MMB

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 55 PM '00

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

MM 99-25

RECEIVED

MAR 06 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

SUZANNE ABRAMSON
402 W BIRCH
FLAGSTAFF AZ 86001
NO PHONE

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

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 55 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

BRAD DAVIDSON
810 W. BIRCH
FLAGSTAFF, AZ 86001
(520) 774-8751

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

JAN 18 3 55 PM '00

ORIGINAL

January 14, 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 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,

Angie M Krall

Angie M Krall
2008 1/2 N. 2nd Str.
Flagstaff AZ 86004
(520) 213-9130

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

RECEIVED

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

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 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,

Christina Norlin
1255 Cox. Av.
Flag. Az. 86001

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

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

January 14, 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 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 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,

MICHELLE DEGROSIERS
810 W. Beech
Flagstaff, AZ
86001
(520) 774-8751

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

Molly Segelin
2516 N West St #2
Flagstaff AZ 86004

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

ORIGINAL

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 12, 2000

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 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,

Michael Lyndon
404 E David
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
520-773-1341

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED ORIGINAL

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

Lisa Connor

Lisa Connor
21 W. Silver Spruce
Flagstaff Az 86001
(520) 774-4589

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

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January 14, 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 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 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,

Ann Hilton
13N Bonito St.
Flagstaff, AZ
86001

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

ORIGINAL EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED
MAR - 6 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

Adam Tsikin
540 Franklin St.
Flagstaff AZ 86001

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
MAR - 6 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

Kathleen Madeira
PO. BOX 216
GRAND CANYON, AZ 86023
(520) 638-2066

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

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED
RECEIVED
JanMAY 14 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 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,

Hope Grey

Hope Grey
810 1/2 W. Grand Canyon
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

January 12, 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 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 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,

Lucy Nolen

Lucy Nolen
P.O. Box 3802
Flagstaff, AZ
86003

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

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
MAR - 6 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

Jim Madera
PO Box 216
Grand Canyon AZ 86023

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

January 14, 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 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 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,

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

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
MAR - 6 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

Marco Lipscomb
1555 W Johnson St
Flagstaff AZ 86001

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
RECEIVED
No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

January 14, 2000

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 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,

OLIVE L. OTTERSTEIN
503 N. BERTRAND
FLAGSTAFF, AZ. 86001
520-779-1482

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

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
MAR - 6 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 10, 2000

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 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,

Beth A. Otterstein

Beth A. Otterstein
503 No. Beaver
Flagstaff, Az. 86001
520 779-1482

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

ORIGINAL

January 14, 2000

RECEIVED

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 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,

Katherine A Mareck

KATHERINE MARECK
204 S. Spring
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
520-773-8996

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

Matthew E Robinson
419 W Phoenix
Flagstaff, AZ

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

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

January 14, 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 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 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,

Becky Howard
4333 S Walt Ln
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
(520) 774-7153

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

RECEIVED
JAN 18 3 54 PM '00
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
MAR - 6 2000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January

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 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,

Jay R. McCormick

Jay R. McCormick
Rt 4 Box 1010
Flagstaff AZ
86001

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

ORIGINAL

January 14, 2000

RECEIVED

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 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,

Tomas Robison
PO Box 23522
Flagstaff, AZ 86002
SAGEDESIGN@EARTHLINK.NET

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

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January 14, 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 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 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,

3300 N. Chinwood
Flagstaff, AZ 86004
520-774-8252

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

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

January 14, 2000

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 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,

Heather Songster
PO Box 23522/54 Ch of Tr.
Flagstaff AZ 86002
(520) 525 9221

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