

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

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

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> 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,



1182 TO VAR TR #20  
FLAGSTAFF AZ 86001

520-525-9634

No. of Copies rec'd 011  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

January 14 2000 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steve King  
930 N. San Francisco #13  
Flagstaff AZ 86001  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

No. of Copies rec'd 011  
List ABCDE  
\_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

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

No. of Copies rec'd 071  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00 MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

  
J. A. Middendorf

1624 W Ashley Way  
Flagstaff Az. 86001  
520-214-8567

No. of Copies rec'd 071  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

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

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

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

JAN 18 3 54 PM '00

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

  
Amanda J. Wilson  
PO Box 797  
Flagstaff AZ 86002

No. of Copies rec'd 071  
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

JAN 18 3 53 PM '00

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

Nicole DiPierre  
Nicole DiPierre  
PO 23703  
Flagstaff, AZ  
86002

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

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 53 PM '00

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*Carolyn Jensen*  
4215 E. Chaparral  
Cave Creek, AZ 85331

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

*07/1*

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 53 PM '00

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

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

No. of Copies rec'd 021  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED  
Jan 18 3 53 PM '00

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard, OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

Respectfully,



KATHERINE HARRIS  
101 KLETHA TRAIL  
FLAGSTAFF, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd 071  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Dear Chairman Kennard,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*[Handwritten Signature]*

4215 E. Chaparral  
Cave Creek AZ 85331

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

No. of Copies rec'd 071  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

ORIGINAL

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

RECEIVED  
January 14

MAR - 6 2000

Dear Chairman Kennard,

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,



Robin A. CRAIG

P.O. Box 31358

Flagstaff, AZ 86003-1358

No. of Copies rec'd 071  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

Rose Adams  
Rose Adams  
Box 50462  
Parks AZ 86018

No. of Copies rec'd 081  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

Dear Chairman Kennard,

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

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> 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,

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

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

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*Emily Stonecipher*  
Emily Stonecipher  
501 W. Havasu  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

*AS*

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JANUARY 14 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

Respectfully,



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

No. of Copies rec'd 057  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

Shannon Wells

Shannon Wells

826 W. Summit

Flagstaff, AZ 86001

512213-0352

No. of Copies rec'd 071  
List ABCDE

Bill -

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

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JANUARY 14 2000

MAR - 6 2000  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

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

It has come to my attention that the FCC has placed this issue on the agenda of it's Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> 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,



ALESSANDRO FREDDA  
7421 DRAPER ST  
92037 LA JOLLA

No. of Copies rec'd 041  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

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

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

No. of Copies rec'd 041  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

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 Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> 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,

Spasando Ubaldo  
7921 DRAPER ST  
La Jolla, CA 92037

No. of Copies rec'd 071  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January 14, 2000

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

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

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

071

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

January 18 2000

RECEIVED  
MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

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

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

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


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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

"UNCLE" 

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

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE 071

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

Dear Chairman Kennard,  
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED  
January 14, 2000

MAR - 6 2000  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

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

No. of Copies rec'd 011  
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED  
January 20 2000  
MAR - 6 2000  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

*Frank J. Santorelli*  
FRANK J. Santorelli  
2401 W. Rt 66 #84  
Flagstaff AZ 86001  
320-214-0782

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

*AK*

RECEIVED

JAN 18 3 52 PM '00

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN

ORIGINAL

MME

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January 20, 2000

RECEIVED

MAR - 6 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Chairman Kennard,

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

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

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

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


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

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

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

Respectfully,

David L. Totten

  
702. W. Grand Canyon Ave  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

071