

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

1225 SW Oak Terrace  
Lake Oswego, OR 97034  
January 28, 1999

RECEIVED

FCC Secretary  
1919 M Street, NW 122-  
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Docket ~~FCC MA~~ ~~122-122~~

Dear Madame/Sir:

The February Newsletter of KBPS, a public radio station in Portland, Oregon, contains an article dealing with a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking by the FCC that will affect public radio. As the author describes it, the change is to a system of selecting the winning applicant for public radio frequencies by either lottery or chance. Presumably, the reason for seeking to make such a change is the finding of a federal court that the previously used "comparative criteria" are vague and hence cannot be used.

I do not wish to see public radio or (television frequencies) be awarded by the use of lottery or chance. Rather, I urge you to seek to formulate criteria that are not "too vague" and which consider the public interest. If need be, even seek to have Congress aid with legislation in the matter.

Public broadcasting is much, much too important to be left to chance (or the highest bidder). Please make the effort to do this and avoid losing one of the jewels in American life.

Sincerely,

  
Stanley Aschenbrenner

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E \_\_\_\_\_

*2*

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Vancouver, WA  
January 30, 1999

FCC Secretary  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

RECEIVED

FEB 2 - 1999

FCC MAIL ROOM

RE: Docket#95-31

Dear Sirs:

I *strongly oppose* changing the present use of comparative criteria for selection among competing applications for noncommercial (public) radio frequencies.

The change over the years in the methods selecting applications and assigning frequencies for commercial broadcasters have led only to the control of radio by larger and larger national concerns and a most depressing lowering of the quality of all commercial radio.

There are many of us who now rely entirely on the "public broadcasters" for all radio programming, and the quality of those broadcasts has remained high, and in some cases actually improved.

Public broadcasters are not high-rollers who have access to major financing, and the idea that these channels should suddenly become open to the avarice of the marketplace is scandalous. Neither a random, chance selection nor a lottery (in which the richest broadcasters must inevitably win) is a satisfactory solution to any problem whatever.

Only the old-fashioned method, whereby conscientious local broadcasters can hope to win out by serving and appealing to their local listening base for support is at all appropriate.

I urge you to resist whatever pressures come from either the Congress or the broadcasting lobbyists.

Do the right thing, and scrap this inane proposal.

Yours,



Richard W. Alexander  
2223 "F" Street  
Vancouver, WA 98663  
Tel: (360) 695-7876  
E-Mail: kays@csci.clark.edu

No. of Copies rec'd 0  
List A B C D E