

To the Commission:

It is the 1000 watt Low Power FM stations which have the greatest inconsistency with public policy as set forth in FCC OET Bulletin 65 (concerning human exposure to RF Radiation). With the 60 meter antenna height restriction, the RF Human Exposure Limits at the base of the tower or structure holding the antenna exceeds limits. It is the 100 Watt and microradio Low Power FM Stations which are most likely to pose the least environmental and financial trouble for new entrants into this market. It is for this same reason the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) and their supporters desire further delay in these proceedings, and want to explore the "issue" of microradio further. In fact, the 1000 Watt stations are most likely outside the financial limits of most people; accordingly, the competition springs from those most apt to afford the necessary equipment to effectuate their proposals. By sending a message to the FCC like the 1000 watt stations are more acceptable to the NAB, it essentially states that it is willing to go along with Low Power FM if the NAB and its membership can outprice the common folks from competing. This defeats the intent of the Low Power FM service; accordingly, any further delay in the process of adopting Low Power FM should be viewed as a possible source of interference with competition, and not a merely another shot at comment from the public. It is in the public interest, for reasons of competition, that the microradio service within Low Power FM should be adopted more quickly, the NAB knows this shall generate stupendous amounts of competition and quickly, and therefore, the NAB is opposed to the FCC adopting microradio anytime soon.

Thanks! /s./ James E. Whedbee