

•  
•  
•  
•  
•  
•

14 Georgetown Court  
Union, MO 63084-1111  
[636] 583-5975  
FAX: [603] 590-7186  
E-Mail:  
KBowles@broadcast.net

# facsimile transmittal

**To:** FCC Commissioner Tristani      **Fax:** [202] 418-2801

---

**From:** Dr. Ken Bowles      **Date:** 01/18/00

---

**Re:** NPRM 99-25, Low Power FM Broadcast Service      **Pages:** Two

---

**CC:** FCC Chairman Kennard and Commissioners Ness, Powell, and Furtchgott-Roth

---

**Urgent**       **For Review**       **Please Comment**       **Please Reply**       **Please Recycle**

---

A letter from Cheryl A. Leanza, Deputy Director, Media Access Project, dated January 18, 2000, was posted today on the Electronic Comment Filing System (EFCS). The letter gives notice of an *ex parte* presentation via telephone and e-mail with Rick Chessen of your staff on January 13, 2000.

Ms. Leanza believes small non-profits will require ample notice to “adjust to frequent changes and will need ample notice for application requirements and deadlines.” I disagree with Ms. Leanza.

The more than 3,200 comments, representing perhaps thousands of more individuals and organizations through multiple party filings, speaks to the fact that LPFM is probably the best publicized proceeding in FCC history. These filers are already on board. Potential applicants who have not participated in the comment process will become aware of the opportunity through trade and public press once the service is authorized.

**DR. KEN BOWLES**

• • • • •

If the Commission allows a process whereby unprepared applicants are nevertheless allowed into the application process via wide windows of opportunity, several problems will develop:

- The FCC's resources will be taxed by a huge number of applicants.
- The resources of prepared applicants will likewise be taxed.
- If the unprepared applicants ultimately become licensees, they may also be unprepared for their technical and programming responsibilities. Scarce spectrum may go under-utilized or unused. This would be unfair to prepared applicants and would not be in the public interest.

**I encourage the Commission to utilize soon, short windows of opportunity.**

Finally, my FAX of January 12, 2000, listed several items of concern. I would like to add one additional item. **LPFM should be a primary service, not a secondary service.** My argument is the same I used to support renewable licenses. Organizations will spend large amounts of resources to construct and operate LPFM stations. They should not have to do this while taking on the additional risk that their stations could be terminated by primary stations.

This FAX has been placed in the ECFS. Please see that Mr. Chesson receives a copy of this FAX.

I appreciate the effort you have made considering the LPFM service.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kenneth W. Bowles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

Kenneth W. Bowles