1 of 3

EUGENE F. ELANDER
23 HEMLOCK STREET
HILLSBOROUGH, NH 03244
603-464-6272
elanders@isp.com

TO: FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
November 15, 2006
ATTN: TELEVISION STATION RELICENSING UNIT
445 12TH Street, Southwest
Washington, DC 20554

RE;
RELICENSING APPLICATION OF WMUR-TV, MANCHESTER NH

3 NOTE!

THIS COVER LETTER AND THE ATTACHMENTS CONTAIN THE ESSENCE OF SEVERAL COMPLAINTS AGAINST WMUR-TV OF MANCHESTER, NH, WHICH IS DUE TO BE RELICENSED IN 2007. I UNDERSTAND THAT NO APPLICATION WILL BE FILED UNTIL DECEMBER BY THEIR ATTORNEYS, BUT SINCE I WILL BE GOING TO SWEDEN IN DECEMBER, I AM FILING THIS COMPLAINT NOW.
WHILE I AM IN SWEDEN UNTIL AUGUST 2007, I CAN BE REACHED BY EMAIL TO: elanders@isp.com (same address as here in New Hampshire.)
(Please note per top attachment that I tried to file this complaint on-line but received no reply at all from your "fccinfo" link, which is most unfortunate.)

The essence of my complaints, illustrated by the November 13 email (attached) from WMUR station manager Jeffrey S. Bartlett, Exhibit 3,
is the persistent and consistent failure of WMUR, which boasts "Nobody Covers New Hampshire Like We Do" (the poor grammar is theirs)
to carry out its basic public responsibilities of full, fair, balanced, and thoroughly-documented coverage of vital New Hampshire issues, with
the result that our residents (including police officers) are put at unnecessary and severe risks of injury, property damage, and even death.

Further grounds for this complaint include WMUR's failure to provide substantive information as to just who and what unit will handle their re-licensing, making it difficult to reach the re-licensers directly (see Exhibit 2.) It is obvious that they hope to defuse complaints by making it difficult for the complainants to reach the appropriate people or sections at the FCC. Their attorneys admittedly have that information or they could not do the necessary re-licensing application, but Station Manager Bartlett manages to avoid making the one phone call to those attorneys to get that data.
In addition, my wife and I watch WMUR at various times of day, and always see the evening news programs at 6 and 11 pm, and have only seen
ONE REFERENCE TO THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO GIVE INPUT TO THE FCC IN THE PAST TWO MONTHS. I doubt that WMUR is making any real effort to

encourage its viewership to provide that vital input to the FCC, which may also be a violation of your re-licensing requirements.
The FCC should absolutely require WMUR to document exactly when and how they ran spots about the FCC re-licensing process for the public.

The specific failures of WMUR to cover major issues and situations in New Hampshire involve, first, the severe flooding of Fall, 2005, with the loss of seven lives in the southwestern part of the State, millions of dollars of property damage, much of which could have been avoided by such simple emergency preparedness as cleaning out culverts and drainage ditches, warning the public well in advance of the flooding, and similar measures. My SCOPE proposal (see Exhibits 5 and 6) would have greatly mitigated that damage, and reduced the scope of other disasters as well.
(I can email you the full SCOPE proposal if you send me a valid email address.)
WMUR was given all of the attached materials on SCOPE and related to the flooding, but as their Station Manager admits in Exhibit 3, the most they did – if they even did that – was to ask Emergency Services about the proposal, the same Emergency Services who had sat on their hands for several years after first endorsing the proposal as the NH Office of Emergency Management (see Exhibit 5). WMUR's listless inquiry into ways of mitigating flooding and other disasters was like asking the Fox how the Hens are doing – Emergency Services helped make the problem, so of course they would not admit the need to reduce and mitigate it. Thus, WMUR destroyed the public's right to know that New Hampshire and its residents are at unnecessary and severe risks due to incompetence.

The second failure of WMUR to meet the public interest criteria of the FCC occurred with their coverage of the tragic shooting death of Officer Mike Briggs in Manchester, wherein an officer on a bicycle was sent into a dangerous neighborhood known to be a center of drug deals and violence
to investigate a domestic violence complaint without adequate backup, patrol cars, a SWAT team or other protection. The officer was killed, due in my professional opinion to negligence by the Manchester police's command structure as much as by the horrid criminal conduct of the shooter. But WMUR did nothing, zero, nada to get at the root cause of the shooting, namely the incredibly-unwise use of bicycle officers in violent situations.
Instead, they spent much "news" coverage on the tragic loss of Officer Briggs, his funeral, and so on, without even raising the issue of the wisdom of such dangerous bike patrols. The station is based in Manchester and claims to handle New Hampshire's issues, but not the touchy ones like this,
even if lives might be saved. I sent them full documentation of the above facts, including an analysis of what needs to be done to prevent similar tragedies in the future. Again, there was zero coverage, and also zero response on the issue. That is hiding the truth, and a disservice to our police.

What WMUR does love to do is to hype up their website, so than on many "news" shows the viewers are told that they can get all sorts of irrelevant and unrelated

information by going to WMUR.Com. The fact that much of that information appears to be in the form of advertisements from which WMUR receives revenue would not be so bad, if they spent nearly as much diligence on vital issues such as those raised above. Please investigate.

Sincerely, Eugene Elander 11/15/06

Eugene F. Elander, 23 Hemlock Street, Hillsborough NH 03244 and Stanga Box 89, 62315 Stanga Gotland Sweden; elanders@isp.com

(both locations)

Copy: Station Manager Bartlett
WMUR-TV (11/15/06)
(w/o attachments, sent by email previously)

Exhibit 1

From: "Birgit and Eugene Elander" <elanders@isp.com> **Block Address**
To: eelander@mail.plymouth.edu
Subject: **Fw: Regulation of Television Stations**
Date: Tue, 14 Nov 2006 06:00:57 -0500

Reply | Reply All | Forward | Print | Delete

----- Original Message -----
From: Birgit and Eugene Elander
To: eelander@mail.plymouth.edu
Sent: Sunday, November 12, 2006 7:48 PM
Subject: Fw: Regulation of Television Stations

----- Original Message -----
From: Birgit and Eugene Elander
To: fccinfo@fcc.gov
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2006 11:39 AM
Subject: Regulation of Television Stations

WMUR, New Hampshire's TV station, is now up for relicensing. I understand that the FCC will be doing an evaluation of WMUR. I have input to provide, and would like to know the best FCC email and regular mail addresses to which I can send my information and comments. If there is a division or person to whom I should write, please also notify me. Please reply to elanders@isp.com.
Thank you very much, Eugene Elander, 23 Hemlock St., Hillsborough NH 03244 603-464-6272

No Reply! — Whoever covers your info link is asleep at the computer, 😊

Reply | Reply All | Forward | Print | Delete

Top

SUNGARD HIGHER EDUCATION

Exhibit 2

From: "Birgit and Eugene Elander" <elanders@isp.com> **Block Address**
To: eelander@mail.plymouth.edu
Subject: **Fw: Specific FCC data**
Date: Tue, 14 Nov 2006 06:00:42 -0500

Reply | Reply All | Forward | Print | Delete

----- Original Message -----
From: Birgit and Eugene Elander
To: avrees@hearst.com
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2006 7:32 AM
Subject: Specific FCC data

Per my earlier email, I am contacting the FCC regarding your re-licensing, citing two major stories you refused to cover: **how flooding and other disasters could better be prevented or mitigated in NH**; and **how dangerous it is to send bicycle officers into high-risk neighborhoods at night.** I gave you data on both of these issues; what is lacking at WMUR is the courage to tackle them. Failure to cover these issues was and is a disservice to our State and people. The FCC will be informed of your selective coverage while you prefer to hype up junk on your website.

The FCC address you provided has failed to respond on the above. Therefore, I need the specific unit of the FCC with which you are dealing, and a name or email address of the person supervising their WMUR review.
If I cannot obtain this from you, I will ask my new Congressman to try to secure it as one of his first tasks. I will also make sure that the FCC knows you failed to provide any specific data. By the way, you have not announced the FCC licensing review for a considerable period of time on the station news, as far as I know.

Eugene Elander, consumer economist, Hillsborough, NH elanders@isp.com

Reply | Reply All | Forward | Print | Delete

Top

From: "Birgit and Eugene Elander" <elanders@isp.com> **Block Address**
To: eelander@mail.plymouth.edu
Subject: **Fw: Specific FCC data**
Date: Tue, 14 Nov 2006 06:00:28 -0500

Exhibit 3

Reply | Reply All | Forward | Print | Delete

----- Original Message -----
From: "Jeffrey S Bartlett" <jbartlett@hearst.com>
To: <elanders@isp.com>
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2006 1:59 PM
Subject: Fw: Specific FCC data

>
>
>
>
>
>
> Dear Mr. Elander,
>
> In response to your e-mail let me say first, since no one in the news
> department has any specific expertise in flood mitigation they checked
with
> the state Department of Emergency Management concerning your
suggestions.
> They told us your suggestions had little merit. Frankly, if you feel
your
> ideas are worth consideration you should take them to those in
government
> who can actually understand your analysis and apply it if they find it
has
> value. Failing that, you could always send them to the governor. It is
> unclear if you have done either of those things. If this is so
important
I
> would think you would take it to those who have the power to do
something
> about it. You have to understand we get hundreds of story ideas from
> viewers and follow up on those we can confirm and find news worthy.
Many
> times stories are not or can not be confirmed or not pursued for a
variety
> of other reasons including time constraints, cost etc.
>
> We do not have any specific information on who at the FCC will be
looking
> at our license renewal application. That is handled by our FCC
attorneys
> and the application will not even be made until December 1. We have
been
> following the FCC procedure for notifying the public concerning the
renewal
> which requires announcements to be run in specific day parts on
specific
> days. You might try the FCC website for more information on who to
> contact.

>
> Best Regards,
> Jeff Bartlett
> General Manager
>
>
> "Birgit and
> Eugene Elander" To:
<avrees@hearst.com>
> <elanders@isp.com cc:
> > Subject: Specific FCC
data
>
> 11/13/2006 07:32
> AM
>
>
>
>
>
> Per my earlier email, I am contacting the FCC regarding your
re-licensing,
> citing two major stories you refused to cover: how flooding and other
> disasters could better be prevented or mitigated in NH; and how
dangerous
> it is to send bicycle officers into high-risk neighborhoods at night.
I
> gave you data on both of these issues; what is lacking at WMUR is the
> courage to tackle them. Failure to cover these issues was and is a
> disservice to our State and people. The FCC will be informed of your
> selective coverage while you prefer to hype up junk on your website.
>
> The FCC address you provided has failed to respond on the above.
> Therefore, I need the specific unit of the FCC with which you are
dealing,
> and a name or email address of the person supervising their WMUR
review.
> If I cannot obtain this from you, I will ask my new Congressman to try
to
> secure it as one of his first tasks. I will also make sure that the
FCC
> knows you failed to provide any specific data. By the way, you have
not
> announced the FCC licensing review for a considerable period of time on
the
> station news, as far as I know.
>
> Eugene Elander, consumer economist, Hillsborough, NH
> elanders@isp.com
>
>
>
>
>
>
> ==========
> This e-mail message is intended for the personal use of the
recipient(s)
named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review,

copy
or distribute this message.
>
> If you have received this communication in error, please notify the Hearst
Information Services HelpDesk (helpdesk@hearst.com) immediately by e-mail
and delete the original message.
>
> ==========
>

Reply | Reply All | Forward | Print | Delete

Top

SUNGARD HIGHER EDUCATION

Exhibit 4

From: "Birgit and Eugene Elander" <elanders@isp.com> **Block Address**
To: eelander@mail.plymouth.edu
Subject: **Fw: Specific FCC data**
Date: Tue, 14 Nov 2006 05:59:55 -0500

Reply | Reply All | Forward | Print | Delete

----- Original Message -----
From: "Birgit and Eugene Elander" <elanders@isp.com>
To: "Jeffrey S Bartlett" <jbartlett@hearst.com>
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2006 6:21 PM
Subject: Re: Specific FCC data

> You are a prime example of the old saying, My Mind Is Made Up, Don't Bother
> Me With The Facts -- facts which are that I had already taken all of your
> obvious suggestions, per emails sent after this one, to you and Mr. Vrees.
> Emergency Services is headed by an incompetent -- the SCOPE proposal was
> endorsed strongly by his predecessor, Woody Fogg, and deputy, Ed Murdough.
> But your news department's superficial inquiry was rebuffed because
> Emergency Services cannot admit that they dropped the hazard mitigation
> ball -- and because of lack of investigative reporting by your news staff,
> they get away with dropping that ball. No, your staff are not 60 Minutes,
> but they should know a put-off when they get it. They took the easy way
> out, while New Hampshire remains at unnecessary risk. That is shameful, and
> is the FCC's business.
>
> The forwarded items cover your other comments, but know that your own email
> will provide an excellent basis for my complaint to the FCC, so I must thank
> you for confirming my views of WMUR's unwillingness to deal with tough
> issues. Those views are based on my own career, which includes advanced
> degrees in economics as well as publishing a newspaper in Connecticut for
> ten years, producing and hosting a weekly radio show, and being affiliated
> with WHIO-TV in Dayton, Ohio in the 1960s. I know whereof I speak, which is
> more than I can say for WMUR. And I hope you have a log of when you have
> run or will run the re-licensing spots, as I have only seen one and we watch
> WMUR regularly and at different hours of the day, since NOBODY COVERS (UP)
> NEW HAMPSHIRE like you do. See you at the hearings, Eugene

> Elander
>
>
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Jeffrey S Bartlett" <jbartlett@hearst.com>
> To: <elanders@isp.com>
> Sent: Monday, November 13, 2006 1:59 PM
> Subject: Fw: Specific FCC data
>
>
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Dear Mr. Elander,
> >
> > In response to your e-mail let me say first, since no one in the news
> > department has any specific expertise in flood mitigation they
checked
> with
> > the state Department of Emergency Management concerning your
suggestions.
> > They told us your suggestions had little merit. Frankly, if you feel
your
> > ideas are worth consideration you should take them to those in
government
> > who can actually understand your analysis and apply it if they find
it
has
> > value. Failing that, you could always send them to the governor. It
is
> > unclear if you have done either of those things. If this is so
important
> I
> > would think you would take it to those who have the power to do
something
> > about it. You have to understand we get hundreds of story ideas from
> > viewers and follow up on those we can confirm and find news worthy.
Many
> > times stories are not or can not be confirmed or not pursued for a
variety
> > of other reasons including time constraints, cost etc.
> >
> > We do not have any specific information on who at the FCC will be
looking
> > at our license renewal application. That is handled by our FCC
attorneys
> > and the application will not even be made until December 1. We have
been
> > following the FCC procedure for notifying the public concerning the
> renewal
> > which requires announcements to be run in specific day parts on
specific
> > days. You might try the FCC website for more information on who to
> > contact.
> >

> > Best Regards,
> > Jeff Bartlett
> > General Manager
> >
> >
> > "Birgit and
> > Eugene Elander" To:
> <avrees@hearst.com>
> > <elanders@isp.com cc:
> > > Subject: Specific FCC
data
> >
>
> > 11/13/2006 07:32
> > AM
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Per my earlier email, I am contacting the FCC regarding your
re-licensing,
> > citing two major stories you refused to cover: how flooding and other
> > disasters could better be prevented or mitigated in NH; and how
dangerous
> > it is to send bicycle officers into high-risk neighborhoods at
night. I
> > gave you data on both of these issues; what is lacking at WMUR is the
> > courage to tackle them. Failure to cover these issues was and is a
> > disservice to our State and people. The FCC will be informed of your
> > selective coverage while you prefer to hype up junk on your website.
> >
> > The FCC address you provided has failed to respond on the above.
> > Therefore, I need the specific unit of the FCC with which you are
dealing,
> > and a name or email address of the person supervising their WMUR
review.
> > If I cannot obtain this from you, I will ask my new Congressman to
try
to
> > secure it as one of his first tasks. I will also make sure that the
FCC
> > knows you failed to provide any specific data. By the way, you have
not
> > announced the FCC licensing review for a considerable period of time
on
> the
> > station news, as far as I know.
> >
> > Eugene Elander, consumer economist, Hillsborough, NH
> > elanders@isp.com
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > ==========
> > This e-mail message is intended for the personal use of the

recipient(s)
> named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review, copy
> or distribute this message.
> >
> > If you have received this communication in error, please notify the Hearst
> Information Services HelpDesk (helpdesk@hearst.com) immediately by e-mail
> and delete the original message.
> >
> > ==========
> >
>

Exhibit 5

From: "Birgit and Eugene Elander" <elanders@isp.com> **Block Address**
To: jbartlett@hearst.com
Cc: eelander@mail.plymouth.edu
Subject: **Fw: SCOPE PROPOSAL by Eugene F. Elander, retired hazard mitigation consultant to NHOEM**
Date: Tue, 14 Nov 2006 05:59:35 -0500

Reply | Reply All | Forward | Print | Delete

Ignored - no reply, ever

Yes, I did do what you suggested - a year ago!

From: Birgit and Eugene Elander
To: BCHENEY@NH911.STATE.NH.US
Sent: Saturday, October 15, 2005 8:51 AM
Subject: SCOPE PROPOSAL by Eugene F. Elander, retired hazard mitigation consultant to NHOEM

Dear Director Cheney,
Knowing that you and Emergency Management are immensely busy with the severe flooding conditions, this email may seem like "back burner" material, but it deals with my SCOPE (Safer Communities through Organized Preventive Effort) proposal which, had it been implemented at the former NHOEM, would have potentially materially reduced those same severe flooding conditions. **The Governor's Chief of Staff has informed me that the SCOPE proposal email I sent him has been appropriately forwarded to you for review.**

I am therefore writing to provide more detail about SCOPE, which I developed in the last few months of my tenure at NHOEM, which ended when FEMA Hazard Mitigation grant funds from Hurricane Andrew ran out. Your predecessor, Woody Fogg, was very favorably impressed with the proposal, which former deputy NHOEM director Ed Murdough also shared with Don Bliss, Woody's successor. So this is far from a new proposal.

The attached article referring to how the present severe flooding could and should have been mitigated outlines the proposal. I am also attaching an original email to Woody Fogg and Ed Murdough. The original SCOPE proposal has been modified for workability and affordability, with input from many NHOEM staff, key FEMA people, and others. I am prepared to help implement SCOPE over the next few months, but at the start of 2006 my wife (who is Swedish) and I will be spending some time at our other home in Gotland, Sweden. That is another reason why I am writing now.

Please give me your reaction to SCOPE, or have an appropriate staff member of Emergency Services contact me. Every good wish for your efforts to mitigate the present flooding disaster; SCOPE can help prevent future ones.

Eugene F. Elander, retired NHOEM hazard mitigation consultant, former FEMA Disaster Assistance Employee, Emergency Management Coordinator in Vermont, author of Bennington Cty. Vermont's summary Emergency plan
for BCRC (Bennington County Regional Commission)
23 Hemlock Street, Emerald Lake, Hillsborough NH 03244 603-464-6272 cell 312-8224 elanders@isp.com

Flooding Mitigation Op-Ed Piece 10-05.wps	Name: Flooding Mitigation Op-Ed Piece 10-05.wps Type: application/octet-stream Encoding: base64

PROFESSIONAL RESUME UPDATED	Name: PROFESSIONAL RESUME UPDATED 2005.doc

Exhibit 6

Birgit and Eugene Elander

From: "Birgit and Eugene Elander" <elanders@isp.com>
To: <news@keenesentinel.com>
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2005 7:26 PM
Attach: Flooding Mitigation Op-Ed Piece 10-05.wps; PROFESSIONAL RESUME - Emergency Management, 2005.wps
Subject: FLOODING MITIGATION OP-ED PIECE by Eugene F. Elander (also sent as an attachment, with my resume) THIS IS AN EXCLUSIVE FOR FIVE DAYS; PLEASE LET ME KNOW IF YOU WILL USE IT. THANKS.

EUGENE F. ELANDER

PRESIDENT, ELANDER ENTERPRISES

Economist, Emergency Management Consultant

Safety, security, and counter-terrorism projects

23 Hemlock Street, Hillsborough NH 03244

elanders@isp.com

603 464-6272 home 312-8224 cell

A FLOODING DISASTER WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN MITIGATED

by Eugene F. Elander

Retired Hazard Mitigation Consultant

New Hampshire Office of Emergency Management

Former Disaster Assistance Employee, FEMA

Former Emergency Management Coordinator, Vermont

During my tenure as Hazard Mitigation Consultant to the then-New Hampshire Office of Emergency Management (NHOEM - now part of the State Public Safety Department),

I had occasion to visit many of the communities now so ravaged by severe flooding. It was clear that many roads, bridges, dams, and buildings were at risk from future heavy rains, Spring runoff from melting ice and snow, and similar causes. Many Town Emergency Management Plans were obsolete at best, and useless at worst. Communities claimed they did not have the resources to update their planning and modernize their response systems. I was administering Hazard Mitigation Grants going back to Hurricane

Floyd, and when those funds were gone, the State of New Hampshire cut the program.

Out of those serious concerns, I devised the SCOPE (Safer Communities through Organized Preventive Effort) proposal which was very well received by NHOEM.

The proposal outlined a systematic process for each Town and City in New Hampshire

to review all of the strengths and weaknesses of its Emergency Management plans and procedures, via an

interview process using a structured questionnaire for officials, first responders, and others with input and ideas. Unfortunately, NHOEM felt it could not afford to fund the SCOPE proposal while I felt New Hampshire could not afford to let

natural and societal threats receive the lackluster planning and mitigation in place then and now. It was only a matter of time, for example, until moderate rains caused severe flooding and the concomitant property damage and displacement of people, even loss of life. This would not take the fabled "100-year storm," just a heavy and continued rain.

And now that rain has come to pass, and New Hampshire has been caught unprepared.

The many devoted first responders, emergency management professionals, local and State elected officials, and media people have done a magnificent job coping with a flooding disaster which did not have to be nearly this serious. There are many dams which could have been raised to a higher level, preventing the heavy overflow of rainwater and the resulting severe damage. There are many roads which could have been shored up, given higher-capacity culverts and other drainage devices, and saved from massive erosion.

A FLOODING DISASTER WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN MITIGATED - 2 -

There are many residents throughout Southwestern New Hampshire who could have been notified much sooner that their homes and businesses were at major risk from locating in or near flood plains -- residents who could have been urged to obtain flood insurance.

There are many other steps which could, and should, have been taken -- and were not.

When the present Governor took office, I first emailed his transition team, and then his staff, offering to volunteer to help discuss and possibly implement the SCOPE proposal.

When nobody answered several emails, I sent a regular mail letter, and his Volunteer Coordinator wrote back that they would find a niche for my volunteer efforts. That never happened, there was no further communication. This week I emailed the Governor's Chief of Staff again offering the SCOPE proposal, and at least he replied that it has been sent to the present State Emergency Management head. So it has gone full circle, as that is where it died the first time, for lack of funds. So I am hopeful, but not very optimistic.

The moral of this situation is that flooding, and other hazards, both natural and societal

(such as terrorism) can and should be mitigated but that can only happen when such mitigation is made a real priority at Emergency Management. It is fine to publicize the State's efforts in that vital direction, but those efforts need to be real and urgent, and more than just photo opportunities. Talking about what is being done to mitigate disasters is much less useful than actually doing what is needed. That "100-year" storm may still be coming, and we had better be ready for it. One would think that Tsunamis, Hurricanes,

and Earthquakes within the past twelve months would have taught us that much.

PS. I can provide additional specifics, naming projects and towns, if that would be useful (I am not sure about that.)