



**Final Observations  
in CRTC 2015-421  
Review of Local and Community TV**

**February 16, 2015**

# Table of Contents

	<b>Paragraph #</b>
Financing.....	2
Responses to Questions and Comments Raised by Others.....	17
Governance by Not-for-Profit Community-Elected Boards.....	19
The Possibility that Multiple Groups Might Apply in a License Area, that There Would Be “Turf Wars”, or that “Groups on the Right” Might Compete with “Groups on the Left” .....	25
The Difference Between a Not-for-Profit Board and a Citizen Advisory Council.....	33
There is No Conflict Between Access and Quality.....	35
Demand by Canadians for a Not-for-Profit Model of Community TV.....	40
The Difference Between Quebec and Other Provinces.....	43
Telus “Access Producers” Are Really Independent Commissioned Producers.....	46
Restatement of Our Proposals.....	52
CAMF Could Help Public and Private Broadcasters Too.....	54

1. The comments set out below represent the final observations of CACTUS. CACTUS reaffirms all of the proposals and comments set out in our November 6, 2015 and January 5, 2016 submissions, as well as the proposed trial of community media centres filed on February 9, 2016.

### **Stable Sources of Operational Financing Needed for All Not-for-Profit Community TV Organizations**

2. As detailed in our January 5<sup>th</sup> submission to this proceeding, presently close to 70 unlicensed not-for-profit TVCs and licensed not-for-profit community TV stations contribute access programming to the Canadian broadcasting system. This access programming includes more than 10,000 hours that the BDUs use to satisfy their regulatory 'access minima' of 50% (or 30% in exempted systems). A number of public libraries and other community media organizations including radio stations and video co-operatives are also willing to generate access TV content with additional financing.
3. We are delighted that the Commission is interested in our proposed community media centre model. The trial that CACTUS has proposed in response to an undertaking requested by the Commission panel, will, if adopted by the Commission, 'test-drive' (what we presume will ultimately be) a small number of such centres as a precursor to a full roll-out of community-owned TV channels across Canada.
4. We remain concerned, however, regarding the sustainability and development of the remainder of these nearly 70 organizations and the burgeoning potential and interest of other community-based organizations such as libraries and radio stations to contribute to a community TV mandate. The survival of these groups must not be imperiled pending the successful outcome of the trial and the eventual launch of a Community-Access Media Fund to support more of such centres.
5. Furthermore, while the community media centre model may seem new at the regulatory level as a consistent and coherent approach to community media service delivery in the digital era, our members have underscored to us since the trial was proposed last week that many of them have been on the road to a multimedia service model for some time. Whether or not they are picked as one of the few 'trial sites' should not discourage their development. For example, several of our license-holding members already simultaneously offer community TV and radio, as do some members of the Fedetvc, and some unlicensed services such as FirstTel TV5 in Manitoulin. Most Fedetvc and CACTUS members already provide some community news and information on their web sites to accompany Internet streams of their programming.
6. What is 'new' about the community media centre proposal is full articulation of what has been happening 'on the ground' of its own accord, but which is currently hampered by a severe lack of funding. For example, the Commission heard from Sid Tan of Carnegie TV, about how the W2 Media Centre in Vancouver had pursued a multimedia model, but was unsustainable. Although Carnegie TV provided substantial content to Shaw, which helped Shaw satisfy its regulatory access exhibition minima, W2 (and all the other TVCs in the Vancouver region)

have never received any funding from Shaw for these efforts. Each of these TVCs has been self-funded and many are just barely hanging on. We do not want any community media centre trial to inadvertently become a reason that all other not-for-profits who have clung on by their fingernails to provide high-quality access services to Canadians during the difficulty policy environment of the last decade are ignored and left by the wayside, while a handful of lucky organizations participate in a three-year trial which may or may not lead to more widespread support for citizen-owned and -operated community TV and media, or to the Community-Access Media Fund that constituted our main proposal.

7. The trial must not become the latest reason in an 18-year struggle to stall the development of a healthy not-for-profit community television sector. If the Commission is satisfied that not-for-profit TVCs and licensed community television undertakings have been productively contributing to the Canadian television broadcasting system for the last decade (which they have), all such entities should be immediately supported and recruited as the most cost-effective way to help meet the Commission's goal of making more news and information available to Canadians outside major markets. The community sector offers the only effective method of achieving this goal outside the 59 largest markets that are host to public and private broadcasters, none of whom have proposed serving additional markets as the community sector can.
8. The trial should be viewed as a trial to develop best practices specifically of a *multimedia approach* to providing media access to Canadians, including both traditional and new media. This trial *should not hold up* the demonstrated capacity of existing TVCs and licensed not-for-profit community TV organizations to fulfill the community element's mandate, and the Commission's current goal of making more news and local information available outside major markets. When the trial is done, these TVCs and licensed broadcasters can apply the best practices learned in the trial in their own operations to become full-blown multimedia centres if they choose. If we allow them to go under because they are not sustainable while the trial is taking place, everyone loses, especially the Canadians outside major markets that are most in need of local information.
9. CACTUS submits that funding for these groups is necessary now, regardless of whether the trial is adopted or not. Without much-needed funding, many of these groups—who have been an instrumental and valuable source of access programming—will cease to exist. At best, they will continue to underachieve, rather than fulfilling their potential to respond fully to the need for more local information to serve Canada's smaller communities.
10. Therefore, if for any reason the Community-Access Media Fund (CAMF) that we have proposed is not established as a result of this proceeding, CACTUS proposes the following funding mechanisms for not-for-profit community TV corporations:
  - *License-holding not-for-profit community television broadcasters be admitted to the Small-Market Local Programming Fund* (the SMLPF).

11. We note that all CACTUS members currently meet the eligibility criteria for this fund: they serve markets with fewer than 300,000 people, and are independently owned and operated. The SMLPF should also be open to not-for-profit community broadcasters that seek digital-only undertaking licenses in cases where it is not possible to broadcast over-the-air; for example, in light of the current Industry Canada moratorium on new OTA licenses with a pending 600 MHz auction, or in the case of markets where no OTA frequency is currently available.
12. The amount of funding available from the SMLPF for such community licensees should reflect the community-access production model, and serve as a 'top-up' to existing sources of operational funding, consistent with the small, medium and large community budgets provided both with our proposed trial and in our January 5<sup>th</sup> submission. Dollar for dollar, funding provided to community broadcasters can be used to generate between 5 and 10 times as much content as funding provided to private- or public-sector TV broadcasters.
  - ***Additional Funding to SMLPF Should be Allocated to Organizations that Deliver incremental or Higher Quality Local Programming***
13. If the SMLPF receives additional funding as a result of this proceeding, we submit that it should be allocated exclusively to organizations that undertake to deliver incremental local programming compared to what they offer today, or which can substantiate that hours of production going forward are produced at a higher quality or in genres that require more resources than they produced before.
14. We leave it to the Commission to decide whether additional hours of production must be 'news' and the definition of 'news' for private-sector applicants, but we would underline that in the case of not-for-profit community broadcasters managed by boards of directors elected by the communities they serve, the particular format of incremental production should be decided by the community. The tightly packaged 'news hour' favoured in large markets a) may or may not be desired in the small communities that many of our members serve and b) may not fit a volunteer-enhanced model of production.
  - ***BDUs Should be Required to Fund TVCs and Licenced Not-For-Profit Community Channels that Supply Access Programming***
15. If a Community-Access Media (or similar) Fund is not created as a result of this proceeding and some BDUs continue to operate community channels with some or all of the current budget for local reflection (1.5-5% of their revenues, depending on their situation), we support the proposal by Télévision Communautaire de Frontenac that ***TVCs that do not pursue independent licensing in order to apply to the SMLPF should be provided financial support by the BDU to whom they contribute access content*** in proportion to the amount of the BDU's access exhibition requirements that they meet. In the case of Quebec TVCs, this amount should not be less in dollars than they received in the 2014/15 programming year, until such time as CAMF or a similar fund is available to support them.

- ***The Commission should Licence Community-Owned Community Channels if BDUs fail to Abide by the Community Television Policy.***

16. The Commission should honour the spirit and letter of the clause in Broadcasting Public Notice CRTC 2002-61 and Broadcasting Regulatory Policy CRTC 2010-622 that stipulates that in cases where a BDU does not operate its community channel in accordance with the policy, a not-for-profit undertaking within the license area should be licensed to offer community TV services in its stead, with the applicable percentage of revenues available for the purpose. We note that we supported ICTV Montreal's application under this clause, and that there are over 80 complaints of non-compliance outstanding against Canadian licensed and exempt BDUs as at this date.
17. While this mechanism would address the need for both access and more hyperlocal content in some jurisdictions, the current method of calculating funds available for local expression as a percentage of terrestrial BDU subscriptions favours large urban areas at the expense of rural settings, which may be more reliant on DTH services and whose populations are smaller. For this reason, we favour (in the long term) the creation of a Community-Access Media Fund, in which adequate operational funding is made available for not-for-profit entities to offer community media services to all communities.

## Responses to Questions and Comments by Others

18. We would like to address several issues raised by Commissioners, as well as issues raised by other parties during the oral component in this proceeding. We will address the issues raised by the Commission first.

### Governance by Not-for-Profit Community-Elected Boards

19. Various Commissioners and the Chair expressed uncertainty in their questions to various interveners (for example, to the Fédétvc, ELAN, and PIAC) about the stability and experience of not-for-profit community-elected boards to manage community TV licenses and budgets. We would like to respond to these concerns, as we believe they are unfounded.
20. There are approximately 170 not-for-profit community-elected boards of community radio stations in place today. These not-for-profit community elected boards already manage licenses and budgets raised from a variety of sources and ensure that their radio stations operate in accordance with Commission policy. We are not aware that they have had a greater number of regulatory issues as a group than TV or radio licenses in the public and private sectors. Greater accountability is in fact built into community not-for-profit licenses as administrators of public money, in that they report to the communities they serve and members of the community can participate directly in governance, versus for-profit entities that report to shareholders and have a specific mandate to maximize profit, which may be (and often is) at odds with a public-service mandate. Such entities may also not be headquartered in the communities they serve.
21. There are almost 70 not-for-profit community television organizations already in existence in Canada. Seven are licensed. At least one that we know of (FirstTel) is unlicensed, yet has maintained a regular programming schedule on Manitoulin Island for 26 years. Of the 60-odd unlicensed TVCs that contribute to the schedules of BDU community channels, approximately 20 manage the entire programming schedule on behalf of their BDUs (in Quebec), including preparing and filing appropriate paperwork with the Commission. The remaining 20-odd TVCs in Quebec file regular reports to account for the money they receive from the Quebec Ministry of Culture, which they say are more than the reports that license-holders file with the Commission. Of the just under 20 TVCs outside Quebec, many receive funding from municipalities, foundations, and other sources, and report regularly to these entities.
22. These almost 70 incorporated, stable community TV-producing not-for-profit organizations already contribute more than 11,000 hours of new television production to the Canadian broadcasting system every year, more cost-effectively than the public and private sectors. All of these almost 70 organizations already have experience among them managing public, foundation, and municipal budgets, fundraising for themselves, managing licenses (some of them), and filing paperwork with the Commission (some of them).

23. The transfer of experience and skills (including governance experience and skills) is the purpose of industry associations such as CACTUS, the Fédétvc, the NCRA, the ARC du Quebec, and ARC du Canada. These associations educate members about applicable codes, filing procedures, and regulations. Canada is in fact fortunate in having a wealth of experience managing not-for-profit community media.
24. If the Commission implements the community-owned and -operated community media policy that CACTUS and many others in this proceeding support, the funding and operation of such channels will be in capable hands.

***The Possibility that Multiple Groups Might Apply in a License Area, that There Would Be "Turf Wars", or that "Groups on the Right" Might Compete with "Groups on the Left"***

25. Commissioners raised the possibility that more than one not-for-profit group might apply for a license to run a community TV undertaking in a given area.
26. Currently, when frequencies open up—for example in major markets, as recently occurred in Toronto for an Aboriginal radio frequency—the Commission purposefully posts a notice of consultation to encourage multiple applications in order that it can select the 'best' or most viable. A competitive licensing process for community TV is not a departure from past Commission practice.
27. On the other hand, we don't view a competitive process as necessarily in the best interests of communities in terms of community media service. In part to address the need for stability and a non-partisan community television service, since 2010 we have proposed that stable institutions with a common interest in service to local residents should hold permanent seats on the board of community television organizations that seek public funding, such as from the Community-Access Media Fund (CAMF) that we propose. For example, we have proposed since 2010 (and reiterated this recommendation in the Community Media Centre Trial we submitted on February 9th) that a representative of the municipality hold a permanent seat. This would ensure:
- liaison in order to ensure municipal council and similar open-governance programming can be created
  - the needs of all residents are met (at least in theory; municipal councils are mandated to take into account the needs of all residents)
  - access to municipal legal, accounting, and other governance expertise is available to the channel as needed
28. We submit that municipalities holding a seat on the board of community TV channels will afford an ideal balance between providing stability and a global view of the community and



its needs, while limiting the possibility of political interference.

29. We also propose that permanent seats be filled by a representative of the local public library in order to assist in developing a media literacy and archiving strategy for the community media centre, and representatives of other stable community organizations representing a range of interests including educational institutions, the Chamber of Commerce, artistic and cultural organizations, and social service organizations. (Please see Appendix C to the Trial Proposal we filed on February 9<sup>th</sup> for more details.) We propose that these permanent stable seats form approximately half of the board, and be balanced by seats elected by users and viewers of the community media centre to ensure that it meets the day-to-day access needs of the community.
30. Using this suggested board structure, it would be unusual for two groups in the same community to submit a license application, since these bodies (the municipal council, public library, local educational institutions and Chamber of Commerce) would already have flagged a dual application process. Interested citizens would have to work together with their local institutions to make sure all interest groups are represented on the proposed board, and Commissioner Simpson's suggestion that the Commission might receive competing applications from 'a right-wing group over here, and a left-wing group over there' just wouldn't happen. This internal process of self-reflection and development of a broadly representative board is a healthy and necessary precursor to setting up a community TV channel that will be reflective of all members of its community and is to be encouraged.
31. Public libraries in particular are viewed as honest brokers. They are in the business of ensuring that the media literacy needs of the whole community are met, and that the platform itself is a neutral 'pipe' to enable the individual self-expression of community members. The community media organization itself should not have an editorial voice or 'line' per se.
32. Furthermore, CACTUS itself has experienced when making applications to arts and development funding bodies that if an application fails to meet the criteria of a fund, fund coordinators will provide feedback on how to better meet the criteria in the next round. If multiple applications were to arrive at the CRTC from a single community, either one would have the backing of the community organizations mentioned above (including the municipality) and the other would not (making the selection clear), or the mere fact of receiving two would be a flag to the Commission that the community was not ready for a license, because it hadn't adequately held public consultations to ensure that all groups are represented in the board structure and application process.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In our January 5<sup>th</sup> supplemental submission, however, we detailed that we are not against multiple community TV licenses in an area if, for example, an applicant wanted a license to serve only a third-language community, or a particular religious group (for which the current low-power and digital community undertakings exist). This is one of the reasons we proposed that a new "community-access community TV license" be created with open-access criteria and broad community board representation as described above in order to be eligible for public funding to support a wide community-access mandate anticipated under the Broadcasting Act, and to replace the current BDU model.

*The Difference Between a Not-for-Profit Board and a Citizen Advisory Council*

33. Several of the Commissioners asked various interveners whether access by citizens to TV broadcasting could be ensured if the CRTC requires BDUs to implement citizen advisory councils, and if they (the interveners) would be satisfied with such a solution.
34. There are three key problems with this proposal:
- i. As Commissioners themselves stated several times, it is the licensee that has legal responsibility for the content aired. Therefore, even if BDUs implement 'citizen advisory councils' (such as have been recommended since the first policies in the 1970s but rarely implemented), the BDU will always have both the power and the responsibility to override the advisory board on programming decisions. Citizens will know this. The first time their decisions are overridden they will be discouraged. When people volunteer their time, they want it to count and for their views to be respected. BDUs themselves do not want these councils (or else they would have implemented them already), nor would they facilitate access programming if they weren't required to do so by regulation, as several of them acknowledged during the oral proceeding. Imposing such citizen advisory councils would create more opportunities for conflict and frustration by citizens as they will still not be able to plan their own community media resource as an integral part of the community.
  - ii. A community-access media service is more than just a set of programming decisions. When a community manages a resource such as a media centre, it:
    - plans the facility design for maximum access by community members at all hours of the day, ease of access on bus routes, the availability of free parking, and so on. (We heard in the oral proceeding about the mismatch between community needs and the single 'access point' for Shaw volunteers in Vancouver... a corporate tower with no free parking)
    - purchases robust equipment models that are easy to use
    - makes content freely available to the whole community, not just to BDU subscribers

It is in the DNA of private corporations to think competitively, on behalf of shareholders. It is not in their DNA to consider the needs of the least or most marginalized of its community members. The conception, design and delivery of community media services go far beyond just programming decisions.

It is also part of the process for a community to mature to plan and negotiate how to deploy scarce resources, including resources to facilitate the community's own capacity for dialogue and internal communications. This happens on a not-for-profit elected board where notions of community and community service must be negotiated. Yes,

there may be growing pains, but these are the growing pains of the community as a whole as the community media organization becomes part of its fabric for the long term.

- iii. Even if the Commission mandates citizen advisory councils for BDU community channels, it doesn't mean such councils will either be implemented or meet the spirit or intent of the policy, just as the Commission's change in regulatory policy to increase the access minimum in 2010 from 30% to 50% of the programming schedule has not resulted, in many cases, in any additional access in practice. If an organization is ill equipped to deliver a service (such as BDUs have become in respect to the delivery of community media following more than a decade of technical and ownership restructuring), no amount of policy-making on paper can overcome the essential mismatch between community need and 'the geography of BDUs'.

**There is No Conflict Between Access and Quality**

35. Another thread in the Commission's questions concerned the relationship between production "quality" and access by ordinary citizens. As was well articulated in the responses to the survey done by the Community Media Policy Working Group, the point of community media organizations is to serve as the bridge between the raw expressive ideas of citizens (such as the unmoderated opinions expressed on the Internet) and the need to package those ideas so that they are accessible to television audiences. This is why community media organizations exist: to leverage that raw creative potential, train it, guide it, and package the results so that those citizens can be heard by their fellows.
36. While there will always be differences in ability and editorial quality from story to story and program to program, there are aspects to 'quality' beyond simply technical slickness that are recognized by the Broadcasting Act. The Act recognizes that the community element is complementary to the public and private sectors. The community element brings the possibility for:
  - greater geographic and editorial diversity of content
  - depth and subjectivity of expression and exploration of topics
  - greater ability to take risks
37. The community element therefore introduces the possibility for greater depth, editorial diversity, and creativity within the system, which contribute to its overall quality.
38. The presentation by Vice highlighted the blurred line between subjective journalism and quality. Their slick presentation spoke of technical 'quality' (which is possible given money and adequate technical support for citizen content also), but deliberately eschewed the very same standards of 'objective journalism' that Friends of Canadian Broadcasting and groups such as the Forum for Research and Policy in Communications endorsed as necessary for high-quality news journalism. This point was brought home to CACTUS when it received a request for an interview from a staff person at a regional CBC news bureau during the hearing

process. It was a bureau in a city of a million people, which one would have thought would be well resourced, employing the kind of highly trained journalists groups such as Friends endorse. Yet this person had not read the public notice of consultation and had no idea what the policy review was about. She was less well informed than any one of the more than 20 community media groups intervening. Technical and editorial quality have a more close relationship to funding than to any particular element of the broadcasting system. A well-funded community media organization with seasoned professionals to guide citizen volunteers may generate higher 'quality' content than a poorly funded public broadcast bureau.

39. There is no magic bullet, but the Broadcasting Act embodies the wisdom that you need complementary contributions by all three elements to ensure balanced access by all Canadians to adequate local, Canadian and international reflection, news, information, entertainment, and cultural content.

*Demand by Canadians for a Not-for-Profit Model of Community TV*

40. Chairman Blais asked the Fédétvc what proof it had that citizens in the communities they serve want their subscriber contributions to be used to support the TVC rather than a BDU community channel. Both CACTUS in this proceeding and the Fédétvc in prior proceedings have filed survey data that indicate much higher viewership to not-for-profit community-owned channels (in excess of 45% weekly reach) compared to BDU community channels (1.5% of weekly reach). (See appendices B and C in our Jan. 5<sup>th</sup> submission.)
41. The Let's Talk process itself confirmed that Canadians want access to local news and information, which is the most watched category of information produced by CACTUS and Fédétvc members. Outside the 59 largest Canadian communities, there is no one but CACTUS and Fédétvc members—and new community TV organizations that operate using the same volunteer- and community-amplified model—that can serve smaller communities.
42. Finally, where no viable and locally responsive community media exist, groups spontaneously arise to fill the need, but they're often financially fragile and ultimately unsustainable; such as the W2 example in Vancouver (responding to the vacuum left by Shaw), the multitude of TVCs in Quebec operating within the license areas of BDUs, CACTUS member OTA license holders in small communities where BDU community channels have closed, and gaming groups that have sprung up to address the need for new media skills training in big cities. The fact that TVCs exist at all (and are community-run and -operated) means the community wants them. These 70 not-for-profit entities are not imposed upon communities from outside; they have evolved within their communities. If they hadn't, they wouldn't be there. All of these groups are supported by 1000s of volunteer hours, the goodwill of dozens of supportive community service organizations, and the personal sacrifices of the underpaid staff and uncompensated board members who lovingly see that they survive from year to year in an inhospitable policy environment. They do this because they know that *community media matters*. It's the glue that holds our communities together.

*The Difference Between Quebec and Other Provinces*

43. Chairman Blais asked the Fédétvc about the difference between Quebec TVCs as a model and community TV in the rest of Canada, following an exchange regarding the fact that Quebec's 40-odd TVCs have a combined budget of approximately \$7 million. It was implied in the exchange that this \$7 million is raised by the TVCs through their own efforts in each license area, and therefore Chairman Blais wondered why this apparently effective fundraising methodology couldn't be applied elsewhere. We believe it's important for the Commission to understand that the majority of the budget of Quebec TVCs derives from two sources that are not available to TVCs or licensed not-for-profit community TV license holders in the rest of Canada. These two factors account for the much greater number of TVCs in Quebec per capita:
- The Quebec Ministry of Culture provides direct financial subsidies to TVCs in Quebec. To date, no other provincial ministry has offered support for community television.
  - After Videotron cut off many Montreal-area TVCs from access to cable distribution in the late 1990s and early 2000s (which led to the founding of the Fédétvc), Videotron was asked specifically by the Commission to contribute financially to the support of TVCs in Quebec. Other TVCs in Quebec appear to have followed this precedent. While both CACTUS and individual TVCs in English Canada have asked Rogers and Shaw for financial support, we and they have so far been refused.
44. These two sources account for the majority of the budget of \$7 million reported by the Fédétvc. While we are not seeking to gainsay their testimony, we wanted to answer from the point of view of non-Quebecois TVCs where the difference lies.
45. Other than this fact, TVCs in other parts of Canada (the majority of which are located in the Vancouver area) operate in the same fashion as in Quebec. They auto-finance however they can, and contribute their content to the community TV channels of BDUs, yet are not compensated for helping the BDUs to meet their regulatory access exhibition requirements.

*Telus "Access Producers" Are Really Independent Commissioned Producers*

46. We have pointed out in the past that terrestrial BDUs that offer VOD platforms but which offer no bricks and mortar production facilities cannot facilitate "access" production. They have nowhere to offer the public training, equipment access and production support. To expend their "access production" budgets, they write cheques to independent producers who perform do not need training, and own, lease or rent their own equipment.
47. We note that in the finding of non-compliance against Videotron, the Commission agreed with CACTUS' and ICTV's definition of access, which is that a professional broadcaster, host, or technician who is paid or contracted by the BDU is not an 'access producer'.
48. During the testimony of the "independent producers" on the Telus panel, the non-access

nature of this production was clear. At line 11515, Ms. Mainville-Neeson, Telus' Vice President of Broadcasting Policy and Regulatory Affairs, introduced her fellow panelists as "independent producers" as "the heart and soul of TELUS' community programming services", whereas it is the longstanding vision and stated goal of the Commission's community television policy that citizens are the "cornerstone" of its community television policy, not independent producers. She introduced Matt Embry, who she stated has been "commissioned" to produce the series *People We Love*, Arielle Boisvert, who "with an access programming grant from Optik Local", produces the series *Eastside Stories* (coincidentally the name of a series once produced by first Rogers and then later Shaw volunteers), Ramin Eshraghi-Yazdi who produces "the access series called *Cowtown*". Mr. Eshraghi-Yazdi is with Nur Films, which the company's web site describes as "a full-service creative agency specializing in film and video for all applications from development to delivery.". These are professional independent producers.

49. At line 11566 Mr. Eshraghi-Yazdi states, "I personally have a production company in Calgary and I have camera gear as well, and I know of other producers who have accessed the Telus grants that use their own camera packages that are also in a way subsidized, so there's a lot of resources used."
50. Telus is using "access" expenditures to pay professional independent producers to make content. Ms. Boisvert is not a resident of Vancouver's Lower East Side. Like any professional journalist, she is reporting *about* that community. It is Sid Tan's Cargegie TV that is actually resident in the Lower East Side, enabling its street people, homeless, and addicts to speak for themselves, dropping in to a physical location to access cameras and assistance whenever they are able.
51. Later in the conversation, Telus' paid independent producers provide an example in which a \$10,000 "access grant" consisted of only \$1000 in equipment rentals, and it is implied that the remaining \$9,000 went into the producer's pocket. There is also a discussion of Telus' competitive "Storyhive" process in which only certain applicants are given "access grants". Community-access TV is not a granting system. It's supposed to be a system that provides equipment access and production support for non-professionals to express themselves. It is the experience of CACTUS members that when there is a common facility in a community, no one need be turned away and the process need not be competitive. There are sufficient cameras, editing facilities, and studio times that can be booked to get productions done. There are no cash budgets that limit access nor rationale for a competitive process.

## Restatement of Our Proposals

52. We would like to restate our proposals from our January 5<sup>th</sup> Supplemental submission. Nothing we have heard in testimony from other parties has changed them, and we refer the Commission to our January 5<sup>th</sup> supplemental submission for details regarding each one:

**Recommendation #1: Create a New “Community-Access Licence” Class**

**Recommendation #2: Clarify Status of For-Profit (Private) Channels**

**Recommendation #3: Leverage New Media**

**Recommendation #4: Pool Resources, Ensure Discoverability of Community Content**

**Recommendation 5: 2% Contribution from All BDUs Toward CAMF**

**Recommendation 6: Requirements for “Community-Access” Licence (Including 80% Local Production, 75% Access)**

**Recommendation #7: Distribute Content on Multiple Platforms**

**Recommendation #8: Remove Low-Power Limitation; Consider Community-Access License Holders Primary Assignments**

**Recommendation #9: Mandate Carriage by Terrestrial BDUSs throughout Service Area Approved by Commission**

**Recommendation #10: Reserve One Channel for Community Use; Assume Responsibility for Reserved Frequency of the Public Broadcaster?**

**Recommendation #11: Multiplex Community Broadcasters if No Frequency Available**

**Recommendation #12: Satellite Distribution**

**Recommendation #13: Maintain Community Signal Quality**

**Recommendation #14: Seamless Over-the-Air Viewing**

**Recommendation #15: Appoint an Ombudsperson for Community Element**

**Recommendation #16: Initiate a Consultation with Parliament to Re-Examine Restriction on Municipal Licenses**

**Recommendation #17: Cease Dividing Community Channels (and Communities) by Language**

53. We would also like to restate our conviction that the \$151 million currently collected by BDUs for the purpose of providing Canadians with access to television broadcasting is the right amount and is needed for this purpose, although the current management by BDUs has been ineffectual at meeting the Commission's policy goals for the community element. Any diminution of this amount in order to direct it to the private sector as a hand-out for whatever purpose is both a distortion of the purpose and goals of private-sector broadcasting—which is a business—and will necessarily hobble the community element and deprive Canadians of access to the broadcasting system to which they are entitled under the Broadcasting Act.

### **CAMF Could Assist Public and Private Broadcasters as Well**

54. While we did not have time to raise this issue during our oral comments, we wanted to respond to the Commission's suggestion in its Working document that the sectors (community, public, private) might help each other to fill the need for adequate local reflection for Canadians.
55. Since 2012, CACTUS is on the record proposing partnerships between public and community media in order to increase the quantity, diversity, and quality of local content available to Canadians. We first presented a research paper in partnership with Karen Wirsig of the Canadian Media Guild in 2012 at the Journalism Strategies conference at McGill in Montreal (and we have placed this report on the record of prior proceedings). This paper explored various possible models for partnership, including facilities sharing (e.g. reclaiming CBC transmission towers), as well as content sharing. We would like to reiterate that an adequately funded community sector could supply raw footage or edited stories from the regions (wherever the community media centres have members) for use by public- and private-sector TV broadcasters to increase the range and diversity of their coverage of communities where they have no presence. We note that part of the Community Media Centre Trial that we propose is to develop an adequate digital archival strategy. This could be the first step in such a database of regional content and stories.

\*\*\*\*\*

56. The time for community ownership of community television is now and we ask the Commission to make this happen. We thank the Commission for the opportunity to participate in this proceeding.