

**THE BLUEPRINT PROJECT:
EXPANSION, DIVERSITY AND BUILDING CAPACITY
1990 –1994**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY REPORT

Funded by
The Corporation for Public Broadcasting
System Development Fund

Executive Summary Report prepared February, 1996.
Original Final Report submitted to CPB June 30, 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	ii
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	1
Findings.....	2
Guiding Principles.....	2
Background	6
Project Description	7
Station Selection	7
Station Assistance	8
Summary of Assistance	10
Audience Research Results	11
Conclusions and Recommendations to CPB.....	12
Criteria.....	13
Budget Impact.....	14
Acknowledgments and Credits.....	15

PREFACE

The Blueprint Project was about change; changing the way stations thought about audience service. And much has changed since this report was originally written. Public radio is now examining long-held beliefs and historic ways of operating stations and national organizations. Tax-based funding sources are declining, including the possible elimination of CPB funding. We face challenging questions about our relevance and value from friends and foes alike, both on Capitol Hill and elsewhere. Competition in the marketplace is increasing. New and emerging technologies present challenges and opportunities.

The entire public radio system has been debating these issues over the past year. CPB added an audience service standard to their funding eligibility criteria and created a large "Future Fund" to stimulate station efforts to generate \$60 to \$100 million of new (non-taxed based) revenue annually. In fact, the challenges that the Blueprint stations faced during the Project (and continue to face) seem more common now. Now more than ever, public radio stations must be "audience successful, economically healthy, and organizationally sound."

For the most part, the four stations that participated in the Blueprint Project remain locked in a day-to-day struggle for survival. Although two of the four may be considerably better off and show quite healthy signs, internal conflict over mission, audience focus, governance and programming still consume too much energy and resources.

No single blueprint for success can be developed that applies perfectly to all stations – circumstances vary too much. This report, however, includes insights, guiding principles and practical tips for the entire public radio system, not just emerging stations trying to service new audiences. The single most important decision for a station is to define a target audience whom you serve well. The single most important factor is leadership, albeit, one person or a small group.

While the Project findings and lessons will seem obvious to many, they do serve as a reminder to stations striving to better serve an audience. It should also be helpful for evaluating Future Fund projects. Investing our limited resources wisely, locally and nationally, is paramount to public radio's continued success in the future.

As you read the report, keep in mind that some of the specific recommendations may not hold up under the current funding climate. Nevertheless, the lessons and criteria for investing collective resources in individual stations remain relevant. Chief among them is that **audience service and creative, courageous leadership remain the most critical factors for success.**

Bruce Theriault
February, 1996

**THE BLUEPRINT PROJECT:
EXPANSION, DIVERSITY AND BUILDING CAPACITY**

Executive Summary

"The central question, stated at the broadest level, is how, over the next decade, can public radio substantially increase the number and diversity of Americans it serves."¹

INTRODUCTION

The goal of the Blueprint Project (1990-94) was to find a way to bring new and diverse listeners (that is, more racial minorities) into the public radio audience. This was to be accomplished by developing a plan or "blueprint," with a set of pilot stations, that could be used by other stations in similar circumstances to guide their development. The "blueprint" was to be developed by working intensively with two struggling, yet potentially emerging, stations. Two other stations would get minimal direct assistance but were to benefit from what was "learned" by working with the first two stations. All four of the stations were interested in minority audiences, but their impact was limited by low listenership, financial and organizational problems. They were considered "outside" the public radio system and did not receive CPB support.

In its 1990 report the Public Radio Expansion Task Force identified the improvement of "outside the system" stations as one of the major means for public radio audience growth and diversification.² The Blueprint Project asked how this could be accomplished, and posed these questions:

- Could an infusion of audience research, infrastructure building and program development (including the use of national programs, where appropriate) help these targeted stations become audience-successful, economically healthy and organizationally sound?
- Could their experience be used as a "blueprint" by other stations facing similar challenges?
- Could these stations, through their increased listenerships, bring significant new constituencies and audiences to the public radio system?

¹ "Public Radio in the 1990s, Fulfilling the Promise, The Report of the Public Radio Expansion Task Force," January, 1990.

² The other major means was for the existing "mainstream" stations to do a better job at serving their target audience.

FINDINGS

Clearly, the infusion of audience research, infrastructure building and program development did help the two (of the four) stations that received it. They are considerably better off and show quite healthy signs. Those two stations have clarified their mission, identified a target audience, and focused their programming better. Both now receive CPB support, one as a full CSG qualified station; the other as a STEP station.

Nevertheless, by the end of the Blueprint Project, none of the stations have not gone far enough and have not achieved significant audience gains or financial security. For the most part, the four stations that participated in the Blueprint Project remained locked in a day-to-day struggle for survival. Internal conflict over mission, audience focus, governance and programming still consume too much energy and resources.

The Blueprint Project concluded that no single "blueprint" for success can be developed that applies perfectly to all stations – circumstances vary too much. There are, however, some universal principles (see below) that can guide all public radio stations, including emerging, minority-controlled stations, toward being more audience-successful, economically sound, and organizationally healthy.

By the end of the Blueprint Project, most of the audience growth for public radio was achieved by the "mainstream" stations improving – not the "outside the system" stations. Audience growth for the Blueprint Project stations, including significant new constituencies (i.e., minorities), was slow or non-existent. While there were unique circumstances that created major obstacles, including a hurricane knocking one of the stations off the air for nearly a year, the problems remained largely organizational issues and programming focus.

Much of what the Blueprint Project experienced confirms most of the basic "rules" for how organizations, especially radio stations, should operate to be successful. Over time, if applied effectively, these principles would give public radio the best chance to increase its audience, impact and significance, including bringing new and diverse listeners to public radio.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Clear Mission

The board of directors must articulate an inspiring, yet clear and understandable, mission (that is, a reason to exist) that is radio-oriented, do-able, and agreed upon by all the key players. Except for WWOZ, the Blueprint Project stations' missions were extremely broad and complicated statements, with their intent open to debate and not easily accomplished through radio.

Audience Focus

Radio stations must choose a target audience of significant size. The first challenge for the Project stations was picking an audience. These stations did not have a clear sense of the main audience they were trying to serve. In each case, numerous audiences were identified in their mission statements.

Stations must be audience driven. Volunteer access to the station was a stronger focus at these stations than listener service. They were producer, not audience driven; more like a radio club than a radio station.

Leadership

One person (or small group) can and does make the difference. We found that the difference between moving successfully forward or remaining stuck in a cycle of failures was whether or not one person or a small cohesive group was exercising leadership. The leader was not always a paid staff person, but it was critical to have someone articulate a vision, organize others, develop consensus and keep the group focused on achieving the goal.

Governance

Stations must separate the board of directors from management and operate within a structure that is clearly defined, allowing both functions to perform their respective duties. The board of directors and the station manager and staff have different and non-overlapping roles. In general, the stations' boards and staff functions were ill-defined, and the boards were heavily involved in day-to-day operations, especially programming decisions. Staff did not have the authority to operate the stations. They performed caretaker or coordinator roles. The role of the board is to articulate the mission, set broad policy, provide fiduciary oversight and hire management. Management implements the mission by operating the station and developing the program schedule/format.

Radio (Program) Formats

Radio stations must have a format that consists of programming with similar appeal that serves the targeted audience (since programming with similar appeal makes a format and draws listeners). The stations in the Blueprint Project were trying to serve too many audiences with discrete programs for each group, i.e., their program appeal was inconsistent, and therefore not really reaching any of them. This does not mean that the programming has to be all homogenous: it can be quite diverse if it remains consistent in its appeal.

Programming

Stations need strong, defining programming to center their formats around and define their core audience. For the most part, the Blueprint Project stations do not have public radio's core national programming (e.g., Morning Edition, All Things Considered, A Prairie Home Companion and Marketplace) to anchor their program formats and define their core audience. They must create and produce nearly all their own programming, which is difficult and costly.

The critical dayparts (Monday-Friday, 5:00 a.m.-7:00 p.m., and Saturday-Sunday, 8:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m.) define the "format" and audience appeal of the station. Also, for the most part, the (Monday-Friday) early morning time period defines the sound or format of the station for listeners; for example, you're a "jazz" station if that's what they hear in the morning. Without paid professional staff to consistently program these dayparts, the Project stations had a different sounding station daily during these times. WDNA and WWOZ, with assistance from the Blueprint Project, invested in professional staff to program these time periods. This created a more consistent sound and even helped fundraising efforts at WWOZ. Both managers reported good feedback from the community.

Change

Change is more difficult and much slower to occur when organizations are focused on day-to-day survival, with no paid staff and insufficient financial resources. Also, people resist change unless they have a clear, inspiring reason to change, that is, they must believe things will improve if they do something else. A motto of the Blueprint Project was: "You can't become what you want to be by remaining the same." In hindsight, the Blueprint Project anticipated too much change too quickly, given the status of the stations.

Changing also meant that some people with programs or stake in the status quo would lose out. The Blueprint Project team became an easy target to rally around for opponents of change – "carpetbaggers" or "network executives (from Washington DC. or Minneapolis)" are trying to take over the station and make it "commercial" or just like the other "NPR" public radio station.

In some cases it wasn't clear who, if anyone, had the authority to make (major) decisions. Even when decisions were made and programming and/or other changes were begun, things had a way of slipping back to the way it was – regular contact or monitoring, including personal station visits, was essential to assist staff in keeping on track as they faced many day-to-day demands for their time and energy.

Flexibility/ Sensitivity

Outside advisors must be sensitive to a station's sense of identity and flexible to individual circumstances. People working on a national level are aware of common problems and solutions. This makes it seem to some that they are bringing a "one size fits all" approach that is disrespectful of a station's individuality. Care in choosing consultants is very important – picking those whose backgrounds will resonate with the people at the "emerging" station can make all the difference between "hearing" and "accepting" recommendations or not.

Vision/Philosophy

The Blueprint Project stations were working from a paradigm that equated volunteer access to the air waves with serving audiences. In fact, three of the Project stations actually prohibited paid staff from doing on-air programs. The central choice was one of focus. The station could continue to focus on volunteer access, which is more like a radio club or on audience service, i.e., a radio station. While volunteers can and do make perfectly good programmers, without an audience-driven program strategy they are left to individually define the programming. This creates an inconsistent format and programming appeal, with (often) uneven or shoddy sounding programming. The result is very few listeners, low audience loyalty, and insufficient financial support.

In other words, the stations are not serving a large enough (core) audience willing to support it. In fact, the Blueprint Project stations were nearly no one's favorite station. They had an extremely small core audience and little loyalty – the vast majority of listening was light fringe.

BACKGROUND

It is clear that the public radio system must increase the number and diversity of the Americans it serves. Congress repeatedly calls for this, as have the leaders of public radio in several forums. It is a priority in the System Development Fund, the Public Radio Expansion Task Force and several other public radio groups. The emerging stations, many not within CPB's system of assistance and communication, are a potential source of the needed growth. These stations show the possibility of serving a broader, more diverse group of listeners than are presently served by public radio. They show this possibility in their mission, their ownership, or in some cases, in their existing audience.

The Blueprint Project addressed the problem of how to bring these stations to a point at which they could provide significant listener service that would have an impact on public radio's audience. This, by necessity, involved developing the station's capacity to support itself. It also meant examining the station's potential to extend national programming to new listeners, an objective of the System Development Fund.

Not that CPB has ignored system growth. The addition of the STEP Program recently extended CPB's system of supporting stations. However, it still requires that stations reach a certain level of operation before getting assistance. This "threshold" requirement is certainly a valid test. Nevertheless, the Blueprint Project found that some of the stations that show great potential for expanding the public radio audience may never qualify for CPB assistance under this system. These stations are often in a cycle of crises and struggles, with a lack of access to national resources and knowledge that precludes the growth and success that would benefit them and the system.

Public Radio International (formerly American Public Radio) discussed this situation with the National Federation of Community Broadcasters. It was our belief that a proactive stance, which seeks out appropriate stations and provides them with intensive, targeted assistance, would be an efficient way of building the growth and diversification that the system needs. We decided, in cooperation with Walrus Research, to propose the Blueprint Project as a way of testing this idea.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Station Selection

In order to identify potential stations, set criteria, and select the best candidates, the Project team talked with many people, including members of the Expansion Task Force and CPB staff. We visited prospective stations to interview staff and board members. In selecting the stations, we looked for the following characteristics:

- a) Located in a medium to major city (top 50 metro markets as defined by Arbitron);
- b) Adequate broadcast signal to cover the metro area of license;
- c) Limited or extremely tight financial resources;
- d) Limited access to national and international news programming and other sources of non-local programming;
- e) Managed and/or programmed by a small paid staff, that is, a predominantly volunteer programming staff; and
- f) Minority/ethnic ownership and control, and/or stations with a program format designed to predominantly serve a minority audience, or a station interested in developing such a format.

The Project team selected two "chronically underperforming" stations that were considered "outside the system." These were WWOZ in New Orleans, Louisiana and WRFG in Atlanta, Georgia. WWOZ, licensed to the Jazz and Heritage Foundation, had a mission to present the music and culture of New Orleans. WRFG had a patchwork schedule, and an expressed desire to serve the African American community of Atlanta.

Early in the course of the project KKFI in Kansas City, Missouri and WDNA in Miami, Florida were added. They would receive less intensive help that allowed us to test the approaches developed in working with the two primary stations. KKFI was a relatively new station with a majority African American board that wanted to clarify its mission and goals. WDNA was in the process of changing from a very eclectic sound to an orientation toward Latino listeners.

We realized that a station had to do more than fit the profile. The Project needed a commitment that the station was ready to work on change. Therefore, each selected station was required to provide assurance that the station's management and governing body endorsed and supported the project. This was included in our written agreements. The agreements also

stipulated that station personnel would participate in the process, that they understood that it would involve change, and that they would be willing to make the changes as determined by the station staff in consultation with the Blueprint team.

Despite these assurances, and to no one's surprise, resistance to change was a major factor at each station. At one station (WRFG), resistance to change was great enough that the station was dropped from the Project and efforts were redirected to WDNA (see "Change" in the Guiding Principles). Unfortunately, the WRFG Board and staff increasingly were unable to work with the Project, making it impossible to implement change.

Station Assistance

The station building program consisted of three parts: 1) audience research, 2) development of infrastructure, and 3) program development to build audience. Walrus Research coordinated the research aspect, with the results being used in all parts of the work. NFCB was responsible for infrastructure building, based on their experience with "Building the Winning Team" and a long record of work with developing stations. PRI worked with each station on program development, operations issues, format design and national programming. Although there was a division of responsibility, team members from NFCB and PRI worked closely together on all aspects of the Project.

The substance of the Project began with a planning workshop involving the station's board, staff and volunteers. This included the presentation of a "snapshot" or in-depth assessment of the station and a similarly in-depth audience research report. The research was shocking to many of the people at the stations. They were aware of organizational deficiencies, but without audience data, many had assumed or hoped that they were reaching more people. All of the stations showed well below what is considered average or even weak performance. WDNA, for example, showed an almost unmeasurable share of the audience at 0.1%, and WRFG was only 0.3%. KKKFI and WWOZ were a little better, but still clearly underperforming.

From audience reports and the "snapshot", the project proceeded to planning. The stations set a variety of goals, but they all involved audience growth, improved fundraising, and more clearly defined organizational structures and systems. WWOZ, for instance, decided to improve the station's sound and make it more consistent. They wanted to double their average quarter hour audience and achieve a weekly cumulative audience of 60,000. Other goals were to develop program policies and procedures, establish training and evaluation processes, work to achieve on-air discipline by program hosts, have staff attend the Public Radio Program Directors'

Annual Conference, and design and implement program changes.

With the goals set, the Blueprint support began to flow to the station. They received regular research reports. Training and consulting in programming, development, technical and financial matters came from both Project staff and outside consultants. The stations became PRI affiliates and were provided with access to national programming, although as it turned out, little was found useful.

Ongoing and follow-up consultation continued as the stations implemented the changes. The Project subsidized certain strategically chosen expenditures: morning show staff at WRFG and WDNA, and morning show support at WWOZ.

Much of the process of working with the Blueprint stations involved meetings or visits between Project team and station staff. It turned out to be quite important to have the Project team physically at the stations to keep the process going. The opening workshops, stretching over three days, were followed by day-long detailed planning sessions with managers, days of listening to the station sound and working with program staff, and attendance at crucial station board meetings. There were a total of 28 meetings between project and station staff, and innumerable phone calls, using substantial amounts of Project time.

Technical, fundraising, and programming experts were called in as well. For example, a consulting engineer enabled WRFG to apply for a large power increase to expand its coverage area, and gave WDNA the information necessary to relocate its transmitter and antenna with greater height and power after Hurricane Andrew knocked the station off the air. Programming expert Carlos Lando, program director of station KUVO in Denver, Colorado, spent several days at both WWOZ and WDNA to help them refine their music presentations and program operations. Development consultant Loretta Rucker went to WRFG and WWOZ for their fundraising marathons and revamped their presentations. All in all, there were 16 occasions in which the Blueprint Project provided such specialized assistance.

The morning became the focus for Blueprint changes at all of the stations (although KKFI has been unable to implement much). The reason is that radio listening patterns dictate morning as the key period of the day. It has by far the most potential listeners, and the morning sound positions a station's image for the rest of the day. When the Blueprint changes went into effect at WRFG, the station's AQH at 8:00 AM went from 867 to 2697. Even considering that there is a margin of error, this shows positive change (when WRFG discontinued Blueprint changes, the audience reverted to the old levels).

Summary of Assistance

A summary of the help provided to the stations follows.

Audience Research:

- * Arbitron reports (quarterly);
- * Audigraphics reports;
- * Presentation by researcher George Bailey on the stations' listening patterns and radio listening in general;
- * Consultation visit from research and programming expert (and PRI staff member) Craig Oliver (WWOZ);
- * Focus group research on listeners (WWOZ);
- * Phone discussions of research results.

Infrastructure Building

- * "Snapshots" of each station (detailed report on the pre-Blueprint state of the station);
- * An intensive 2-1/2 day informational and goal-setting workshop;
- * Technical analysis of signal expansion opportunity and equipment;
- * Subscription system software and training (WWOZ);
- * CPA analysis and recommendations for software and systems (WRFG);
- * Assistance in applying for a power increase (WRFG);
- * Funding a station staff member as on-site project coordinator (WDNA);
- * Legal assistance to resolve Channel 6 problem (WDNA);
- * On-going phone consultation on management and organizational problems (WRFG, WDNA and WWOZ).

Program Development:

- * Blueprint staff consultation on programming;
- * Intensive consultation with music and program consultant Carlos Lando (WWOZ and WDNA);
- * Funding for morning show staff (WRFG and WDNA);
- * Intensive seminar for staff on programming (WRFG, WDNA and WWOZ);
- * Funding for morning show support (AP, computer) (WWOZ);
- * Affiliation to PRI and access to selected programs;
- * Distribution/Interconnection fee and satellite installation (WDNA).

Audience Research Results

At the conclusion of the Blueprint Project in June of 1995, audience reports showed virtually no change in listening at the Project stations. Nevertheless, there were some early hopeful signs. For example, WRFG's listening started to go up when they made dramatic changes in their morning programming, but this rise was aborted when they rescinded the changes. And KKFI had shown some increase in their weekly cume audience, specifically in afternoon drive time.

Audience growth lags behind program changes. It can take more than one Arbitron book to demonstrate results when starting with audiences this small. Another factor is that stations in these circumstances move slowly. It took quite some time to implement many of the recommended program changes, some only occurring within the last month of the project.

The larger changes at the Blueprint Project stations occurred in periods for which we do not have audience figures (indeed, WDNA was off the air or at very low power for many of the survey periods). There was some "tinkering," i.e., program scheduling changes, adjusting volunteer programmer assignments, providing some programmer on-air training, which also may be helpful over time. But, within the scope of the Project, it did not produce much listening change (see "Programming" in the Guiding Principles section).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO CPB

We are convinced that targeted assistance to some stations can be effective in increasing and diversifying public radio's audience over time, although not every station can successfully pull it off. None of the stations showed any significant growth in audience through the Project concluded, but three of the four Project stations were making clear progress in the areas of fundraising, local program development and organizational issues.

Systematic and targeted assistance for a few stations currently "outside" the public radio system can, over time, significantly add to the diversity of the public radio system and listenership. If our system's investment is to be cost-effective, stations must be carefully chosen for this special help. In the end, the success of any effort to assist these stations must be determined by whether significant new audiences are listening to public radio. There are a few critical factors in determining which stations make good candidates. They are:

- **Audience Service:** Stations must be willing to adopt an intense focus on audience service, i.e., a target audience of significant size.
- **Internal Leadership:** Internal leadership must be present with sufficient decision-making ability to take advantage of the information, consultation and program development assistance that is provided.
- **Time and Patience:** The service provider(s) must be flexible, expect change to take time, and assistance and monitoring must be ongoing during that time.

The following are specific recommendations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

- I. Establish an **Emerging Station Assistance Program (ESAP)** to proactively assist targeted "emerging" stations to become full participants in the public radio system. The type of station most in need of this specialized assistance is too busy surviving to ask, apply or "qualify" for help.

These stations should be carefully chosen using specific criteria, developed in part from the learning of the Blueprint Project. Most importantly, the station(s) must have the potential to serve a new (and relatively large) and more diverse audience in their market than is served by existing public radio stations. Specifically, the ESAP could apply the following criteria to evaluate potential stations.

Criteria

- 1) Underperforming in audience and financial terms, operationally defined as not having enough resources to qualify for the CSG/NPPAG program, but having the potential to do so.
- 2) Potential to serve a large enough audience to justify the investment by CPB as defined by the total population (including significant minority populations), within the station's coverage area.
- 3) Minority ownership and long-term commitment to serving a not less than 40% minority audience.
- 4) Identifiable leader and/or group within the station eager and able to carry the change forward.
- 5) Understanding that major change needs to occur and a commitment to do it, especially among station's significant stakeholders.

While the current policies, particularly the revised CSG/NPPAG grants formula and the STEP program, are good ways to help stations gain access to CPB funding and national programming, some stations may never get there without more active help.

Factors that would help such a program succeed:

- 1) ESAP should be assigned to a specific staff person in the Station Relations department with the responsibility, oversight and funds for non-traditional, proactive system expansion, i.e., developing minority stations and building a more diverse audience;
- 2) Contract out the specific ongoing station development work of advising, mentoring and monitoring the process. The Management Consulting Service already has a database of people who could provide assistance. Existing Blueprint Project partners (NFCB's Healthy Station Project, program development consultant Carlos Lando and others), could be called on to continue their work. CPB staff should probably not directly perform the consulting services for three major reasons:
 - a) Stations are often fearful of people from Washington who are "here to help them";

- b) Staff probably does not have the required time and may not possess all the specific skills to do the job;
- c) Much of what needs to be done is related to programming, which is not an appropriate role for CPB to take on.

Budget Impact

We anticipate that the ESAP would be working with an average of four stations each year at approximately \$45,000 per station, for a total commitment of \$180,000 a year. Each station could receive the benefits of the ESAP for three to five years before it was ready to move either into the regular CPB grant programs (such as STEP or CSG grants) or be dropped due to lack of progress.

- II. Continue to provide specialized assistance to WDNA, KKFI and WWOZ as the Blueprint Project ends. The Project has helped these stations gain some positive momentum, respectively, but each remains "close to the edge." Much work still needs to be done to develop professional staffs, produce a viable format with quality programming, overcome technical issues, stabilize finances and most importantly gain audience success. The very nature of these stations means that initial progress is fragile. Until they get established, incidents like the loss of major equipment (experienced by two of the Project stations) or staff turnover (encouraged by low pay and difficult working conditions) can create serious setbacks.

Acknowledgements and Credits

The Blueprint Project required a lot of hard work by many people, the commitment of several stations and organizations, the belief that public radio can and does make a difference in people's lives and the dedication to make it better. Over the nearly four years of the Blueprint Project numerous people were involved in making it happen. Lynn Chadwick of NFCB deserves special recognition for her vision of our work and for understanding and helping define a rough idea at the beginning. Former NFCB Director of Station Services, David LePage created and worked tirelessly on station training, traveled endlessly, and patiently talked and worked with countless station staff.

George Bailey of Walrus Research provided the reality base with audience research, analysis and lessons on how listeners use radio. George's wonderful teaching ability and great sense of humor helped enormously in getting people at the local level to understand and accept, albeit begrudgingly at times, real audience information. Craig Oliver, now President of the RRC and former Director of Broadcast and Affiliate Services at PRI, was valuable in helping translate research into programming strategy, including hourly clocks and program flow and continuity.

Midway through the Project we were joined by Carlos Lando, Program Director at KUVO, Denver, who provided real-life illustrations from working at a station serving a more diverse audience with news and jazz programming. Carlos could "talk-the-talk" with local programmers, share stories and discuss specific music mixes. These real world answers, based on his extensive experience as a programmer, were extremely helpful in connecting research analysis and other "classroom" type learning with day-to-day radio reality.

Of course, all projects have people who play vital behind-the-scenes roles. Ours was Mary Brennan, who served as project manager. She managed the budget, handled logistics for countless trips and meetings, wrote numerous reports, as well as regularly communicated with stations and project team members. To say it would have been harder to do the Project without her able assistance would be an understatement.

There were several others who played important parts during the Project. Thanks to Andy Russell, Director of Station Development and System Projects at CPB, who served as grant manager and took an active interest in the success of the Project, Loretta Hobbs and Rick Madden at CPB for funding the Project through the System Development Fund, Doug Myrland, formerly with PRI, now General Manager of KPBS, San Diego, for

his help with stations early in the Project, and consultants Loretta Rucker and Ken Devine. Special thanks to Bill Thomas, now Program Director at Nebraska Public Radio, who helped write this report.

The Blueprint Project wasn't possible without the full cooperation and participation of Maggie Pelleyá and Arturo Gomez of WDNA, Miami; Wali Abdel-Ra'oof, David Freedman, Virginia Prescott and Laura Grunsfeld of WWOZ, New Orleans; Tom Davis of WRFG, Atlanta; and Ed Haase and Greg Hanson of KKFI in Kansas City, Missouri. Last, but not least, thanks and appreciation goes to the many people (too many to name) at the stations who are working hard to make their stations more meaningful and significant services in their communities.