

**ORIGINAL**

MM 99-25

**From:** Dale Reich <ak437@rover.ascpl.lib.oh.us>  
**To:** K4DOM.K4PO2(PJACKSON)  
**Date:** 1/22/00 4:58PM  
**Subject:** Comments from Commissioner Powell's Homepage

**RECEIVED**

Dale Reich (ak437@mail.acorn.net) writes:

MAR 06 2000

A-OK on Low Power Station.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 198.234.71.219  
Remote IP address: 198.234.71.219

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

2

WMD

MM 99-25

**ORIGINAL RECEIVED**

**WILLIAM & RONNA SAURO**

NEVADA RESIDENCE  
101 RED CEDAR DRIVE / UNIT 4  
INCLINE VILLAGE, NV 89457  
TEL: (702) 833-1000

2 00 PM '00

SEASONAL RESIDENCE  
2809 PINE STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94115  
TEL: (415) 928-1686 / FAX: (415) 775-9536

EMAIL: BILL@SAURO.COM / FAMILY WEBSITE: HTTP://SAURO.COM

January 10, 2000

**RECEIVED**

MAR 06 2000

Via Federal Express

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The Honorable William E. Kennard  
Chairman,  
Federal Communications Commission  
The Portals  
455 Twelfth Street S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Kennard:

I thought from the beginning that the idea of creating a Low Power FM (LPFM) radio service was a great idea.

I felt, for example, that Incline Village, NV would be an ideal spot to build a LPFM station. But it would take advertising revenue to support such an effort.


It has now come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20th meeting to severely gut this proposal (NPRM) providing for only non-commercial stations with maximum power of 100 watts (coverage thus limited to only 3.5 miles as opposed to 9 miles for a 1000 watt station).

I don't think that the idea of low-power FM should be limited to non-commercial entities. Why can't it be like LPTV, with the option of commercial or non-commercial operation? And why not give it power enough to succeed.

There certainly is plenty of demand for a service like this; but allowing only non-commercial stations is not in the public's interest.

I would hope that the FCC would vote for LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM or delay the vote to clear the way for a workable LPFM service of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial stations.

Respectfully,



William H. Sauro

No. of Copies rec'd OK1  
List ABCDE

MMB

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

624 Mystic View  
Laguna Beach, CA 92651  
Tel - 949-497-7450  
Fax - 949-497-5370  
bobmccord@home.com



RECEIVED

MAR 06 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

MM 99-25

Fax

**To:** Chairman Kennard **From:** Robert McCord

---

**Fax:** 202-418-2801 **Pages:** 2

---

**Phone:** **Date:** 1/12/00

---

**Re:** Low Power FM **CC:**

---

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

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I have filed comments in the past with respect to the following issue. You have replied and I am grateful for that courtesy.

I have been working with Rodger Skinner on the issue of Low Power FM (LPFM) MM 99-25, for over two years. In the origin stages, most of us envisioned the creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nationwide. It appears now that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20th meeting to dramatically limit the initiative and license only non-commercial stations with a maximum power of 100 watts.

The eight or so corporations that own most of the radio spectrum in the United States, have opened their wallets to ensure the NAB lobby would erroneously convince the media and politicians that LPFM would spell the death of radio. Sure, and TV in the 50's spelled the death of the movie industry. Hogwash!

I am not alarmed at the vested interest of campaign-fund needy politicians being swayed by this rhetoric or indeed the mainstream media, but the FCC?

As Mr. Skinner so aptly puts it: "What possible reason can the FCC give for not permitting commercially supported LPFM stations, other than to protect NAB member stations from competition? Commercial support has nothing to do with interference! There is no good reason to doom the LPFM service by taking away its ability to support itself by the sale of commercial advertising, a method of support that has served this nations stations well for over 75 years."

I have talked to many small businesses in Laguna Beach, CA where I had hoped

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE


January 12, 2000

to establish a service. They have been excited about the possibility of LPFM providing them with the with their first time opportunity to advertise on radio. So much for that option if the non-commercial status is ruled on. The NAB is now a tight knit monopoly. Soon they will have IBOC broadcasting to boost revenues even further. They are currently compressing audio signals (see NY Times Jan 6, 00) to insert even more commercials. In the meantime they characterize LPFM as the greatest threat to radio in two decades. If the FCC caves in to the politicians we might as well take a step back to the revolution and start all over. We appear to have come full circle. The people are not running the Country any longer, the special interests are.

Again as Mr. Skinner points out, "The public has spoken on this matter and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) is a disgrace and use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB should be investigated by the Justice Department." It appears to me that the inmates are running the prison.

I first became interested in LPFM as a result of my frustration and the frustration of my fellow residents, during the fires that wiped out 400 homes in my Community of Laguna Beach. I would ask that in the event of another devastating fire, or mudslide here, that perhaps someone from the FCC will explain to it's residents why the NAB stations in Los Angeles were not able to provide the indigenous information that was so desperately needed.

Respectfully,



Robert McCord  
624 Mystic View, Laguna Beach, CA 92651  
949-497-7450

**ORIGINAL**

**RECEIVED**

MM 99-25

MAR 06 2000

January 11, 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard:

**EX PARTE OR LATE FILED**

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

I am a supporter of creation of a Low Power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in docket MM 99-25, which called for creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nationwide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20<sup>th</sup> meeting to severely gut this proposal (NPRM) providing for only non-commercial stations with a maximum power of 100 watts (coverage thus limited to only 3.5 miles as opposed to 9 miles for a 1000 watt station).

To place such severe limits on LPFM would doom the service before it begins, making it impossible to obtain enough financial support, without being able to sell commercial airtime, to exist.


I wish to remind you that there was an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in this proceeding supporting the creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt stations, allowing for both commercial and non-commercial operation as set forth in the FCC's NPRM.

The public has spoken on this matter and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) is a disgrace and use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB should be investigated by the Justice Department.

The NAB tried to cause confusion on this issue by claiming that the new LPFM station would cause interference to existing stations. A receiver study conducted by the FCC proved this to be incorrect. The NAB raised this smokescreen issue to attempt to conceal its real dislike for LPFM, in fact that it does not want competition for listeners or for advertising revenues for its member stations. The FCC cannot prevent competition and is supposed to promote competition.

I would hope that the FCC would vote in LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM or delay the vote to clear the way for a workable LPFM service for 1000 and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial stations.

Respectfully submitted:



Richard L Walen  
834 Pleasant Avenue  
Zumbrota, Minnesota 55992  
507-732-5005

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

Dear Chairman Kennard,

As someone who has followed the Low Power FM debate ~~from the start~~ and developed a profound respect for you and your work to **bring the idea** to reality, I'm deeply concerned by the rumors that you'll be ~~submitting to a watered down~~ version of the proposal.

Please stick to your guns and vote for your original **proposal**: Allow these stations to be commercial! Please! Allow these stations to max at 1000 watts, not 100! Please!

I don't follow much legislature, but I'm an avid supporter of community radio and the power of the frequencies. You've done a noble service by proposing LPFM in the first place. Why not go whole hog and stick to your guns. I remain,

Hopeful and appreciative,

Randall Roberts  
St. Louis, MO  
(314) 615-6702

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARYMM 99-25  
FX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Sunday, January 16, 2000

Chairman Kennard  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, DC

Dear Chairman Kennard:

I am a supporter of creation of a Low Power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in docket MM 99-25, which called for creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nationwide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20th meeting to severely gut this proposal. These cuts would provide for only non-commercial stations, limited to a maximum power of 100 watts (coverage thus limited to only 3.5 miles as opposed to 9 miles for a 1000-watt station).

To place such severe limits on LPFM would doom the service before it begins, making it impossible to obtain sufficient financial support. Without the ability to sell commercial airtime, who in their right mind would even attempt to build such a facility.

What possible reason can the FCC give for not permitting commercially supported LPFM stations, other than to protect NAB member stations from competition? Commercial support has nothing to do with interference! There is no good reason to doom the LPFM service by taking away its ability to support itself through the sale of commercial advertising, a method of support that has served this nation's stations well for over 75 years!

In fact to not allow commercial support would do a great disservice to small businesses in America that cannot afford to advertise on full-power radio stations. The needs of the small business can be met through the presence of LPFM stations. A decision to not allow commercial support would have an extremely negative impact on small business in America and may well violate some rules of the Small Business Administration.

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

I wish to remind you that there was an overwhelming **number** (thousands) of comments filed in this proceeding supporting the creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt stations, allowing for both commercial and non-commercial operation as presented in the FCC's NPRM.

The public has spoken on this matter and to ignore **this public mandate** and cave in to political pressure from the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) is a disgrace. The NAB looks after the interests of its **members**. Who looks after the interests of the general populace?

The NAB tried to cause confusion on this issue by **claiming** that the new LPFM stations would cause interference to existing stations. A receiver study conducted by the FCC proved this to be incorrect. The NAB raised this smokescreen issue to attempt to conceal its real dislike for LPFM, the fact that it does not want competition for listeners or advertising revenues for its member stations. The FCC cannot prevent competition and is supposed to promote competition. Are the actions of the FCC in regard to cable, telephone and Internet not applicable here, too? The FCC should—**MUST** spur competition in the broadcast industry. This is the perfect tool for such.

I would hope that the FCC would vote for LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM or delay the vote to clear the way for a workable LPFM service of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial stations. To do any less would be almost criminal in nature.

Respectfully,

Stuart A Rowland  
RR 3 Box 277-B  
Harveys Lake, PA 18618  
(570) 639-5167

## FACSIMILE COVER PAGE

Date: 01/16/00  
Time: 19:09:24  
Pages: 3

To: Chairman Kennard  
Company: Federal Communications Commission  
Fax #: (202) 418-2801

From: Stuart & Nancy Rowland  
Address: RR 3 Box 277-B  
Harveys Lake, PA 18618  
USA

Fax #: (570) 639-5167  
Voice #: (570) 639-5167

**ORIGINAL**

MM 99-25

**WBUI-TV ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT****RECEIVED**

TO: CHAIRMAN WILLIAM KENNARD

FROM: KYLE WALKER

FX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MAR 06 2000

SUBJECT: NEW LPFM SERVICE

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DATE: 01/11/2000

CC: COMMISSIONER NESS, COMMISSIONER TRISTANI, COMMISSIONER POWELL,  
COMMISSIONER FURCHT-GOTT-ROTH

Mr. Kennard,

I write you this letter to express to you my thoughts and concerns of the proposed LPFM service. First, I must say that I am glad to see a new light and direction in the FCC. For the first time in my 10 years in the broadcast industry, I feel that we have a chairman that is truly concerned and constantly pushing the envelope to promote competition and new and enhanced services for Americans today. I was delighted to see that you listened and recognized the need for an additional class of FM radio service. I was also pleased to see how quickly progress has been made from the NPRM in January to where we are at this point. For this you must be commended.

My concern to you is this: It has come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20<sup>th</sup> meeting to severely restructure what LPFM has the potential of accomplishing. The job of the FCC has always been to promote competition and to govern and provide maximum usage of the airwaves. The commission has recognized the need for a new FM radio service based upon the thousands of inquires it receives every year. The commission has also found that under the current classes of FM there are, in most cases, no room at all for ANY additional allotments in the medium to heavy populated areas; however, there is some room in the FM band for a new lower class set of stations what we know now as the LP-1000 and the LP-100 classes. I feel, as I have stated in my comments, that the two new classes should be added, where they may fit, to the standard 201-220 non-commercial and 221-300 commercial allotments we have now and under the same rules and minimum distance requirements as set forth in the NPRM. The NAB is obviously against ANY new FM service as this could "cause interference". Several tests have shown, including your own, that this is simply not true if the new service is implemented correctly, i.e. protection of 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> adjacents. I am a member of the NAB. The fact is that they are only concerned about the "well being" of their supporting stations and financial concerns they could have, especially with a LP-1000 class service placed in the right area of a market.

Mr. Kennard, I sincerely hope that you and the commissioners will place the new LPFM service into place, under the same rules and regulations that a C class down to an A class have now; commercial in the commercial band, non-commercial in the non-commercial band. Keeping the first, second and third adjacents is a must. By doing this the commission will impose the same interference standards that are already in place for

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

new commercial allotments now. The new LP class will cause no additional interference than that of a new class A FM station squeezed in the table of allotments and now on the air. Your answer right there to the "what happens with IBOC" question. No one is concerned about the new station that just signed on down the road. The commission's job has always been to promote competition. I hope that the NAB has not diluted this trust or that the commission will not "water down" the new LPFM class to that of an all non-commercial, LP-100 class that will be used as a peace offering to the NAB and existing radio stations and then as the solution to the people. Minorities and those who do not have access to the 1 million dollar startup cost of even a class A station need a competitive solution. Local business need an affordable solution to radio advertising. We, the people, need a better variety on the airspace that is still yet available in most areas. Your new LPFM service is the solution. I hope that you will place these two new classes into effect, however you deem necessary, in a matter that will serve the public interest and not customize this service to the interest of the NAB and other opposing parties.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "KWB Walker", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Kyle Walker, Director of Engineering  
ACME Television of Illinois  
Calvin Communications

MM 99-25

ORIGINAL

Wayne D. Warren  
217 South Broad Street  
Kennett Square, PA 19348  
610/925-0544

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2000

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 18, 2000

The Honorable William E. Kennard  
Chairman,  
Federal Communications Commission  
The Portals  
455 Twelfth Street S.W.  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Kennard:

I am a supporter for the creation of a Low Power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in docket MM 99-25, which called for creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nationwide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20<sup>th</sup> meeting to severely gut this proposal (NPRM) providing for only non-commercial stations with maximum power of 100 watts (coverage thus limited to only 3.5 miles as opposed to 9 miles for a 1000 watt station). To place such severe limits on LPFM would doom the service before it begins, making it impossible to obtain enough financial support, without being able to sell commercial airtime, to exist.

What possible reason can the FCC give for not permitting commercially supported LPFM stations, other than to protect NAB member stations from competition? Commercial support has nothing to do with interference! There is no good reason to doom the LPFM service by taking away its ability to support itself by the sale of commercial advertising, a method of support that has served this nations stations well for over 75 years!

In fact, to not allow commercial support would do a great disservice to small businesses in America that cannot afford to advertise on full-power radio stations. Their needs would have been met by LPFM stations. A decision to not allow commercial support would have a vast negative impact on small business in America and may well violate some rules of the Small Business Administration.

I wish to remind you that there was an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in this proceeding supporting the creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt stations, allowing for both commercial and non-commercial operation as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. The public has spoken on this matter and to ignore this public mandate and give in to political pressure from the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) is a disgrace and use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB should be investigated by the Justice Department.

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

2

The NAB tried to cause confusion on this issue by claiming that the new LPFM stations would cause interference to existing stations. A receiver study conducted by the FCC proved this to be incorrect. The NAB raised this smokescreen issue to attempt to conceal its real dislike for LPFM, the fact that it does not want competition for listeners or advertising revenues for its member stations. The FCC is supposed to *promote* competition, not prevent it.

As the media outlets in this country become ever more the voices of only the rich and the mergers of corporate "media giants" become common place, LPFM offers an opportunity for individuals and communities alike to once again be served and heard.

I would hope that the FCC would vote for LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM or delay the vote to clear the way for a workable LPFM service of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial stations.

Respectfully,



Wayne D. Warren

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2000

MM 99-25

ORIGINAL

Dear Mr. Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

In the coming days I suspect your office is going to be flooded with letters such as this, so let me be the first to start. My name is Mitchell Tucker and I am a very strong supporter of the creation of a Low Powered FM Broadcast Service as outlined in the FCC Notice of Proposed Rule Making in Docket MM 99-25 for the creation of a 1000 and 100 watt FM commercial broadcast service.

It is my understanding that a vote will take place on Jan 20<sup>th</sup> that appears to be a complete reversal of your support of this service. You seem set to vote to limit the service to a maximum power level of only 100 watts!

Mr. Kennard, you know as well as I that 100 watts is not sufficient and output to provide coverage to amount to anything. In the beginning of this process you seemed ready to provide the LPFM community with 1000 watts. This would have provided coverage to an average size county to allow enough listeners to receive a quality local station.

Sir have you collapsed to the pressure of the NAB? I surely hope not. At first you seemed ready to finally make it possible for average people to serve their community by providing quality programming without the canned sound of full powered stations. Now the indication is that you will vote for a watered down service that will not even allow for the commercial sale of air time!

In the past I sent you e-mails that stated my personal position on this issue. Are you afraid of the alleged interference that the NAB is screaming about that will take place on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> channels in the FM band? It looks like these guys still think receiver manufacturers use vacuum tubes in their receivers. Don't forget your agency conducted a receiver study that disproves the NAB doctrine that there is not enough spectrum space for more FM stations. I have a copy of both the FCC study and the one conducted by the NAB in front of me and there is nothing in the NAB document that can make me believe that Low Powered FM is not possible.


No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

Mr. Kennard, failure to allow for commercial sales even at these levels will not allow but a small, and I mean small number of stations to go on the air. People will not **even be** able to upgrade old equipment without hardship. Is this what the NAB wants, to have **everyone but the rich** fail at the radio business?

Sir don't forget there are a **LARGE** number of people in this country **that wish to see this service** in place. I do not think you can ignore the pressure you are going to be under if you cave to the special interest of the National Association of Broadcasters and **refuse to listen to people whose taxes pay the FCC budget.**

To conclude I think it is time to stop running scared on this and **go ahead and vote for an LPFM service that not only provides an ample power level for survival but the ability to pay the bills for this service should be there as well.**

Respectfully



Mitchell Tucker  
3300 Harrow Court.  
Marietta, GA. 30060  
770-435-3250

ORIGINAL

*MM 99-25***KBTV 25 FAX**1152 Pebblewood Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95833-1157

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

DATE: JANUARY 14, 2000 TIME:

TO: CHAIRMAN KENNARD PHONE:  
F C C FAX: (202) 418-2801

FROM: Bob Suffel, Gen. Manager PHONE: (916) 920-2525  
KBTV 25 FAX: (916) 920-9188

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I support creation of a Low Power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in docket MM 99-25, which called for ~~creation of~~ 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nationwide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20th meeting to severely gut this proposal (NPRM) providing for only non-commercial stations with maximum power of 100 watts (coverage thus limited to only 3.5 miles as opposed to 9 miles for a 1000 watt station).

These changes would only protect the business interests of existing stations, while limiting opportunities for new entrants to FM to provide unique, local service.

To place such severe limits on LPFM would doom the service before it begins, making it impossible to obtain enough financial support, without being able to sell commercial air time, to exist—a method of support that has served this nation's stations well for over 75 years!

Not allow commercial support, would do a great disservice to small businesses in America that now cannot afford to advertise on full-power radio stations. Their needs could be met by LPFM stations. A decision to not allow commercial support would have a vast negative impact on small business in America and may well violate some rules of the Small Business Administration.

There were thousands of comments filed in this proceeding supporting the creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt stations, allowing for both commercial and non-commercial operation as set forth in the FCC's NPRM. The public has spoken, and to ignore this mandate would be to ignore the public interest.

Opponents have caused confusion on this issue by claiming that the new LPFM stations would cause interference to existing stations. A receiver study conducted by the FCC proved this to be incorrect. Hundred of full-power FM stations already operate on 2nd and 3rd adjacent channels without any complaints of interference. Surely, low-power FM stations would not create an interference problem.

I would hope that the FCC would vote for LPFM in its full form, as proposed in the NPRM, or delay the vote to clear the way for a workable LPFM service of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial stations.

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2000

MM 99-25

ORIGINAL

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

I am a supporter of creation of a Low Power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rule making in docket MM 99-25, which called for creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nationwide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20th meeting to severely gut this proposal (NPRM) providing for only non-commercial stations with maximum power of 100 watts (coverage thus limited to only 3.5 miles as opposed to 9 miles for a 1000 watt station).

To place such severe limits on LPFM would doom the service before it begins, making it impossible to obtain enough financial support, without being able to sell commercial air time, to exist.

What possible reason can the FCC give for not permitting commercially supported LPFM stations, other than to protect NAB member stations from competition? Commercial support has nothing to do with interference! There is no good reason to doom the LPFM service by taking away its ability to support itself by the sale of commercial advertising, a method of support that has served this nations stations well for over 75 years!

In fact to not allow commercial support would do a great dis-service to small businesses in America that cannot afford to advertise on full-power radio stations. Their needs would have been met by LPFM stations. A decision to not allow commercial support would have a vast negative impact on small business in America and may well violate some rules of the Small Business Administration.

I wish to remind you that there was an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in this proceeding supporting the creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt stations, allowing for both commercial and non-commercial operation as set forth in the FCC's NPRM.

The public has spoken on this matter and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) is a disgrace and use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB should be investigated by the Justice Department.

The NAB tried to cause confusion on this issue by claiming that the new LPFM stations would cause interference to existing stations. A receiver study conducted by the FCC proved this to be incorrect. The NAB raised this

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

2

smokescreen issue to attempt to conceal its real dislike for LPFM, the fact that it does not want competition for listeners or advertising revenues for its member stations. The FCC cannot prevent competition and is supposed to promote competition.

I would hope that the FCC would vote for LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM or delay the vote to clear the way for a workable LPFM service of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial stations.

Respectfully,

George Smith

729 28<sup>th</sup> Street West

Dickinson ND 58601

701-227-1848

**RECEIVED**

MAR 06 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*MM 99-25*  
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**ORIGINAL**

Dear FCC Chairman Kennard :

I am a supporter of creation of a Low Power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in ~~ocket~~ *MM 99-25*, which called for creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nationwide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20th meeting to severely gut this proposal (NPRM) providing for only non-commercial stations with maximum power of 100 watts (coverage thus limited to only 3.5 miles as opposed to 9 miles for a 1000 watt station).

To place such severe limits on LPFM would doom the service before it begins, making it impossible to obtain enough financial support, without being able to sell commercial airtime, to exist.

What possible reason can the FCC give for not permitting commercially supported LPFM stations, other than to protect NAB member stations from competition? Commercial support has nothing to do with interference! There is no good reason to doom the LPFM service by taking away its ability to support itself by the sale of commercial advertising, a method of support that has served this nations stations well for over 75 years!

In fact to not allow commercial support would do a great dis-service to small businesses in America that cannot afford to advertise on full-power radio stations. Their needs would have been met by LPFM stations. A decision to not allow commercial support would have a vast negative impact on small business in America and may well violate some rules of the Small Business Administration.

I wish to remind you that there was an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in this proceeding supporting the creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt stations, allowing for both commercial and non-commercial operation as set forth in the FCC's NPRM.

The public has spoken on this matter and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) is a disgrace and use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB should be investigated by the Justice Department.

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

The NAB tried to cause confusion on this issue by claiming that the new LPFM stations would cause interference to existing stations. A receiver study conducted by the FCC proved this to be incorrect. The NAB raised this smokescreen issue to attempt to conceal its real dislike for LPFM, the fact that it does not want competition for listeners or advertising revenues for its member stations. The FCC cannot prevent competition and is supposed to promote competition.

I would hope that the FCC would vote for LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM or delay the vote to clear the way for a workable LPFM service of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial stations.

Respectfully,

David Rockwell

RR 2 Box 70

Gillett Pa, 16925

Phone 570-596-3305

e-mail - drockwel@prolog.net

MM 99-25



# DODGE CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

2501 North 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue • Dodge City, Kansas 67801-2399 • 316-225-1321  
1-800-FOR-DCCC (1-800-367-3222) FAX: 316-225-0918

ORIGINAL

FX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

1/14/00

To: Mr. William Kennard  
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, DC.

From: John L. Ewy  
Prof., Mass Communications  
Dodge City Community College

Re: Low-Power FM

I know you don't have much extra time for letters. I will keep this short. I appreciate the fact that you have supported the idea of LPFM. I know the NAB, is not in favor of it. I think it is very much needed, especially in western Kansas.

Two major broadcast companies own almost the radio (AM and FM) stations in the Dodge City and Garden City area. We have many small communities that do not get local coverage. Small business folks don't have big adv. budgets to purchase radio time that goes outside their market place.

I strongly support docket MM-99-55, for the creation of 1000 and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations. I would be happy to work with people needing training to get stations on the air and keep them on the air.

Thanks again for your support of LPFM.

John L. Ewy

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
MAR 06 2000

MM 99-25

Dear FCC Chairman Kennard

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am a supporter of creation of a Low Power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in docket MM 99-25, which called for creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations nationwide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20th meeting to severely gut this proposal (NPRM) providing for only non-commercial stations with maximum power of 100 watts (coverage thus limited to only 3.5 miles as opposed to 9 miles for a 1000 watt station).

To place such severe limits on LPFM would doom the service before it begins, making it impossible to obtain enough financial support, without being able to sell commercial airtime, to exist.

What possible reason can the FCC give for not permitting commercially supported LPFM stations, other than to protect NAB member stations from competition? Commercial support has nothing to do with interference! There is no good reason to doom the LPFM service by taking away its ability to support itself by the sale of commercial advertising, a method of support that has served this nations stations well for over 75 years!

In fact to not allow commercial support would do a great dis-service to small businesses in America that cannot afford to advertise on full-power radio stations. Their needs would have been met by LPFM stations. A decision to not allow commercial support would have a vast negative impact on small business in America and may well violate some rules of the Small Business Administration.

I wish to remind you that there was an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in this proceeding supporting the creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt stations, allowing for both commercial and non-commercial operation as set forth in the FCC's NPRM.

The public has spoken on this matter and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) is a disgrace and use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB should be investigated by the Justice Department.

The NAB tried to cause confusion on this issue by claiming that the new LPFM stations would cause interference to existing stations. A receiver study conducted by the FCC proved this to be incorrect. The NAB raised this smokescreen issue to attempt to conceal its real dislike for LPFM, the fact that it does not want competition for listeners or advertising revenues for its member stations. The FCC cannot prevent competition and is supposed to promote competition.

I would hope that the FCC would vote for LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM or delay the vote to clear the way for a workable LPFM service of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial stations.

Respectfully, Tom Scozzari

304 West High St Milford Pa 18337

570-296-1750

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

**ORIGINAL**

MM 99-25

**To:** FCC Chairman Kennard **From:** Scott Drew **RECEIVED**

**Fax:** 202-418-2801 **Pages:** 1 **MAR 06 2000**

**Re:** LPFM **Date:** 01/14/00

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I am a supporter of creation of a Low Power FM (LPFM) radio service as outlined in the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in docket MM 99-25, which called for creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial LPFM stations with no 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> adjacent channel restrictions nationwide.

It has come to my attention that the FCC intends to vote at its Jan 20th meeting to severely gut this proposal (NPRM) providing for only non-commercial stations with maximum power of 100 watts (coverage thus limited to only 3.5 miles as opposed to 9 miles for a 1000 watt station).

To place such severe limits on LPFM would doom the service before it begins, making it impossible to obtain enough financial support, without being able to sell commercial airtime, to exist.

What possible reason can the FCC give for not permitting commercially supported LPFM stations, other than to protect NAB member stations from competition? Commercial support has nothing to do with interference! There is no good reason to doom the LPFM service by taking away its ability to support itself by the sale of commercial advertising, a method of support that has served this nation's stations well for over 75 years!

In fact to not allow commercial support would do a great dis-service to small businesses in America that cannot afford to advertise on full-power radio stations. Their needs would have been met by LPFM stations. A decision to not allow commercial support would have a vast negative impact on small business in America and may well violate some rules of the Small Business Administration.

Additionally, there should be no 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> adjacent channel restrictions. The NAB tried to cause confusion on this issue by claiming that the new LPFM stations would cause interference to existing stations. A receiver study conducted by the FCC proved this to be incorrect. The NAB raised this smokescreen issue to attempt to conceal its real dislike for LPFM, the fact that it does not want competition for listeners or advertising revenues for its member stations. The FCC cannot prevent competition and is supposed to promote competition.

I wish to remind you that there was an overwhelming number (thousands) of comments filed in this proceeding supporting the creation of 1000 watt and 100 watt stations, allowing for both commercial and non-commercial operation as set forth in the FCC's NPRM.

The public has spoken on this matter and to ignore this public mandate and cave in to political pressure from the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) is a disgrace and use of such anti-competitive actions by the NAB should be investigated by the Justice Department.

I would hope that the FCC would vote for LPFM in its full form as proposed in the NPRM or delay the vote to clear the way for a workable LPFM service of 1000 watt and 100 watt commercial and non-commercial stations with no 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> adjacent channel restrictions.

Respectfully,



Scott Drew  
2421 NE Irving St #214, Portland, OR 97232 503-236-1601

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

JAN 12, 00

DEAR CHAIRMAN KENNARD,

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

WE NEED TO HAVE A NON-  
COMMERCIAL LOW POWER RADIO  
BAND. PLEASE DO WHAT YOU CAN  
TO HELP LOW POWER RADIO. VOTE  
FOR LPFM IN ITS FIVE FORM.

THANK YOU

Rich Bartholomew  
P.O. Box 2073  
Pawleys Island, SC.  
29585.

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE



EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MM 99-25

Attention: ~~William Kennard, FCC Chairman~~ ORIGINAL RECEIVED

Subject: LPFM - Vote on January 20, 2000 MAR 06 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

My name is Gerard Brice. I am president of a newly formed company that is ready to embark on Low Power Radio Ownership. We have never been so excited about the possibility of owning our first radio station.

My company consists of all African-American Men with MBA's and excellent radio broadcasting experience.

As you are aware, the need for more minority radio stations is in great demand. We saw LPFM as the perfect opportunity to enter the radio arena without the huge financial costs associated with A. Full Power Station.

We were anticipating the FCC to grant licenses for LPFM in the year 2000, but most importantly, 1000 watt commercial stations as mentioned in the proposal.

It has come to our attention, that the NAB has "successfully influenced and pressured" the FCC to completely modify the original proposal to Noncommercial, 100 watt stations only. This would be a terrible injustice!

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
Ltr ABCDE

**The sad fact is that without commerical LPFM, African-Americans and other minorities well we eliminated from radio ownership.**

The FCC is planning to vote on Jan 20. Without **1000** watts commercial LPFM stations, we will NEVER have an **opportunity** to compete and financially survive.

We were so devastated by this news and frankly **disappointed** in the FCC. We understand the political and "Big Corporate" **power** that wants to Kill LPFM. The FCC has been fighting for LPFM so **long** and we surely would have been an **excellent example** of a successful African-American LPFM radio station.

**Please vote on 1000-watt commercial Low Power Stations.**

God Bless.

Gerard Brice  
DeMichael Media  
(312) 946 - 8760