ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

NMLE

RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

AUG 2 4 11 PM '99

RECEIVED

NOV 01 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

William E. Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street N.W.
Washington DC 20554

To whom it may concern;

This letter is to support our Low-Power FM radio – community radio. This is a very good opportunity for local music lovers to listen to really what they want instead of big hot shot radios and their own picks. Local event and activities could also be heard easily instead of listening to what's going on in New York or Los Angeles, we would like to hear about our neighborhood. We are in support of bringing the idea of localism back to Denver Radio. It is a good way to broaden arena of political, social and entertainment programming.

Erkan Genel

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

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

AUG 2 4 11 PM '99

William E. Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street N.W.
Washington DC 20554

To whom it may concern;

This letter is to support our Low-Power FM radio – community radio. This is a very good opportunity for local music lovers to listen to really what they want instead of big hot shot radios and their own picks. Local event and activities could also be heard easily instead of listening to what's going on in New York or Los Angeles, we would like to hear about our neighborhood. We are in support of bringing the idea of localism back to Denver Radio. It is a good way to broaden arena of political, social and entertainment programming.

Krista R. Reckwen

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

C...GINAL MM 99-25

RECEIVED EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

AUG 2 4 11 PM '99

RECEIVED

NOV 01 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

William E. Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street N.W.
Washington DC 20554

To whom it may concern;

This letter is to support our Low-Power FM radio – community radio. This is a very good opportunity for local music lovers to listen to really what they want instead of big hot shot radios and their own picks. Local event and activities could also be heard easily instead of listening to what's going on in New York or Los Angeles, we would like to hear about our neighborhood. We are in support of bringing the idea of localism back to Denver Radio. It is a good way to broaden arena of political, social and entertainment programming.

Serkan Yalcin

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

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

William E. Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street N.W.
Washington DC 20554

AUG 2 4 11 PM '99

RECEIVED

NOV 01 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

To whom it may concern;

This letter is to support our Low-Power FM radio – community radio. This is a very good opportunity for local music lovers to listen to really what they want instead of big hot shot radios and their own picks. Local event and activities could also be heard easily instead of listening to what's going on in New York or Los Angeles, we would like to hear about our neighborhood. We are in support of bringing the idea of localism back to Denver Radio. It is a good way to broaden arena of political, social and entertainment programming.

KAAN BERBEROGLU

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

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: "J. Payne" <JCPayne@Mediaone.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Mon, Oct 4, 1999 8:16 PM
Subject: Stay as "no" to regulation.

RECEIVED
NOV 01 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman William Kennard,

I'm writing to you about the Open-access debate of cable networks. I've been reading many different stories from many sources, and have even been in newsgroup discussions. I think that the unregulation method is the most healthy for the Internet community, I have MediaOne's cable service and think the regulation will only lead to other companies not wanting to make any investments in future technologies. With open-access, I think it would be reasonable for individual cities and towns to have the rights to 'buy back' the lines from the cable franchise holders and license them to any companies the city chooses but the idea of having one company invest in expensive high-speed lines, and have them taken away. Would only create a lack of services in the future. Each service available will have it's chance in the "lime light". Cable modems, currently have that chance now. If someone else makes the next technology and markets it. Cable services will have the same fight as other ISP's are- and will have to drop prices likewise.

Many other ISP's are already turning to ADSL services, which in time will begin to drop in price. Any local governments also wanting to purchase infrastructure should be aloud to do so. But taking one companies investment will stop any further advancements. For instance, suppose AT&T is forced to maintain the lines and open-access is in place. If there are ANY cities or towns without cable modem service chances are they would never get cable modem services. AOL wouldn't pay to run lines there for everyone else to use. AT&T wouldn't invest anymore money in it either, ofcourse you couldn't expect for Cox or @home to spend money on someone else's lines either(AT&T's). I think it would be a serious mistake for future inventors and or investors and will hinder future improvements.

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

From: <KCROGUE1@aol.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Wed, Oct 6, 1999 12:23 AM
Subject: Modem access

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
NOV 1 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I read your speech on Broadband internet access, my suggestion is that you remove the 53K limit on Dial Up Modems. If Broadband providers know that consumers can access the internet at let's say around 70-100K on a Dial Up Modem, then they'll have to lower costs to make it worthwhile for consumers to want Broadband. That should give you the competition you're looking for.

Bryan Cooper
615 Kenneth Lane
Belton Mo 64012
(816)331-7095

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
NOV 01 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Daniel O Boyd <danboyd@bellsouth.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Mon, Oct 4, 1999 8:28 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Daniel O Boyd (danboyd@bellsouth.net) writes:

I hate to say it but it looks like I am going to have to vote Republican. I wish you could see the desparity in treatment between the RBOC's and the long distance carriers that you with the FCC are giving, that is from my prospective.
The RBOC's are face with yearly enormous
cost to maintain their network while the long distance carriers enjoy low cost and the cream of the top. Not to mention having you mislead to delaying the RBOCS entrance into their market while they merge into even larger players. It seems like your trying to put BellSouth out of business. Well keep it up and you might succeed! I think the FCC needs to be 5 or 6 seperate subsidiaries. And see how easy it becomes to get any thing productive accomplished. At any time other than the present what you are doing wouldn't be believed muchless permitted.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.214.174.126
Remote IP address: 209.214.174.126

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Scott Watson <scotwatson@home.com>
To: K4DOM.K4PO2(NETMSGS)
Date: Fri, Sep 24, 1999 8:36 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

RECEIVED

NOV 01 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Scott Watson (scotwatson@home.com) writes:

Dear Ms. Ness, Please allow ATT to compete in the SF-Bay area. ATT has the programs that work the best for me. GTE, Sprint, Cellular One, and PacBell are all available. Why not let ATT compete? I think keeping ATT out of my area is anti-competition. Thanks for your time. Scott Watson.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 24.1.64.33
Remote IP address: 24.1.64.33

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

From: Brian L Gass <bgass@az.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Tue, Sep 28, 1999 1:00 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED
NOV 01 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Brian L Gass (bgass@az.com) writes:

Dear Sir:

I am writing this e-mail to let you know of one citizens frustration with the current "Open Access" debate.

I am totally against any forced access regulation. If I were a company investing BILLIONS of dollars to create value for my business, shareholders and CLIENTs by offering high-speed Internet access...why would I want to invest the enormous resources only to have those who INVEST NOTHING, be able to benefit?

I hope someone lets the people in Portland, Florida and other places who are becoming the puppets of AOL and the baby bells that some know what is going on and why.

AOL and the phone companies have been excruciatingly slow in providing high speed access. Why? BECAUSE THEY DIDN"T HAVE TO GIVE IT TO US! ISDN has been around for a dogs age, yet no broad deployments of it? Why BECAUSE THEY DIDN"T HAVE TO GIVE IT TO US!

I hope you realize that the motivation behind the open access issue is only to slow down or kill any real attempt to get high speed access to the masses.

Sincerely,
Brian L Gass

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.145.7.32
Remote IP address: 216.145.7.32

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
NOV 01 1999
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: Brian R. Vegoe <brvegoe@yahoo.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(BKENNARD)
Date: Tue, Sep 28, 1999 1:59 PM
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Brian R. Vegoe (brvegoe@yahoo.com) writes:

hello, i am a broker who has put many clients into ATHM. i feel completely betrayed and cheated by the legal system regarding this open access debate. how can you let isp's and aol get open access on cable companies networks after these companies have made enormous investments in their cable systems. the owners of these cable companies (shareholders) have seen their stocks underperform for years and finally when there is some light at the end of the tunnel with new services being offered some political/legal pissing match starts that basically ruins any monentum these cable companies had. did AOL buy this judge in Oregon? or does this judge have no clue how american capitalism works. the service that athm offers is cheaper and better than anything out there, this ruling is delaying broadband!!! how can you let this happen and when are you guys going to do something about it? how can anyone with any knowledge of antitrust laws regulate something like this before its even rolled!
out???? i want my cable broadba
nd, and i want it NOW!!!!!!! please respond to these comments. how can one judge in Oregon be allowed to dictate national anti-trust laws. and when are the local phone companies going to open up their markets? this situation really upsets me and i can't believe something hasn't been done already, San Fran Chronicle does a great job argueing my point, READ IT and do SOMETHING!!!!!!!!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 198.36.203.202
Remote IP address: 198.36.203.202

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

MM 99-25

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED APR 8 10 53 AM '99

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED

NOV 01 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

March 29, 1999

Beth Williams
6848 26th Avenue NE
Seattle, Washington 98115

William Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
445 12 Street SW
Washington D.C. 20554

I encourage you to support the legalization and licensing of micro radio stations (low power radio stations of under 100 watts), to NOT auction off the licenses to the highest bidder, and to require micro station owners to live in the communities to which the micro radio station broadcasts.

Auctioning off the licenses would put the licenses out of the financial reach of the local, low budget but good cause type of groups that I would like to see be able to use the "public airways." Auctioning off the licenses puts a one-time infusion of money over public interest. I encourage you to value the service that can be provided by low power radio broadcasting more than the large licensing fees that large broadcasters can afford but community-based groups cannot. Micro radio licenses should be available at a fairly low, flat fee for purchase by non-commercial community-based groups.

Allowing community-based groups to use radio waves to broadcast information to their local communities would be the best way the FCC could server the public interest. As you know, micro radio stations are fairly inexpensive to set up but other types of communications (e.g. print ads, billboards, TV spots, staffed telephones, paper mailings) are prohibitively expensive for small, local organizations. Community-based groups do a lot of good in local communities but need better and less expensive ways to communicate with the users of their services.

The FCC can help promote democracy and strengthen local communities by legalizing micro radio stations, making the licenses within financial reach of small local groups, and requiring that the licenses can only be purchases by members of the local community.

Sincerely,

Beth Williams

Beth Williams

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

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MM 99-25

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

William E. Kennard
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street N.W.
Washington DC 20554

4 11 PM '99

RECEIVED

NOV 01 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter because there seems to be a lack of community-oriented radio in the current Denver market. Right now, it is hard for local voices to be heard on the radio stations that are controlled by corporate radio. I gladly support low-power FM radio. It not only helps the small businesses in the community by giving them a more focused targeted audience and potential patrons, but it also gives them a low-cost option for advertising.

Low-power FM radio stations, being community based and operated, will also give me more information about events taking place in my neighborhood. Corporate radio stations don't have the same interest invested in the local community that a low-power FM radio station might.

I hope that you take my thoughts into consideration when you make a decision regarding low-power FM radio stations. I would appreciate it. Thank you.

Best Regards,

Jessica Westerberg

Jessica Westerberg

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL MM 99-25

RECEIVED
AUG 2 3 47 PM '99

RECEIVED
NOV 01 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4-7-99

William E. Kennard,

I would like to briefly communicate to you the benefits of supporting Low-Power FM Radio. The argument, for me is both personal and one that can be rationed politically.

First of all, personally, I have friends who are pursuing careers in the radio industry, but they don't want to support the promotion of the select few most popular musical groups which most corporate radio stations broadcast exclusively. I also know a broad diversity of listeners who would support alternative stations out of desire for diverse music.

As a musician myself, I see the industry as overly selective, even discriminatory toward music that has not already accomplished publicity. So, it comes to the vicious circle of "it takes publicity to get publicity". If the range of music broadened, then more musical groups would have the chance to be aired, as opposed to a select few. I think that the general public would react positively to an abundance of more diverse local stations, because people are diverse, and themselves don't like to hear the same type of music, or specific songs, overplayed.

Supporting Low-Power FM Radio could easily help bring communities together because of the increased opportunities for local inter-community interaction and the proliferation of more local voices.

There is good reason to support Low-Power FM Radio because it provides positive community opportunities for radio staff, musicians and citizens. As local stations promote community involvement, they then would be contributing to the integrative well-being of the area.

Thank you,

Maura Williams
2880 Newland St.
Edgewater, CO 80214

P.S. Thank you thoroughly for your time. I don't expect a reply.

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

ORIGINAL

MM 99-25

RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

AUG 4 3 22 PM '99

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED

NOV 01 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

March 4, 1999

The Honorable William E. Kennard
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Room 8-B210
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Kennard:

I am writing in opposition to the creation of a new low power FM radio service as proposed in the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making ("NPRM"), released February 3, 1999. I am a radio broadcaster on the island of Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico possesses a number of unique factors which make it ill-suited to the expansion of the FM band. Puerto Rico, therefore, should be excluded from whatever rulemaking the Commission undertakes with regard to low power FM radio.

The island of Puerto Rico is a relatively small land area, less than 100 miles long and roughly 35 miles wide, that is currently saturated with AM and FM broadcast stations. Compared to the United States, Puerto Rico is made up of a mere 3,427 square miles, less than one tenth of one percent of the land area of the United States, a land area slightly larger than the State of Delaware. Nonetheless, despite its relatively small size, Puerto Rico has roughly 120 licensed radio stations. By comparison, Delaware has a mere 28 radio stations for an area roughly similar in size.

Puerto Rico has a unique topography. It is a small island with a large mountain range dividing the island from east to west. As a result, a disproportionately large number of radio stations have been licensed in Puerto Rico, many of which are licensed to small communities. Currently, all communities in Puerto Rico are well served by the existing AM and FM stations.

Another factor which makes Puerto Rico ill-suited to the newly proposed class of FM stations is the fact that the island has been designated by the FCC as a "coordination zone," designed to protect the Arecibo Radio Astronomy Observatory near Arecibo, Puerto Rico from

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

radio interference.[1] In its *Report and Order*, the Commission stated that "the Observatory is a unique scientific tool, and ... harmful interference to the Observatory's operations is a serious concern."[2] As a coordination zone, all broadcasters on the island are currently required to coordinate license modifications with the Observatory. Thus, to add the new class of stations to the island would not only add to the congestion of the radio frequencies, but also increase the likelihood of interference to the Observatory. Given the priority the Commission has placed on protecting the Observatory from interference, it would be inconsistent with the *Report and Order* to flood the Puerto Rican airwaves with even more radio stations.

In sum, such service would not benefit the residents of Puerto Rico, where a great number of radio stations adequately serve the public, and the broadcast spectrum is already crowded. As such, Puerto Rico would be better served without microradio broadcasting to further clutter the airwaves and it should be excluded from any rulemaking that the Commission undertakes in this matter.

Respectfully submitted:

Date: 7/30/99

President Aguadilla Radio + TV Corporation
WABA AM

A:\Lowpowfm.doc

---

1 *Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish a Radio Astronomy Coordination Zone in Puerto Rico, Report and Order*, ET Docket No. 96-2, RM-8165, October 15, 1997.

2 *Id.* at 5.