your decision if a C-SPAN crops up in California. You have problems in Washington with the House and the Senate covering the cameras, we would have that same problem here. You would have that same problem. I remember days in this Capitol when, if one member of the committee objected, we were thrown out.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: That is still the rule.

MR. BIONDI: You have to be very careful about the operation of your business, for example, negotiations on sensitive political matters: who makes the decisions on what goes out and who's covering it. I think you're talking about coverage of this Capitol at several different levels. I don't think the state ought to pay for it. I think it ought to evolve on its own, completely independent of you, because it is going to happen anyway.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: That ought to be made clear, we are not going to fund any organization to get it started. What we're really talking about in this era of reform, is that maybe there is a public need. People talk about sunshine, but how about a little sunshine on the issues and work that we do here? That's basically what we're talking about. Again, let me reemphasize, there has been no decision as to how this is going to be done or even if we are going to do it. What we're doing is exploring the possibilities.

MR. BIONDI: I think you're right to ask the question. You are right to ask the question and get people thinking about it.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Ms. Killea?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LUCY KILLEA: I think Mr. Frizzelle raised an issue, whether or not television is going to be used for grandstanding.

We did a straw-poll of the congressional offices in our district. Three of the four are Republican offices.

Duncan Hunter's office thought it was great. It gives the minority party a chance that they feel, because they are the minority party, they don't always have in the committees, this is an opportunity for them. They also have an opportunity after the session to air their views. Duncan Hunter took advantage of an all-night special order on the flag burning controversy, which kept everybody up all night. According to his office, it doesn't affect the nature of the debate. Maybe people are dressed a little bit better. Maybe they speak a little more carefully, but there seems to be no difference in what people say.

Jim Bates, Democrat, thinks it is great. "It was controversial when it started, but there are no complaints. Everyone has adapted to it and likes it very much. The debate seems to be more open and maybe a little bit more polished. People are watching their language, but it really hasn't affected their assignments. In fact, power isn't indicated by who speaks most eloquently on the floor. Clearly it is the committee assignments, the work they do, the bills they sponsor and so on and that doesn't change whether they speak before the television cameras or not. That doesn't have the

effect of influencing it. " The other opinion we got was from Congressman Loury's office, another Republican. They thought it was very positive. "All the Members thought they were going to hate it, that it would turn into something that was very artificial and they would have to play to it, but is hasn't done that really." They are getting used to the cameras, and they just go right on with business as usual. No disadvantages they can think of.

Congressman Ron Packard's office, another Republican, thinks it is "wonderful," and "strongly encourages Sacramento to have hearings televised." They feel explaining the working of Congress is very important for the people. "It is really very educational." They get a lot of mail about things that are happening on C-SPAN, asking questions, making comments, and getting input from it.

I don't know how many people you run into, but I run into an awful lot of people who don't know what the state government does. They don't have the faintest idea of why we even have a state government. I think that is something that requires a remedy.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Thank you for those comments. I had the opportunity to talk to some members in Congress who once served in this house. They have some concerns and felt perhaps it might not be such a good idea, for the reason that Assemblyman Frizzelle mentioned: they felt that some people will grandstand, given the opportunity to be on television. Again, I think, that would

depend on the kinds of coverage. We are talking about a variety of different things. In all fairness, both sides have to be heard. I tried to get a couple of them to come to this hearing. When we do this again, we may be able to get some of them to tell us exactly where they stand. Dr. O'Connor?

DR. O'CONNOR: I have to go teach a class, so let me quickly add a couple of thoughts.

In the various generations of these proposals, which I will gladly supply to the Chairwoman if you don't have them in your files, alternative models that were explored. It was interesting to hear about the early years of C-SPAN. When you take something like Tracy's study and you try to implement it full-blown, it is overwhelming to everybody. There are middle grounds that need not interfere with what Steve does or or with Vic Biondi's people. There are alternate ways we can have television coverage of the Legislature and not compete with one another.

On the Educational Technology Committee that I chair, we know there is an overwhelming need in high school and junior high civic classes for gavel-to-gavel coverage. They don't really care about edit programs. They just want gavel-to-gavel coverage. Gwen, Larry Stirling, and Bill Lockyer went up to Canada. The CBC uses a lot of university interns. You that you have the CSUS system at your disposal. We run your fellowship programs for you at CSUS. That is something that you could decide to do: gavel-to-gavel coverage tied



into instructional uses. That doesn't compete with what commercial broadcasters are doing.

I agree that, televising does stimulate interest. God forbid if you get more interest! The voter registration rates and the turn-out to vote are so low that I'm sure all of you would like to have more people enthusiastic about what is going on in this Capitol. But I don't think they need an expensive "California Channel" kind of project at the outset. That may be competitive with what Steve is doing. I'm glad Steve's doing it, because it is about time someone can buy a feed from this Capitol.

The key issue that I see and it is addressed in all the generations of proposals -- from the three cable companies and the California Public Broadcasting Commission -- is independence regarding who runs the cameras. Whatever proposals you accept, you have to deal with that issue: Who is in charge of the cameras and how are they focused?

How much does it cost? There are alternate ways of doing that. Inherent in the proposal before you today is a cable-driven model. I caution you, as a scholar dealing with regulatory issues, about going down that patch. The California Public Utilities Commission recently issued a preliminary opinion that would allow phone companies to deliver television, too. You might look to public television as a delivery system. They have the federally-paid for PBS satellite network that they can use for delivery. Hughes Aircraft is looking to sell unused transponder time as a commercial business.

So, there are alternate delivery systems. Whichever model you take, don't get locked solely into the cable industry. I would like to make the case for at least the instructional use of gavel-to-gavel coverage, for high school kids, junior high kids and even some college-level civics classes. There's a built-in constituency that would love to have that instructional material in the classroom. We can get an agreement on that without dealing with the political issues that are very iffy, on which we might not get agreement.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Barbara, let me interrupt you for a minute. Did you have an opportunity to review the background paper for this hearing?

DR. O'CONNOR: Yes, I received it Friday, but I looked at it over the weekend.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Let me draw your attention to the questions of interest to the Committee. Why don't you take a look at those as well? Is there's anything there that you might want to respond to? The others of you, if you will also take a look at the questions, it would be very helpful to us. I'd also like to hear from Dan Brenner, who has a plane to catch, about public broadcasting. Maybe you can respond to some of the things that Barbara just suggested as possible models.

DR. O'CONNOR: I have addressed a couple issues. The alternative delivery system is a key one. You need to first decide whether you want to do anything. I think Tracy's study demonstrates clearly there is an interest out there. I could add to

that the Educational Technology Committee's. I work with teachers. I know there's an interest, at least from an instructional point of view if no other.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Yes, there is a possibility of developing materials that could be utilized in the classrooms for educational purposes. Is there funding for that kind of thing?

DR. O'CONNOR: It depends on if you pass out Assemblyman Farr's bill which you all will be voting on -- the educational technology bill -- and Senator Morgan's bill.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: We're open for commercials. What is the bill?

DR. O'CONNOR: Sam, what's the bill number? AB 1470. Senator Morgan's is SB -- that I don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN FARR: Senator Morgan's bill passed today on the consent calendar. My bill will be on the Senate Floor next week.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: SB 1201 (Morgan). Good enough. Mr. Brenner? And then we will go to Assemblyman Mountjoy. Thank you very much, Barbara.

MR. DAN BRENNER: Thank you, Chairwoman, and it is a pleasure to be back before the Committee. I would like to make a brief point if I could.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: You have a chance to do a little commercial on who you are. So, why don't you do that?

MR. BRENNER: My name is Dan Brenner. I'm director of the Communications Law Program and a professor of law at the UCLA Law School. Before that, I was staff to the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission for seven years as a senior legal advisor. I was also appointed by President Reagan to a Democratic seat on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in 1986.

Let me touch on three subjects which I think are useful at this very preliminary phase. First, how does a public entity like the Corporation for Public Broadcasting operate? It would not be a model for a private entity. Second, what kind of architecture would you want between the Legislature and the feed of your service? Third, what would be on a "California Channel?"

First, you should accept the fact that even not one penny is spent on the "California Channel," the public perception will be that government is involved in the funding. I've seen this time and again in public broadcasting where there are no government dollars spent on public programming. Still, there is a perception. It is very important, if it is not the will of this Legislature to fund this (and it doesn't appear to be the essence of the proposal either) that be communicated very clearly: this is not a government program. It is not a puff service for legislators anxious to move onto other jobs.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: "Credibility" is what you're saying.

MR. BRENNER: Yes. It is very important. Exactly. Unless it is made very clear, as it was in C-SPAN originated as a cable industry-driven product, that perception could occur.

Second, as to points made by the Professor earlier, I think that what's critical, if this Committee is behind this idea -- and I hope it is because I think it is a wonderful idea -- what the Committee must seek from the Legislature is a willingness to be covered. To allow a feed to be created within the building, to meet your needs first and then to be made available to the California Channel or whoever uses it. You are the masters of your own destiny in creating an internal service to meet your needs. Once that has been established, you might then want to use the model that we talk about in telecommunications called "open network architecture." Anyone can take that feed and use it as they will. If Mr. Mallory has a use for it that is different from the California Channel, fine. If public broadcasters decide this is something that they want to take overnight, fine. If it something the California Channel wants, fine. In that way, you remain independent as far as picking which technology uses the service. What you really want is very simple. It is useful to have a television service for the Legislature, and that feed will be available to outside users so that others can watch what the Legislature does.

Which leads to my third point: what else should be on such a channel? I am a watcher of C-SPAN, and a great deal of it is boring; certainly the after-speeches are. I don't know how Ed feels

about this, but they are in the nature of a pump-piece. They are used by legislators to get a national television audience.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Don't you think that most people know that?

MR. BRENNER: I don't know. I never underestimate the power of television to convince people they are watching something real -- I have just been thinking about these Helsinki Hair Formula "news shows " I commend to the Committee the wonderful article in Spy magazine next month that goes through a whole listing of these Pseudo news shows, for hair formulas and "Monty Halls' Get Rich in Hawaii," which appear to be regular television shows. The whole point of these program-linked commercials are to convince people they are watching are a real newscast.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: We see that in political advertising, too.

MR. BRENNER: Yes, right. The most recent scheme of broadcasters for promoting their own on-air news personalities is to have them interviewed. These completely contrived interviews about...

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: You are going to make me give Vic and Warren some time to rebut your statement.

MR. BRENNER: The most artistic comment made so far is the fact that Steve Mallory, after being in Beirut, decided to move to Sacramento.

My final point is, this thing can really take off. I think it really could. People in the cable industry, besides counting their money, feel that they have really done something different for America. They have created an all-news channel that didn't exist in this country and the world; they created an all-public affairs channel. No commercials, totally devoted to the discussion of public issues in a meaningful way. I'm convinced that a state as big and as interesting as California can provide loads of such programming, whether it is symposium that goes on at the university or whether it is the weekly Town Hall luncheon in Los Angeles or the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco. There is a wealth of activity in this state that could be covered by such a channel.

I also believe, and this is my law school hat, that this could lead to a greater coverage of our court system, whether it is on public television or a "California Channel." I would very much like to see, as a regular matter, the California Supreme Court's arguments being televised. Never more than in the late 1980's has the California Supreme Court been a place where people are discussing and thinking hard about public issues. We got rid of our Supreme Court chief justice over a public issue. Arguments about the death penalty, abortion, school prayers, issues that come up before that court should be heard by the public so they can be fully informed about how the justices really approach those issues, and courts of appeal could follow suit.

In summary, my major points would be: make sure that the public is aware that this is not being either funded or controlled by the government, that you maintain a technology-neutral approach to its architectures, that you promote creation of such a feed from the Capitol, and you make sure that the service can add other diverse elements that could make a real difference in terms of public-affairs coverage.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Is public broadcasting looking at funding for a channel something similar to the "California Channel?"

MR. BRENNER: I was thinking about that. As the gentleman from KQED knows, there are certain rules that qualify stations for federal "Community Service Grants." The Corporation for Public Broadcasting issues those grants. Whether or not a channel like this could ever qualify...

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: I wasn't thinking so much "channel" as I was programming, because you do give grants for programming. I was thinking of grants for programming that you talked about, in terms of creating something that was technology-neutral.

MR. BRENNER: It is not inconceivable. The amount of federal dollars not tied to the major strand programs -- that is the National Series Programs -- is rather small, \$26 to \$50 million depending on how you count it. You don't fund a lot of programming with that, although this kind of programming could certainly be grant-worthy.



Another point I'd make (and this is probably what you don't want to hear) is that in other states, believe it or not, there is substantial funding for educational television, direct funding for public television. I know there is some funding that eventually makes its way into instructional television in the state. In many states, there is a much more direct connection.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: There used to be one here, but we don't do that any more.

MR. BRENNER: Right. My guess is that you might find funds for some programs, but it would not be a primary place for Corporation for Public Broadcasting dollars.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Thank you. Mr. Mountjoy?

ASSEMBLYMAN RICHARD MOUNTJOY: You said we really haven't decided whether or not we are going to do this.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: No, we're just discussing.

ASSEMBLYMAN MOUNTJOY: My question is, couldn't they simply do it now? They can have permission to go on the Floor and film gavel-to-gavel now. The committee may be separate, but...

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: It is not feasible kind, commercially to do gavel-to-gavel coverage. What this hearing seeks is to explore various ways that other states and governmental entities are utilizing new technology and new methods. That is basically what we're hearing.

ASSEMBLYMAN MOUNTJOY: Right now, they can go on the Floor and do gavel-to-gavel if they wanted to. They can film

whatever they want on the Floor and produce it. I think it is a good idea. I think we ought to get ahead in this. I would have liked it done a couple of years ago, personally. I think it is a good idea. I think it is what the public needs. One of the comments made by the last speaker was that we would first meet our legislative needs and then the public needs. I think it needs to be the opposite. I think the public needs are the needs that should come first. That is the reason that you want it televised. The need of the public ought to be the first consideration of any broadcast; the things they ought to see. The least control that the Legislature would have over the selection of those programs is the best control. That's my personal view.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: That is what he was saying, that anybody who wants to come in and film, whatever, we make it available to them, although we may do the actual camera work.

ASSEMBLYMAN MOUNTJOY: As far as choosing what they can or can't film, as I believe the least government is in the best government, I think the least control government over that media is the best interest of the public. I just believe that. I have a tendency to trust the private element more than I do the government element.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: I believe that comes under freedom of the press.

ASSEMBLYMAN MOUNTJOY: Right.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Why don't we go to Mr. Farr?  
And then I want to come back to Ms. Pine, who has not had the

opportunity to speak, so we can hear a little bit about local government funding and the programs they have.

ASSEMBLYMAN FARR: I would like to make a comment and address a question to Mr. Allen. In the material that you handed out, which I think is excellent, in addition to the report, is U.S. Senate Resolution No. 28. It, like the committee background paper, points out that this isn't going to happen in California without a good public/private partnership. It is not something that is just going to land at our feet. Assemblywoman Wright jumps in and says, "Well, if there is any public money in it, let's not do it." As I understand with C-SPAN, the Senate and the House had retrofit the system, and they had to put a lot of money in it. This Senate resolution shows that they appropriated \$3.5 million to get the House ready and directing the Capitol architect to expend those funds. Then C-SPAN was able to get a license fee of four cents per subscriber to be earmarked for coverage of C-SPAN.

I know in California we have local cable operators carrying local public affairs, but they haven't done it out of the goodness of their hearts. They have done it to satisfy the conditions of franchise agreements. Cities have given cable operators franchises and said, "If you want to do business in our community, you've got to carry our city council meetings." Some of these cities have municipal channels, operated by public employees who are working for government. Los Angeles is one of those. In our schools, Los Angeles County Office of Education has its own television studios. It is doing

educational programming throughout the state. I believe Chico State University is a hub for programming in the northern part of California.

There is a lot of public/private partnership that is absolutely essential. If we are going to do this, the Legislature is going to have to be a fiscal partner in developing the in-house infrastructure. I'd like to hear from Mr. Allen what he recalls the public involvement to have been at the national level.

MR. ALLEN: I would be glad to. By the way, we have another little reunion going on here. Vic Biondi mentioned one. My former company is the company that supplies cable service in Chico and the Monterey Peninsula. We have another reunion going.

The genesis of "retrofitting," as you called it, the cameras first in the House and then in the Senate for the use of the House and the Senate, not C-SPAN. Even if this concept never gets off the ground, though I hope it does, this body would want to enter the 1990's with the best possible technological tools to observe the Floor action, the committee action or whatever it might be. As it is true with the Canadian Parliament, the British Parliament, the French Parliament, and the American Congress, the "raw feed," as we call it, that comes from these cameras, is picked up by C-SPAN. The cost after that point -- after we are delivered the feed -- is borne by the cable television industry, not the government.

ASSEMBLYMAN FARR: That is only for floor coverage. What about you decide to cover a hearing.

MR. ALLEN: That is all our cost. There is no cost to us for the Floor feed. It is delivered to us as it would be delivered to CBS if CBS wanted to devote that many hours to it. (They don't.) We do not pay anything for floor feed, but all the rest of the costs...

ASSEMBLYMAN FARR: The camera operators are employees of the respective houses?

MR. ALLEN: On the floor, they are employees of the Senate and employees of the House, yes. The titling at the bottom is done by the employees of the Senate and the House. Once it moves out of that body, then it becomes the responsibility of C-SPAN. The studio and remote crews are part of what the four cent per subscriber a month goes to finance.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Let me add a point to that. Sam, as you well know, both the House and the Senate use this, not only for the purpose of public participation, but mainly as an internal tool for themselves. They feed into the offices. As we have squawk-boxes, they have gavel-to-gavel coverage in the House. It is an ongoing thing. It is just like having our squawk-boxes. The public money is spent in the same manner as we spend to have squawk-boxes.

MR. ALLEN: I don't believe the facility here is wired yet, although I am certain it is going to be wired. One of the things Congress did when it created the Capitol distribution system was to put the Washington and Baltimore television stations on, the network stations; to put CNN on so there would be 24-hour news available in

the offices of the legislators, to put the Weather Channel on so they can see what the weather is if they are flying home that weekend, and they also put on the floor feeds so they can see what is happening on the floor. At one time, they only had the floor feeds. They didn't even have C-SPAN. We had a little problem getting C-SPAN into the House.

Now, they can watch a Congressman making a speech at the National Press Club. You can see him chairing a committee hearing. That is very helpful to the staffs. I hope that some day you can get away from the arcaic audio squawk-box and have the same kind of system that is used in Washington. In Canada, they use it to send electronic mail around the Parliament. The party whip can send messages to the members for whom he is responsible.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: They also use it to view broadcasts that were done in their home districts. In other words, we can see Warren's coverage on an issue of statewide significance. We can see Steve's feeds and other newsworthy things that may be helpful. We could see broadcasts from around the state, things like that.

MR. ALLEN: At one time, Madam, the floor feeds were 100 percent of C-SPAN's programming. Now it's less than 10 percent. Ninety percent of the programming is committee hearings, speeches, the close-up foundations, and when the high school students come to Washington.

ASSEMBLYMAN FARR: How do you decide to coverage a committee? I mean, take the network news. If there is a hearing on flag burning, obviously that sexy issue is going to get coverage. You may have previously committed to a hearing on some other subject. As I understand it, once you make a commitment to cover a hearing, you cover the whole hearing.

MR. ALLEN: Hearings are gavel-to-gavel. The decision is made before the day of the committee hearing. We can make changes up to a day before if we find something going on that is more important. We have five remote crews, and there are a lot more than five committee hearings going on.

ASSEMBLYMAN FARR: Do you make decide, "We think the network will cover this and we don't need to, so we can cover something else"?

MR. ALLEN: No. The networks won't be doing gavel-to-gavel for the most part. Turner does on occasion, CNN does on occasion. For the most part, you can't devote that many hours to it. We make the decisions based on what we think our people want to see the most, that which is the most telling issue at the moment, and take it from beginning to end.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Ms. Roybal-Allard?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD: We have been hearing quite a bit about the advantages of this type of coverage. I think there is a lot of value and merit to what has been said. But because we have to make a decision in this regard, I would

like to hear some of the problems and pitfalls that have occurred and that maybe still exist even now. If we were to decide to go ahead, what it is we could do to mitigate or avoid some of those same pitfalls or problems?

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Why don't you take a shot at that. Ed?

MR. ALLEN: I can tell you two problems that C-SPAN has run into. One is the use of "special orders" after the session is over. Members, would get up and orate for hours even though nobody was in the audience. It looked like somebody was in the audience. Congressman Gonzales of Texas was the first to realize the power of special orders, but it didn't take Newt Gingrich long to figure it out. (By the way, that is why we got television in the Senate. They found that Congressman Gonzales of Texas had a higher national profile than Senator Robert Byrd did, because the House was the visible part of the legislature.) That problem was corrected by Speaker Tip O'Neill, who instructed the House employees operating the cameras to pull the cameras back and pan the chamber. There was practically no one in the chamber.

The other problem we have run into, on occasion, is of the rules the Senate and the House. No incumbent can use C-SPAN programming as a clip in a political commercial, but that doesn't apply to a challenger. That has been a problem. Some candidates will take an eight-second sound bite out of C-SPAN, which may be totally out of context, and run it as as political commercial against an



incumbent. I think that goes to the rules of the House and the Senate.

PROFESSOR WESTEN: I can add a couple of comments to that. Our research into what all the other states have done, as well as other parliamentary systems, has revealed that, in the long run, very few negatives surface. There are a lot of questions raised at the outset, but after the system gets up and running, the cameras and become part of the furniture. People tend to forget about it.

When the Senate was trying to decide whether or not to put the system in, they put it in for a two-month trial period, and ran a study of its impact in 20 different areas. I can't remember what they all were, but their conclusion was that in 19 of those areas there was no impact and no problem. The only potential problem they saw was special orders, people giving statements after the floor sessions, just for the cameras. As I understand it, this Legislature does not have that procedure. So presumably it would not be a problem. In terms of grandstanding and the impact on procedure, that has not been a problem in any jurisdiction we have looked at.

The second question is control. Massachusetts, for example, contracts with WGBH, the public television station, to come in and do the coverage. But, the contract has ground rules. Head and shoulder shots only. It is carefully spelled out as to what the coverage can be. Other states think head and shoulder shots produce uninteresting television and let the camera crews roam and do action shots and so forth. The point is, each legislature needs to decide

what the ground rules are. That is something over which you have complete control.

The third point is interest, generating programming that people interested in seeing. States have tried a whole range of different formats: newscast, roundtable discussions, documentaries, viewer call-ins, and so forth. Polling our focus groups, we found a mixture is better than just gavel-to-gavel.

Finally, as Ed said, states and C-SPAN have adopted rules on the use of their coverage. Paid commercials are prohibited. I think there is only one instance that we know of, in which C-SPAN's coverage has ever been used in a political commercial.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD: Legislatures had to change the way they operate. In Congress, they have four microphones and you walk up to the microphones. Right now, we just lift a mike from our desk. Have there been changes in that?

PROFESSOR WESTEN: No, we are not aware of changes. Some legislatures only focus the camera on a podium. Others will focus a camera on an individual seat. Maybe a photograph of the legislators pops up, so when you hear the voice, you see the photograph but you don't see the actual video image. The point is, all possibilities are equally easy.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROYBAL-ALLARD: These are considerations for all of us.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Right.

PROFESSOR WESTEN: The first step is for the Legislature to decide what ground rules it wants. We can make available the Massachusetts contracts and other approaches and give you pros and cons on each. It is completely up to you to shape it in a way that you think is appropriate to your own procedures.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: That would be a function of the kind of system that we determine we want to use. If the cameras were mobile or not, if we were going to just do the floor, those kind of things. I want to hear quickly about what the Community Foundation is doing. Ms. Evelyn Pine?

MS. EVELYN PINE: The Foundation for Community Service TV, as you know, was mandated by the Legislature to encourage the use of public municipal and educational cable channels in California in 1979. We are delighted to see this report. One of the last things we did was to give a grant to this project. We are very excited about it. We were very interested in the issue, because as Dan Brenner said, it is really a public affairs channel. We thought that the gavel-to-gavel coverage was important, but that additional coverage for the public is also important. We were able to see a real difference between the journalistic function and public service programming. Anyhow, it is delightful to see it.

One of the things we have done is to encourage city governments to use municipal channels or combined access channels to provide public service programs. Although some people may think it boring, coverage of city councils and other

governmental meetings has a tremendous response in terms of viewers. It has been very effective. Again and again, when we talked to city staff and elected officials, they felt it had a real positive effect: there was clarity for their constituents had about certain issues. That is the most important comment I want to make.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Thank you. Let's hear from Mr. Mangers, who has not had an opportunity to testify.

MR. DENNIS MANGERS: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. I'm Dennis Mangers representing the California cable television industry. As most of you know, I have represented the industry for about eight years since being liberated from public service.

At four times that I can recall, I have served on committees and advisory boards, etc., related to this concept. You will recall, Thomas Hoeber of the California Journal came up with a distinguish panel. Each time I served on one these committees, I was asked to do so by legislators who had a keen interest in bringing C-SPAN-type coverage to the Capitol and wanted the cable television industry to be involved. So, I got involved.

Each time, two things conspired to see that it failed. One was the lack of will or financing or whatever to do the scholarly, indepth study necessary to determine what the need and what the alternatives were for meeting the need. The other was a seeming lack of interest on the part of legislative leadership to move forward with the concept. As a result, nothing happened.

The cable television industry has a good record as Mr. Brenner suggested, of providing C-SPAN-type coverage; and, at the local level, of providing coverage of local governments: board of supervisors and city council meetings. Some kind of enhanced coverage of state legislative affairs was in order, but we didn't see any substantive action. Then along came Dr. Westen and Ms. Given of the Annenberg School at USC. They proposed to do a very scholarly job, taking plenty of time to look into the issue. The California cable industry's board of directors gave them funding to add to their other funding to do the study properly. When they came back recently and announced the results of their study, the California cable industry was interested enough to ask Ed Allen and myself to represent the industry on the board of directors of this enterprise which we are proud to do. It is clear that the cable industry is willing to participate in this process.

Of the two elements we always needed in the past, we now have. What's still missing is an indication on the part of the Legislature that it, too, wants to move into the new technological era so that its proceedings are properly televised. We think this is the most significant step we have seen thus far in this ongoing discussion.

I want to clarify a couple of things. What needs to be determined, of course, is how it is to be financed and controlled. I want to make it clear: the California cable television industry is not interested in having control, nor is it interested in having singular

responsibility. We note the presence of public broadcasting. We note the interest of independent contractors, and we note the interest of commercial television. We are simply one of the players in the enterprise. We have governmental, educational, and public-access channels that in many cases have programming hours available for this kind of programming. It could be carried to the schools of California and to the homes of California; we are willing to cooperate in that regard. If, as Professor Westen suggest, the day comes when they are able to put together an appropriate programming model, in which there seems to be high interest -- California's cable operators may be willing to spend several cents per subscriber to help finance it. That is something to see, as the program evolves.

The one last point I want to make will clear up a misconception. One of your previous speakers recommended, "Don't get suckered into falling for a single model based on the cable industry, because the telephone company has just been permitted by the PUC or is about to be permitted to become a player in that regard." That is absolutely incorrect. The PUC is considering an alternative regulatory framework. Perhaps this would allow the telephone companies to deploy a fiber optic network that might eventually make it possible to compete, if certain legal impediments were removed. But those impediments have not been removed. At the moment and for the foreseeable future, the telephone companies will not be allowed to provide television programming in their

service areas. So, cable and the organizations represented by Vic Biondi and public television are the players. If we can all work together, we can bring quality coverage of the California Legislature to the people of California.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Mr. Frizzelle?

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIZZELLE: I persist in being concerned about the business of objectivity and who controls what. People can see what's goes on here as fact, as "this is actually something I saw." But, the context often is really more important than what's heard or what's said. Newspapers are able to interpret what has transpired and establish some context. Often television gets the facts, but is lacking in context except for CNN, C-SPAN, and those kinds of programs that spend more time with it. Mr. Mangers, how can we gain some element of objective context for what's said and transmitting it to the public?

MR. MANGERS: I think the answer to your question is inherent in the study itself. They suggested not only gavel-to-gavel coverage of sessions and selected committee hearings in which the audience is left to draw its own conclusions, but they are also spoke about qualified journalists providing commentary on what's going on. You can have dependable weekly or bi-weekly programs in which people, like print and electronic-media journalists who watch the process, provide a commentary that is not influenced by commerical television, the cable television industry, or any of the media -- only by their own judgments.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN FRIZZELLE: Right now, we are seeing a lot of point/counter-point television programming that focuses on context. You get a back-and-forth between commentators on both sides of major issues. It seems to be blossoming. At least, more and more television commercial entities are sponsoring that type of thing. Is that a device that could be furnished by cable television if cable ended up with a system that was utilized?

MR. MANGERS: I think that is the intent. I know that I, as a former school principal, sometimes do my work listening to the squawk-box on issues like abortion, insurance, water distribution, and some of the other critical issues of our day . It sickens me, to tell you the truth, to realize how few of us are privy to this incredible debate when thousands of school children at every level are not getting the opportunity to see this debate being waged about the very issues that will affect their futures; and their declining interest as a result of our not fulfilling our responsibility to them. As a citizen, an advocate, and an educator, I feel pretty bad about that.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIZZELLE: You feel televising could be accomplished?

MR. MANGERS: C-SPAN is the model. When Ed Allen, who helped put the whole thing together, sits here and tells you the same kind of quality coverage can be replicated here, you can take it to the bank. It's not that there won't be problems, but if the Legislature decides it has the will to do it and sets the rules so it doesn't have the problems Assemblywoman Roybal-Allard alluded



to, and everyone around this table has the will to do it, yes, we can do it.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Members, are there any further questions? If not, panel, let me tell you what I'd like to do: I'd like for you all again to take a look at the questions that were posed on the back of the background paper. I am going to give each of you a parting shot. If there are any comments you wish to make, we will do that before we go to the parting shots. Mr. Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Only one, Madam Chairman. Question 1, paragraph 1, in the last line, it uses the term, "representative democracy." At C-SPAN we think we have changed representative democracy into participatory democracy by doing three telephone call-in shows a day inviting the public to participate with us, and more particularly by asking questions of the participants in the roundtable, who are very often journalists (You will never hear an opinion expressed by a C-SPAN staffer. They ask questions, but they don't offer personal opinion.) I think we have created a level of participation which was not present 10 years ago.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Your comment is that not only will democracy be more representative, but we will also create more participation in government, which was the basis on which this country was founded. Beth?

MS. BETH GIVENS: I will speak briefly to Number 5 of the questions. My name is Beth Givens. I'm with the California Channel and co-author of the report.

We're talking about televising the Legislature as a way to bring us into the 1990's and the 21st Century. Television is a one-way medium. I think it is important to think of other technologies that we could combine with television to bring in the two-way, interactive aspect. I know that your committee has done some of that with a computer bulletin board. There would also be the possibility of using television in conjunction with two-way audio to open up committee hearings to people from elsewhere in the state. It is a huge state. People from San Diego, where I live, have a hard time getting up to here to testify. If they had access to one-way video/two-way audio and other forms of two-way communication linked to the one-way medium television, it would make hearings all the more valuable.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Video conferencing and teleconferencing. It would also make it possible to address school programs on a large scale.

MS. GIVENS: That's right.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Let me thank all the witnesses who have been here this afternoon. It has been very enlightening. Let me again reiterate that this our first look at the possibilities. This Committee may do another hearing to look at other aspects of the question, as consider making recommendations as to the Legislature. With that thought in mind, why don't we go around once more. Anything that you didn't get a chance to say and you want to

say, please feel free to say it, if you can do it in less than a minute. If you don't have a need to say anything, then don't.

MR. OLNEY: From the standpoint of a news reporter, this provides a service that isn't available and won't be made available by the commercial broadcast channels. It seems to me that anything that acquaints people with the activities of state government is useful and important. It also might be a useful tool in the broadcast industry, to supplement coverage that we already provide. I would hope that it would stimulate further interest, and consequently, further coverage.

My biggest concern is the question of control and who decides what is photographed and how it is broadcast. It was mentioned before that C-SPAN doesn't allow reaction shots, or that it does under some circumstances and not under others. It is a very important question with respect to the impression people get of what's going on. It is something that you ought to consider very carefully. It goes to the credibility of what's broadcast.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: You indicated in your opening remarks that you were concerned that perhaps C-SPAN was sanitized. I just wonder: is a general opinion regarding broadcast media?

MR. OLNEY: I don't want to overstate the case. What I was referring to was the use of reaction shots and the absence of what I would call, referring to Mr. Frizzelle's remarks, a "visual context" which is often the important part of the presentation. I

don't always see it on C-SPAN. Obviously, they try to provide it to their remarks added after the regular proceedings. But during the proceedings itself, you don't.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Do you think that a group independent of the Legislature is better? Some of you indicated that you didn't think that was a great idea, and some of you thought it was the best idea. Would you, in your closing remarks, also make some comment along those lines?

MR. OLNEY: If it is possible to have the content and actual visual material controlled by somebody other than the Legislature, it would add to its credibility and make it more useful to me.

MR. BIONDI: I agree generally. The first thing is to realistically decide how the Legislature will use modern technology for itself. As you pointed out, the C-SPAN feed on the floor was for internal use, a video squawk-box. Do you do the video on the committee hearings or is that provided to you?

MR. ALLEN: C-SPAN does that.

MR. BIONDI: Okay. You can decide where to draw that line. California, pioneer as it has been, can break that mold. Why not cover the floor with floor cameras? Why not cover three or four hearings a day with three cameras for your own internal use?

No one else has mentioned radio. Radio in California is a very flexible technology. Of course, I represent both radio and television, so I have to say that. But I mean it. Once you decide

internally how you're going to use video and technology, then you can have it go to people like Steve, to us, or to the cable industry -- and that's an interesting challenge from the cable industry that we should seriously consider. If there is another entity that wants to take it and do something else with it, you have washed your hands of it. You've fed it out. I don't think you need to be hindered by what the Senate and the Congress has done, with someone standing there. That is probably it's biggest fault, that you don't trust it. I think you can do better. There is no reason why you can't.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Steve, do you do radio too or just video?

MR. MALLORY: Just video, and we don't do live programming at the present time.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Do you still believe that there is no compatibility between the Legislature doing its programming and you doing what you do?

MR. MALLORY: All day today, since the [California Channel] news conference took place this morning, people have been saying to me, "there's is now someone going to compete with you." It is interesting that several people have said that to me. So, what do they mean? In some respects, we are talking apples and oranges, but again, who is going to pay for this? It's going to be free theoretically, to televisions stations. That competes with us. I was told nonprofit corporations may be subsidized by the government, one way or another. There are nonprofit corporations now that .....

complete with us. I can refer to Sacramento State, which operates a transmitting facility, and Chico State, which competes directly with me. So to say it is nonprofit and say it is not going to compete, that is not true.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: What about an entity similar in structure to C-SPAN?

MR. MALLORY: I thought it was interesting that Mr. Allen said, "Now people are housing themselves with C-SPAN." I think it should be the other way around. C-SPAN should be housing itself with other people, with private corporations, profit-minded corporations. I'm just concerned about protecting what I'm doing.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: I image C-SPAN is using that money to make and put on their program.

MR. MALLORY: I'm sure they can explain that to you better than I can. I don't have any idea.

I think the idea is good. The concept is good. It's terrific. I think it is important that Californians know more what goes on in government. Again, that is why I started this particular adventure. I can't do it as extensively as I would like to, but we have grown extensively in the past two years. What their are proposing is excellent. My main concerns are financing, control, and how much influence the Legislature will have.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Wouldn't this make your system even stronger and better because you could take some of the same things and use it in the manner that you do. You would be

commercially oriented as opposed to their public affairs orientation? The material you would utilize would probably ...

MR. MALLORY: Potentially, we would use some of this to supplement some of the reports we do, the same as any other station might do. It might also eliminate us, but that's small scale in any respects. In their proposals, they are talking about spending a half million dollars for a satellite uplink. That potentially threatens my current business which is also satellite communications. I am in the process of building a similar facility right now in Sacramento. Would that cut into my plans? As I say, Sacramento State has a facility that competes with me and undercuts my prices, and it's protected by the government. So, am I going to be facing more of the same thing?

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: We might be using Sacramento State or some of those other things, since we fund them. Right?

MR. MALLORY: Then the taxpayers are underwriting it.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: To some extent you are probably correct. The taxpayers fund many things that are in their best interest. The State does all kinds of educational things. This may very well be one of them.

MR. MALLORY: I'm sure a balance can be worked out.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: I know you will keep vigil over us. Any ideas you have, will be welcomed.

MR. MALLORY: Thank you.

MR. MANGERS: I would like to strongly second what Vic Biondi said. I can't imagine anybody saying it better, so I won't try.

Both Houses of the Legislature ought to move forthrightly to put in such a system for their own purposes first. You are going to have some alternatives for delivering the signal you develop to the people to California. As Vic and I are neighbors at the Senator Hotel, perhaps we will end up being partners in that process.

DR. MAIN: I'd like to speak from an educational standpoint, although I have strong feelings from a public standpoint. This is a time when we have lessening public confidence in public institutions and particularly legislators. We have lessening participation in government, evidenced by the declining number of people going to the polls every election. This is an opportunity to generate interest among the public end in our state government. There are some potential pitfalls. It must be done well. It must be done credibly. If we are going to bring this into the classrooms around the state, I am very concerned about the independence of who makes the editorial decisions about what's shown and what's not shown. It could become a propaganda tool in the classrooms. I would be very concerned about that. I share a concern with everybody here about control and independence of the programming.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: If this was preceived as a propaganda tool don't you think that people would not use it and message would be communicated to us very quickly?

DR. MAIN: Absolutely. It can be a tool to generate interest in government, and reestablish the credibility of government



and confidence in government. The flip side of the coin is that it can lose or destroy public confidence if it is perceived to be done in the self-interest of government. That's the flip side. We should be very cautious and move carefully to ensure that there's absolute independent of editorial decisionmaking.

Finally, as far as educational utilization is concerned, it is really important that we have a schedule in advance if this is going to be useful in the classroom. It doesn't do any good to have something that is on all during the school day. Teachers plan their classes in advance, their lesson plans and so forth. The value of this is if they can integrate what's going on with the regular curriculum. Having this available in advance is very important. In that regard, the California Technology Project can be very useful. We are establishing a network that would be available to every teacher, to call in and receive information from a computer bulletin board. An advance schedule of programming could be available to every teacher via bulletin board.

I think this is something that was needed 10 years ago in California, just as it was needed in the U.S. Capitol. One of the concerns that I have heard expressed today, was expressed when C-SPAN was going to go into the nation's Capitol. People said you couldn't make deals because you needed privacy. Actually, C-SPAN has had very little impact, as the literature indicates; it has had very little impact on the way the government performs.

MR. ALLEN: Madam Chair, a couple of clarifications and then I do have a final comment. I didn't mean to indicate, if I did, the independent news services were housing with C-SPAN or that C-SPAN was housing with them. They happen to be renters in the same building. The building is close to the Capitol, so it is a logical place to be.

I'm grateful to Vic for bringing up the matter of radio. I'm a former radio broadcaster. You will be interested to know that C-SPAN will have the capability of doing audio feeds this fall. C-SPAN will be delivering, for the first time, two new audio-only feeds. One will be the complete BBC radio and the other will be committee hearings that didn't make it on the tube. But the audio portion of the hearing will be fed, so it is will be an added option for the listener.

When television was about to move into the Senate, those who did not want television in the Senate -- there was a few traditionalists who confused tradition with habit -- suggested radio-only as a way to cover the Senate. It was only a dodge to keep television out of the Senate, so I would hope that if radio or audio services are here, they are an adjunct and addition to the video feed.

A clarification on Mr. Olney's concerns about the reaction shots: I share that same concern. I think reaction shots are part of the full story. The lack of reaction shots on the floor of the House and Senate is one of the rules established by the House and the Senate. When C-SPAN is televising a committee hearing, we have reaction shots.

A final comment, Madam Chairman. I was intrigued by the illustration on the front of the report in front of you. I don't know what the graphic artist had in mind. But as I look at it, the State Capitol has no doors. It has a television set in place of the doors. The doors on this building allow only a couple of dozen or so visitors to come in and sit in the visitor gallery. By substituting the television set for doors, you have expanded the opportunity a million-fold.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Assemblywoman Roybal-Allard was saying that, in Congress, they don't have prunes running around. We had the California Raisins on the floor one week. Today we had the dancing prunes.

MR. ALLEN: That is a reaction shot.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: The final word goes to the publishers of this report.

PROFESSOR WESTEN: Since I have a 4:30 plane to catch, I have decided not to read the entire report into the record.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Perhaps Mr. Brenner has a parting shot before we go to you.

MR. BRENNER: It sounds like this Committee is inclined to move on this idea. One thing I have emphasized in this hearing is that the first step is the infrastructure. If you can convince the Assembly and the Senate to build a state-of-the-art television system for itself, providing that feed as the basic rare material for the

"California Channel," Tracy and his group and everyone around this table can do the rest in turning that into something public.

PROFESSOR WESTEN: That is our recommendation. The Legislature can benefit from an internal system internally. If cameras are in the various committee rooms and on the Floor, then anyone in their office can simply switch the dial on their television set and be able to monitor events throughout the entire building. Other legislatures in the other states and the Canadian Parliament have found that it is an enormous benefit to internal efficiency. Once those signals are available in-house, our proposal is to uplink by satellite and make them available to everyone -- to radio stations, people in rural areas who don't have cable but who have access to home satellite dishes, cable systems, public broadcast stations, commercial broadcast stations -- to everyone.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: For those of us who are chairs of committees, that is a little frightening, knowing how hard it is to get a quorum these days. People would be sitting up in their offices and we would never establish quorums in our committees.

PROFESSOR WESTEN: The first step that needs to be taken is an engineering study to examine what it would cost to put cable in the building. Part of that has already been done. Lighting is adequate in many rooms, so it is not a major expense. Second, the Legislature has to decide what options it wants. How many cameras? How many rooms wired? Where would they be and what are the

ground rules of coverage? Those steps can be taken fairly quickly, so that you know what your options are.

CHAIRWOMAN MOORE: Thank you. Before we do any of that, the Legislature is must decide what it wishes to do. From the recommendations we have heard today, the decisions to ulitize new technology for a more participatory government may be far easier for us to reach than some of the others.

I want to thank this panel. We will probably be doing a follow-up hearing, because I would like to offer members of Congress and other officials who have served in this body the opportunity to testify. This may be the first of several hearings we will hold around the state to see where we go from here.

Again, let me thank you for your testimony. It has been very enlightening. We will be in touch. Thank you for your participation.

MEETING ADJOURNED

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that proper record-keeping is essential for transparency and accountability, particularly in financial matters. The text suggests that organizations should implement robust systems to track every detail, from small expenses to major investments.

2. The second part of the document addresses the challenges of data management in a rapidly changing environment. It highlights the need for flexible and scalable solutions that can adapt to new technologies and data sources. The author argues that organizations must invest in training and infrastructure to ensure they can effectively handle the volume and variety of data they are collecting.

3. The third part of the document focuses on the importance of communication and collaboration. It stresses that no single department or individual can manage the entire process successfully. Instead, it requires a coordinated effort across all levels of the organization. The text provides several examples of how effective communication can lead to better outcomes and more efficient processes.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the role of leadership in driving change and innovation. It argues that leaders must be proactive in identifying opportunities and challenges, and must be willing to take calculated risks. The text also emphasizes the importance of fostering a culture of continuous learning and improvement, where employees are encouraged to share ideas and learn from each other.

5. The fifth part of the document concludes by summarizing the key points and offering final thoughts. It reiterates the importance of maintaining accurate records, managing data effectively, communicating well, and leading by example. The author expresses confidence that these principles will guide organizations toward greater success and sustainability in the future.