

November 29, 2021

By electronic filing

Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye and Associate Justices
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: *USA Today v. Los Angeles Superior Court (Spears)*
Supreme Court No. S271168

Honorable Justices,

The eight organizations submitting this amici curiae letter urge you to grant the petition for review by *USA Today* in the above referenced matter. We submit pursuant to California Rule of Court 8.500(g), with descriptions of our organizations in Appendix A.

Together, our nonprofit associations, labor unions and newsrooms represent several thousand rank-and-file California journalists. This includes employee, contract, freelance, student and independent journalists across all formats (print, broadcast and digital). Millions of Californians depend on our members and colleagues to understand the courts and their decisions.

We ask you to take this petition as an opportunity to safeguard public remote access to nonconfidential court hearings, particularly through live audio streams. This is long overdue. For more than 25 years, our industry has encountered California trial courts that at times have been hostile to our role, obstructed access and effectively operated in secrecy.

The Court of Appeals decision creates real-world harms and ends real-world benefits. As explained below, it compromises health and safety, the media's ability to cover the courts, and the public's ability to stay informed about court proceedings. The questions involved have enormous implications beyond the underlying case. When applied to California courts as a larger system, they become far more important questions.

Covering courts is a uniquely challenging assignment for journalists. The subject matter can be complicated and we strive to get it right. But as will be described, exclusive dependency on physical access doesn't lend itself to doing the job well. When reporters miss something or are put in a position where mistakes are more likely, it hurts public understanding of courts.

Los Angeles Superior Court (LASC) created their Remote Audio Attendance Program (RAAP) in response to COVID-19. The program demonstrated clear benefits for our jobs, the public understanding of the courts, and the courts themselves. Instead of an alternate or lesser method of news gathering, it often proved to be a primary and superior method. Examples from before, during and after RAAP show that remote access is the only way for the press to adequately cover many important proceedings, even in a world without COVID-19.

Document received by the CA Supreme Court.

Restricting the press to physical access is also a disadvantage compared to other parties who still have remote access through LASC's LACourtConnect. As will become clear, remote access may be more critical to the systemic role of the press than it is to many of these other parties.

Our colleagues, including more than a dozen reporters who regularly cover LASC, provided the following observations to illuminate real-world impacts of remote access.

COVID-19 remains a serious health and safety threat to working journalists, especially those with young children. The pandemic isn't over. Breakthrough cases are well documented¹, the vaccinated can spread the virus², and the implications of long-COVID are not well understood³. Given potential needs for any person to access the courts, there are no foreseeable mandates that everyone present be vaccinated. Reporters have observed that courtrooms open during the pandemic were often crowded and forced low income families to gather in large groups, especially for family and eviction hearings.

It's unclear when the FDA will approve vaccines for children younger than five years old. None have received even emergency use authorization as of this letter's submission. Some journalists covering the courts have children in this age range, and attending hearings in person increases risk to family. Similarly, the presence of journalists increases exposure risk to judges, attorneys, clerks, bailiffs, parties, witnesses, and other observers, all of whom may have young children or spend time with the immunocompromised or others who cannot receive a vaccine.

Since LASC's press release about ending RAAP on June 24, 2021, it has issued 17 press releases about additional measures needed because of COVID-19⁴. During the Robert Durst murder trial alone (Case Number SA089983), testimony was halted in August due to a COVID-19 positive observer,⁵ and another individual present for sentencing in October tested positive.⁶ On the date of this letter's submission, the Los Angeles County Public Health Department lists "active outbreaks" in seven different correctional and law enforcement facilities, from which inmates and personnel may regularly be visiting courts.⁷

In an emergency situation like a pandemic, the role of the press is better suited to remote access than most. Courts can't use remote bailiffs, nor would they trust a remote jury. While there is no replacement for regular physical access, this remains an emergency situation. The need to relieve physical courtroom congestion is reason alone to provide remote access.

¹<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/effectiveness/why-measure-effectiveness/breakthrough-cases.html>

² <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/delta-variant.html>

³ <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/long-term-effects/index.html>

⁴ <http://www.lacourt.org/newsmedia/notices/newsrelease>

⁵<https://www.dailybreeze.com/2021/08/06/robert-durst-trial-set-to-resume-monday-in-inglewood-following-courtroom-covid-19-case/amp/>

⁶ http://www.lacourt.org/newsmedia/uploads/142021101618215321_NRDurst.pdf

⁷ <http://publichealth.lacounty.gov/media/Coronavirus/locations.htm>

Courts have expanded in time and space, making physical access impossible on a systemic level. This isn't a question of convenience or cost-effectiveness. In a system like LASC, even the largest media outlets can't do justice to covering all trials that matter to the public without remote access. Most outlets don't have the resources of USA Today, so granting their petition is even more significant for hundreds of other newsrooms and individual reporters who struggle to cover multiple courtrooms in a day.

Public records show the Los Angeles County District Attorney filed 510,996 criminal charges in a two-year span from 2017 to 2018⁸ (pre-pandemic). Of those, 33.4% were felonies and 9.1% were classified by California Penal Code as serious or violent felonies. That's an average of roughly 100 new serious or violent felony charges per court business day. According to LASC, "over 40,000 hearings are held annually on petitions to revoke or modify sentences."⁹

On the civil side, LASC saw 265,985 cases filed during the 2017/2018 fiscal year, and "more than 77,000 unlimited civil cases were initiated in which more than \$25,000 was at stake—more than \$1.5 billion of claims being litigated."¹⁰

There were 1,662,202 total filings during LASC's 2017/2018 fiscal year.¹¹ These cases are heard in a physically massive system that spans 39 buildings¹² across the largest geographical county in the United States.

Most news agencies covering LASC only employ one or two reporters on the beat. To illustrate workloads, one news service reporter typically tracks 40 cases in a day. Without audio access, it was often impossible to attend multiple important hearings on a given day. In particular, reporters would have to skip pretrial hearings expected to be perfunctory, only to discover they missed a critical development. This is especially problematic covering homicide cases, where dozens of pretrial hearings might be scheduled that reporters could never realistically attend.

LASC doesn't stagger their schedule as some other jurisdictions might, creating a need for some reporters to simultaneously be in multiple cities at once. Sometimes it's not only a challenge of miles, but floors. At the Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center, going through secondary security screening on the ninth floor (where many high profile cases are heard) can be problematic for somebody also monitoring cases in another part of the building.

Many scheduled hearings never occur but still require the press to attend. This October, a hearing was scheduled in Long Beach for a school safety officer charged with murder in the shooting death of a young woman (Case Number NA118308). With most of the area's reporters based at least a two-hour round trip drive away, many waited 90 minutes in person only for the matter to be continued. This took limited resources away from other important trial coverage.

⁸ <https://meetyourda.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/lada-lp.pdf>

⁹ http://www.lacourt.org/newsmedia/uploads/1420194241454482018_AR_OnlinePDF.PDF

¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹ *ibid.*

¹² *ibid.* (See map on page 5.)

Eliminating remote access robs specific communities of reporting resources. A Long Beach City Council member is currently a defendant in a civil suit (Case Number 20STCV37998) being heard in Downtown Los Angeles. There have been six scheduled proceedings. Most were continued. The only one held was tangentially related (attorney sanctions for failure to appear). This forces an outlet like the Long Beach Post to gamble on sending one of their limited number of reporters, directly impacting what they can cover in a day. They have foregone other stories because of unheld hearings, hurting local reporting for the 460,000 citizens of Long Beach.

Remote access to courts can even impact the public's understanding of elections. In a recent civil case (Case Number 20STCP01633) about the hand-counting of ballots¹³, newsrooms repeatedly sent reporters to hearings. Four out of six were continued. Meanwhile, attorneys for plaintiffs and defendants were allowed to call in. This created an absurd situation where one reporter would drive up to three hours round-trip in order to sit in a nearly empty room and listen to the court's speakerphone. Local reporters suspect this access barrier created by the court resulted in less coverage and reduced public understanding of an election integrity issue.

The differences with RAAP were stark. Reporters could attend dozens of hearings in a matter of hours. A five-minute status update no longer meant a half day lost to travel, security screening, and routine court delays. Instead, that time could be spent listening to other important hearings. This doesn't suggest that all reporters stopped attending in person. Often, some would wait in the hallway for one case to be called while listening in on other courtrooms.

The situation will not improve even if COVID-19 somehow disappears. The courts face a significant backlog. In the push to address this caseload crisis, there may be more important decisions and deals happening in preliminary hearings which reporters don't have the bandwidth to cover. Simultaneously, people have been sitting in prison for literally years awaiting their cases, and increased stakes for some may result in more complicated cases as defendants refuse to waive certain rights.

Observers may point out that the number of filings seems to be decreasing under the new Los Angeles District Attorney. Whatever change has occurred, it's not enough to alleviate the impacted schedules of reporters. If anything, it increases the need to monitor cases and cover the implications of the new DA on public safety.

Journalists need to confirm information without interrupting the court or missing proceedings. It's indisputable that courts want information about their proceedings to be reported accurately. However, the nature of court proceedings often sets journalists up for mistakes. The press can't interrupt attorneys to ask how to spell a name, or a judge to confirm who "counsel" refers to. Accurate quotations become more challenging the longer -- and faster -- a party speaks. A court reporter (in the stenographer sense) can interrupt to ask that something be repeated or can later replay their personal recordings, but there may still be times when their transcripts say "unintelligible." A journalist does not have that luxury -- and may also

¹³<https://lbpost.com/news/judge-says-la-county-election-officials-do-not-have-to-locate-ballots-for-free-in-measure-a-recount-decision>

be on a tighter deadline. This can result in errors, omissions, or journalists having to leave or be distracted during trials as they track down details. Remote access offers multiple solutions. When reporters are on their computers (which often wouldn't be permitted in a courtroom), they can look up details like spellings. If they were allowed to take recordings, they could play back critical quotations. And in an ideal scenario demonstrated during the Durst murder trial this year, available audio feeds included the names of speakers on screen. This was extremely valuable, as some participants had complicated names and/or used uncommon spellings.

Reporters often can't perform basic job functions while in courtrooms. As mentioned before, judges don't always allow reporters to use laptops, whether to take notes or for any other purpose. Even when they do, reporters are routinely barred from transmitting information inside the courtroom. This forces reporters to choose between listening to entire proceedings or running outside every time a key piece of information needs to be delivered to an editor. In many buildings, wireless internet connections don't work in the hallways. Even if the press's role were reduced to handwritten notes, it was often hard to hear speakers (who wouldn't otherwise use microphones) while in the back of the room. RAAP solved all these issues.

Journalists also face challenges with restrictions on courtroom entry and exit. Sometimes they must enter exceedingly early and are not allowed to return if they leave (ex: to transmit a story update or even use the bathroom). In the Britney Spears conservatorship case, reporters were told that nobody could leave the courtroom for any reason during the last hearing until it concluded. There was no ability to transmit updates from inside the room. However, at least one person ran out when it was announced that the conservatorship was ending. Nobody stopped them, and as a result an outlet was able to learn and break the news first.

Multiple reporters and editors should monitor important moments of high-profile cases.

While one reporter might routinely cover several cases at once, the opposite is true during pivotal moments of trials with the highest public interest. Redundancy is important for accuracy, and news outlets will assign multiple staff members to some hearings and verdicts. During the Durst trial, the Associated Press had one reporter in the courtroom while RAAP allowed another reporter and an editor to listen from their newsroom. The New York Times operated similarly for early hearings in the Spears case, with a reporter in the building while RAAP allowed staff to monitor and verify proceedings from thousands of miles away. In some cases, this means outlets can leverage support from an experienced court journalist (or even lawyer) to ensure accuracy. Sometimes, it's as simple as being able to listen with a group in the newsroom and turn to a colleague to ask, "I didn't hear that, did you?"

This level of redundancy used to be physically impossible. A single outlet couldn't send four people, clogging the courtroom and taking potential seats from other outlets and the public.

In a rare feat, RAAP improved both accuracy and speed. While a reporter in the courtroom could focus on their feature story, their remote colleagues could handle rapid updates to the public.

The public benefits when reporters can cover lower-profile cases, where bad-faith actors may otherwise avoid scrutiny. With increased remote access, the press can include more low-profile cases in their public spotlight. Doing so holds bad faith actors and those in a position to abuse power (potential examples: landlords, employers, local governments) accountable when they would normally avoid the same scrutiny from an audience that can only attend court hearings in person.

Online court portals are not an adequate substitute. Reporters covering LASC have found that the court's online portal doesn't always provide accurate status updates. Often, this is because they're not entered in a timely way, sometimes taking days or a week.

Journalists without access risk dependence on parties with a clear bias. When reporters are supposed to cover multiple cases but can't attend important hearings, they must turn to sources that participated. A neutral party like a judge or jury member is almost never available or allowed to discuss active cases. Invariably, it's an attorney or other party with a vested interest in one side. Often, reporters have questions that aren't explained by an online portal or minute order. RAAP ensured that accurate updates were just a click away, alleviating risk of the public being misinformed about the court's proceedings.

Many communities are underserved in an era of newsroom cutbacks, with impacts potentially worse for those already at an access disadvantage. "News deserts" are areas where people lack access to news outlets and/or reporting relevant to their communities, often because local publishers have gone out of business. Nationwide, total newsroom employment (including traditional and digital) fell from 114,000 jobs in 2008 to 85,000 in 2020.¹⁴ In 2020 alone, a third of large U.S. newspapers experienced layoffs.¹⁵ Advertising revenue for newspapers has fallen nationally from \$50 billion in 2005 to \$8.8 billion in 2020¹⁶. California has seen a 24% decrease in newspapers operating between 2004 and 2019, including a drop from 97 to 68 dailies.¹⁷

It's easy to assume that rural areas are hurt by this trend, and that's true. Remote access allows outlets to cover cases when not located near a major courthouse. These smaller newsrooms are less likely to have the financing to afford transportation (and sometimes lodging) required to cover some trials. Moreover, these newsrooms tend to lack the staffing to dedicate for in-person coverage of courtrooms. An example earlier in this letter described access issues for the Long Beach Post. A strikingly similar situation exists for the Ojai Valley News as they cover a water rights civil suit (Case Number 19STCP01176) involving multiple government entities and impacting over 14,000 properties. The case is being heard 90 miles from their newsroom, which has three reporters. LASC's portal shows 25 proceedings held so far. Choices must be made between covering a hearing or covering other stories of public interest to their community.

¹⁴<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/07/13/u-s-newsroom-employment-has-fallen-26-since-2008>

¹⁵<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/05/21/a-third-of-large-u-s-newspapers-experienced-layoffs-in-2020-more-than-in-2019/>

¹⁶ <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/fact-sheet/newspapers/>

¹⁷ <https://www.usnewsdeserts.com/states/california/>

News deserts can also exist within sprawling urban areas like Los Angeles, where small cities and cultural communities have been underserved. Large media outlets have only recently started coming to grips with systemic racism in coverage, even in a county that is *majority minority*¹⁸. Small jurisdictions have seen political corruption fester for years before large outlets were able to apply resources and expose it. The benefit of this reporting is clear, leading to significant criminal prosecutions and long prison sentences¹⁹.

There are opportunities to offset these losses and oversights, but they often come as nascent publishers fill in the gaps with minimal resources. In Los Angeles, there have been emerging nonprofit and independent operations like LA Taco, which just hired its first full-time reporter, and Knock LA, which does extensive coverage on law enforcement and social justice. Small newsrooms can't be expected to provide the same scope of coverage as better funded institutions, but they shouldn't be stifled by withholding access to programs like RAAP.

Remote access is fundamental to address disability rights. In general, it's best to defer to disability rights experts on potential access violations. However, journalists regularly observe how physical access can be a nightmare for anyone, especially with a disability. Reporters can attest to the struggle navigating court buildings that are often anywhere between eight and 19 stories tall, with packed elevators and long hallways as the only modes of traversal. That's not to mention parking difficulties. It's bad enough for a participant attending a single hearing. It's outrageous for anyone trying to attend multiple in a day, which is a foreseeable issue for journalists with a disability. Opening of participation through RAAP has a proven benefit in this regard. There is no adequate substitute now that access has been granted.

When courts make remote access available, people care and tune in. Ideally, access should not be limited to those working for a news outlet. There is clear public interest in all levels of proceedings.

A state trial court in Minnesota had more than 18 million people watch the Derek Chauvin verdict on television alone²⁰, not counting those who streamed on phones and computers. This trial went beyond audio access, and showed that video can be broadcast successfully. The court allowed this while still protecting the rights of vulnerable people. They prohibited zooming into individuals, turned off cameras when minors testified, ensured jurors weren't visible, and required permission of witnesses and family members to be shown. The defendant himself requested this public access²¹.

During a U.S. Ninth Circuit appellate proceeding in 2017, up to 137,000 people were listening simultaneously to telephonic proceedings on the court's YouTube channel²², while CNN's broadcast averaged 1.5 million total viewers in an hour.²³

¹⁸ <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2020-09-27/los-angeles-times-apology-racism>

¹⁹ <https://timelines.latimes.com/bell/>

²⁰ <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/21/business/media/chauvin-verdict-viewers.html>

²¹ <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/chauvin-trial-shows-why-cameras-need-to-be-in-court>

²² <https://mynorthwest.com/539296/washington-trump-circuit-court-online/>

²³ <https://republicans-judiciary.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Osterreicher-Testimony.pdf>

The United States Supreme Court recently began streaming online audio feeds, with their May 2020 sessions being streamed over 2 million times.²⁴

Often, media outlets help to amplify the signal of a court's own live feeds. The implications are enormous. Consider the following Congressional testimony by National Press Photographer Association General Counsel Mickey Osterreicher²⁵:

“Transparent court proceedings improve the quality of testimony, persuade unknown witnesses to come forward, make trial participants more conscientious, and provide the opportunity to better observe the workings of our judicial system...”

“The framers envisioned court as being part of a public square, a place in an emerging nation where anyone could stop in to observe the proceedings and be assured of the integrity of our system of justice. Given the increasing complexity of our society and the size of our communities, that aspiration is exceedingly more difficult to achieve. As Chief Justice Burger stated in a 1980 case, ‘People in an open society do not demand infallibility from their institutions, but it is difficult for them to accept what they are prohibited from observing.’ The ability of the public to view actual courtroom proceedings should not be trivialized. It touches on an important right, which goes well beyond the mere satisfaction of viewer curiosity. That right advanced by electronic coverage is the right of the people to monitor the official functions of their government, including that of the judiciary. Nothing is more fundamental to our democratic system of governance.”

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTERARGUMENTS AND NEED FOR BALANCING

In response to USA Today's access request and petition for review, LASC produced a minute order and answer that tried to evaluate a court's closure (or partial closure) by focusing on available seating. This is an inappropriate measure of access, which can only apply in a hypothetical scenario with one trial. It fails to consider access in the sprawling, real-world judicial system described throughout this letter. Press resources aren't limitless. They're likely more limited than those of the bench and bar. A critical difference is that if a judge or attorney has a conflict, courts will grant a continuance. Reporters are not afforded the same accommodation. A press request to continue a hearing would likely offend courts and violate the rights of some parties. Consequently, the court system's large caseload, impacted scheduling system, and impossible physical sprawl creates *de facto* closures.

Courts exist to serve the public, meaning the public is always a party to how the court operates. Both the LASC minute order and answer distract from this when making distinctions about physical proximity for parties to a case. Decorum is a separate issue from access. Attorneys, jurors, and other parties aren't allowed to wander about and sit in a judge's chair. The court establishes appropriate places and boundaries for all, which enable everyone to fulfill their role. Fundamentally, that is all we ask. Like the courts, the press also serves the public. We act as

²⁴ <https://www.pogo.org/database/no-more-lines-millions-stream-live-supreme-court-arguments/>

²⁵ <https://nppa.org/news/nppas-osterreicher-testifies-support-cameras-federal-courts>

their surrogate to observe, document, and disseminate accounts of the court's operations. A closure to the press is a closure to the public, and vice versa. The press may not be *identically* situated as some parties, but it is *similarly* situated in having an interest and right to observe.

The concept that the press serves as the public's surrogate was affirmed by U.S. Supreme Court Justice William Burger in *Richmond Newspapers, Inc. v. Virginia*, writing, "Instead of acquiring information about trials by firsthand observations or by word of mouth from those who attend, people now acquire it chiefly through the print and electronic media. In a sense, this validates the media claim of functioning as surrogates for the public. This 'contribute[s] to public understanding of the rule of law and to comprehension of the functioning of the entire criminal justice system...'"²⁶ These words ring even more true today than when written in 1980.

LASC's answer claims, "the Judicial Council and the California Legislature have been actively considering whether and to what extent remote access should be permitted," but cites no rule under consideration nor proposed bill. Instead, it cites a broad recommendation for remote access and two bills passed in a now-concluded legislative session. The recommendation is so unenforceable that LASC is actively violating it (hence the petition), while neither bill addresses the real-world and systemic issues described in this letter. LASC has not pointed to any potential vehicle that might address the important questions raised by the petition.

LASC's minute order and answer raise a concern about "the increased risk of abuses and violations by users [of RAAP]." This is precisely the sort of consideration that must be weighed by the Supreme Court and why the petition should be granted.

We acknowledge and affirm that balances are necessary with a remote access system. For example, the courts may see a need to protect the anonymity of victims, absent the victim's consent. Similarly, in the underlying case, there were privacy concerns during conservatorship proceedings -- until the conserved not only consented but insisted on public access. Defendants facing minor charges like infractions, especially indigent people prone to false accusations and lacking resources to protect their privacy, may be due certain considerations. These are countervailing points that must be weighed in the interests of protecting real people. By granting the USA Today petition, the Supreme Court can ensure these points are weighed equally statewide, perhaps with a rebuttable presumption of remote access.

Of course, a trial court must have discretion to protect real people. But a court itself is not a victim during nonconfidential hearings. It should not be granting or withholding consent in order to shield itself from reasonable public participation and scrutiny.

Courts will eventually have to address realities around recording and we hope will shift toward a more permissive stance. In the Spears case, it remains unknown if a recording was made by somebody on RAAP or LACC. It could have been an attorney or another party entirely, not a journalist. The same risk, at least with audio, exists in physical courtrooms. Most individuals

²⁶ 448 U.S. 555 (1980) at 572-73 (quoting *Nebraska Press Ass'n*, 427 U.S. at 587 (Brennan, J., concurring in judgment))

today carry a phone with recording capabilities. Even when steps are taken to restrict access to devices, recorders smaller than a finger could be snuck in by a witness or observer. The question again returns to balancing and protecting people, and again presents the court with a reason to grant the petition to review those very issues.

CONCLUSION

Please grant the petition for review and allow the press to do our job, as both protected and anticipated by the United States and California Constitutions. Help us ensure an informed public.

Sincerely,



Julie Patel Liss, Vice President, Career Development
Asian American Journalists Association, Los Angeles



Yvette Cabrera, Vice President, digital
National Association of Hispanic Journalists



Ashanti Blaize-Hopkins, Vice President
Greater Los Angeles Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists



Melissa Evans, Managing Editor
Pacific Community Media dba Long Beach Post



Adam Rose, Secretary & Press Rights Committee Chair
Los Angeles Press Club

/s/ Richard A. Knee

Richard A. Knee, Vice President-California
Pacific Media Workers Guild (NewsGuild-Communications Workers of America Local 39521)



Matt Pearce, President
Media Guild of the West, The NewsGuild-CWA Local 39213



Dan Shelley, Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer
Radio Television Digital News Association

APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTIONS OF AMICI

Asian American Journalists Association, Los Angeles (AAJA-LA) has more than 200 members who work throughout SoCal in print, broadcast and online media.

The **Greater Los Angeles Chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists** is devoted to supporting Southern California journalists and ensuring they can carry out their jobs unimpeded. SPJ/LA works to inspire and educate the next generation of journalists, promote high standards of ethical behavior, and protect First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech and the press. SPJ/LA represents 100-plus professional journalists across Southern California.

Los Angeles Press Club is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit with more than 1,000 member journalists in Southern California. The organization has operated since 1913 to support, promote and defend quality journalism.

Media Guild of the West, The NewsGuild-CWA Local 39213 is a local union of The NewsGuild-CWA that represents hundreds of journalists and media workers in Southern California, Arizona and Texas, including at the Los Angeles Times, Southern California News Group and Desert Sun.

The **National Association of Hispanic Journalists** (NAHJ) is a growing organization that brings together a regional and national network of Hispanic and Latino journalists, media professionals, journalism educators and students to provide networking and community, training and professional opportunities for its members and advocate for fair representation in newsrooms and in the coverage of Hispanic/Latino communities.

Pacific Community Media dba Long Beach Post is an independent, locally owned digital publication. Founded in 2007, it has become the largest newsroom in Long Beach, where it covers news and culture in the city of almost half a million people.

Pacific Media Workers Guild (NewsGuild-Communications Workers of America Local 39521) is an organization representing journalists and other communications professionals in Northern California, Northern Nevada and Hawaii in labor negotiations and on issues affecting their ability to do their jobs, including but not limited to government transparency and press freedom.

The **Radio Television Digital News Association** is the world's largest professional organization devoted exclusively to broadcast and digital journalism. Founded as a grassroots organization in 1946, RTDNA's mission is to promote and protect responsible journalism. RTDNA defends the First Amendment rights of electronic journalists throughout the country.