

RECEIVED

JUL 24 1998

FCC MAIL ROOM

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of
Proposal for Creation of the Low Power FM
(LPFM) Broadcast Service

FCC RM-9242

To: Federal Communications Commission

Reply-Comments of Gary Patzel

Gentlemen:

I am writing in support of the creation of the LPFM service as proposed in RM-9242. I believe that the proposed power levels of at least 50-watts for LPFM-2 stations and up to 3-KW for LPFM-1 stations are necessary for LPFM to be successful. The 1-watt maximum level proposed in RM-9208 would not be useful for my purposes.

I agree that FM radio could be improved by a diversity of LPFM stations with local ownership and grassroots broadcasting with freedom from corporate interests.

My concept of LPFM is similar to the character of the amateur radio service, with a minimum of fees and oversight.

I would hope that even home-crafted LPFM equipment would be suitable for use if it meets "type-accepted" standards.

A fundamental concern I have with RM-9242 is the author's suggestion that the cost of owning a LPFM station would be "perhaps less than the price of a new car". My personal observation is that a price suggestive of a new car is far too restrictive for entry into LPFM broadcasting for this to be considered as a "grassroots" service.

The suggested fee of \$490 for processing an application for a LPFM license seems likewise excessive when I consider that a complete transmitter kit which provides a power level suitable to LPFM-2 and produces a signal which has better quality than many standard-power FM stations can now be purchased "off-the-shelf" for approximately \$500.

The suggested annual regulatory fee seems likewise excessive.

Perhaps an association of LPFM enthusiasts could be formed to assist the FCC in LPFM regulation and license processing in order to reduce fees to a more reasonable level.

Another concern I have with RM-9242 is the purpose for classifying LPFM stations into commercial and non-commercial channels as stated in paragraph 70 of the Addendum & Comments on FCC RM-9242 by RM-9242 Petitioner.

I am not familiar with the historical reasons for such a division, yet it seems to me that there would be a variety of LPFM stations with various portions of involvement with both commercial and educational or non-commercial broadcasting.

I would not like to receive a limitation regarding the operation of a LPFM station based on financial support to my station from advertising garage sales, when the remaining 95% of my broadcast production might resemble a PBS station, for example.

I would also like to have the freedom to make my station portable for informal local community sidewalk interviews and display of LPFM radio operation.

I have not found this issue addressed in RM-9242.

I have no other arguments toward RM-9242 at this time. It seems generally complete and suitable to the purpose of creating LPFM, to the best of my knowledge.

Gary Patzel
1834 N. Circle Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80909-2411
Telephone # (719) 634-8060
Date: 7/20/98


