

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

[Handwritten Signature]

1182 TO VAR TR #20
FLAGSTAFF AZ 86001

520-525-9634

No. of Copies rec'd 011
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

January 18, 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



Steve King
930 N. San Francisco #113
Flagstaff AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 011
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED
January 14, 2000

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Joseph T. McDonald
119 S Florence Apt A #3
Flag AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 071
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED RECEIVED
January 14, 2000

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00 MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service ~~to be the chairman~~ in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,


J. A. Middelendorf

1624 W Ashley Way
Flagstaff, Az. 86001
520-214-8507

No. of Copies rec'd 071
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

[Handwritten Signature]
Zita D. MARECK
204. S. Spring
Flagstaff AZ
86001

No. of Copies rec'd 011
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED
January 14, 2000

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Amanda Wilson
Amanda J Wilson
PO Box 797
Flagstaff AZ 86002

No. of Copies rec'd 071
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

JAN 18 3 53 PM '00 MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Nicole DiPierre
Nicole DiPierre
PO 23703
Flagstaff, AZ
86002

No. of Copies rec'd 0/1
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 53 PM '00

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Carolyn Jensen
4215 E. Chaparral
Cave Creek, AZ 85331

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

07/1

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 53 PM '00

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL RECEIVED
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Jennifer Rawls
Jennifer Rawls
913 W Tucson Ave #2
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 021
List ABCDE

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 53 PM '00

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



KATHERINE HARRIS
106 KLETHA TRAIL
FLAGSTAFF, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 071
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Anna Jensen

*4215 E. Chaparral
Cave Creek AZ 85331*

No. of Copies rec'd 071
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

ORIGINAL

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

RECEIVED
January 14 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



Robin A. CRAIG
P.O. Box 31358
Flagstaff, AZ 86003-1358

No. of Copies rec'd 071
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Rose Adams
Rose Adams
Box 50462
Parkes AZ 86018

No. of Copies rec'd 051
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Jay Reisberg
[Signature]
224 Thompson St #10
New York NY 10012

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____ 01

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Emily Stonecipher
Emily Stonecipher
501 W. Havasupai
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

AS

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



Allison Hochen
4333 S. Wait Ln.
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 077
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Shannon Wells

Shannon Wells

826 W. Summit

Flagstaff, AZ 86001

520213-0352

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

Bill -

Make this your legacy -
democratize the airwaves
give the people a voice!
Thank you for your genuine interest
and good work.
Shannon

RECEIVED

Jan 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 18 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



ALEJANDRO FAJDA
7421 WAPOR ST
92037 LA JOLLA

No. of Copies rec'd 011
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

(Carol Kent Ireland)
Carol Kent Ireland
(827 W. Summit Ave.)
mail Po Box 128
Flagstaff AZ 86002
O

Please insure that
the airwaves be made & kept
open to voices with diverse
opinion!

No. of Copies rec'd 041
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

Jan 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
January 18 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,



Fernando Ubaldo
7921 DASSER ST
La Jolla, CA 92037

No. of Copies rec'd 071
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January 14, 2000

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Michael French
MICHAEL FRENCH
13 N. SAN FRANCISCO ST # 305
FLAGSTAFF AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

071

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

January 18, 2000

RECEIVED
MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?


I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

UNCLE


DON B. FANNING
827 W. SUMMIT AVE
PO BOX 128
FLAGSTAFF, AZ 86002-0128

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE 071

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

RECEIVED
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Joe Gioia
JOE GIOIA
P.O. BOX 23651
FLAGSTAFF, AZ 86002

No. of Copies rec'd 011
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
January 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jam. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

Frank J. Santorelli
FRANK J. Santorelli
2401 W. RT 66 #84
Flagstaff AZ 86001
520-214-0782

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

AK

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

MME

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

JAN 19 2000 RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of a low power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in Mass Media Docket 99-25, which calls for creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nation wide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20th meeting. I ask you to consider that providing only for stations with maximum power of 100 Watts is inadequate to address the need of the American people, and certainly inadequate to meet the needs of citizens in Flagstaff and other small communities in the West.

Contrary to NAB claims, their opposition has nothing to do with interference! Witness the years of second and third channel adjacency operations grandfathered in a few years ago, generating no interference complaints. How could LPFM stations operating within guidelines cause interference?

I would remind you that there has been an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in these proceedings supporting the creation of 1000 Watt and 100 Watt stations as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. I am told this represents more comments than in any other FCC proceeding, and virtually all except those from the NAB, National Public Radio, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasters were in favor of the proposal.

The people have spoken, and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the NAB would be a disgrace. The Justice Department should investigate the use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB. Remember, it is not the mandate of the FCC to prevent competition, but, to promote competition.

Chairman Kennard, it has also come to my attention that Rep. Oxley from Ohio has introduced legislation designed to remove proper authority from the FCC to even create this needed class of broadcasting. I urge you not to bow to this misguided political pressure. The legislation is sure to follow the same path toward oblivion as the Tauzin bill last year.

I would hope that the FCC will vote January 20 for LPFM in it's full form as proposed in the NPRM issued last January.

Respectfully,

David L. Totten
702. W. Grand Canyon Ave
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 071
List ABCDE