With Satellite Radio offering Weather and Traffic, it provides an on-demand service that allows the listener to access more frequent updates with a much stronger signal. Often times with AM weather and traffic, you can sit for ten minutes only to go through a zone where the frequency is interrupted. WIth XM, the signal is stronger so that you won't miss what you are listening for. Also, when driving through unknown cities, you may not know the schedule, traffic on the fours or weather on the eights, but with XM, some displays on the faceplate of the radio will display weather, and traffic is constant. NAB's petition 04-160 is attacking specific weather and traffic city reports, however, they choose not to go after XM station, The Weather Channel. While I must say that I enjoy listening to the weather in California it is impractical when all I want is my local forcast. On demand is the current technology of broadcasting, and when local AM stations cannot keep up, and provide what the public wants at that specific moment, it beocmes neccessary to search other sources. With my fee per month, as well as the amount that was paid for the actual hardware, it should be enough to provide me with the traffic and weather at a rotation that fits my schedule. AM is still available to those not paying for XM or Sirius, and with those paying for in-auto, or in-home/office radio, still being the minority, the majority still tune to AM and search for the station taking time away from their syndicated shows to provide a service rather than entertainment. If AM wants more listeners, they need to look internally for their own flaws rather than attempt to quash the ability for the listener to seek out other sources for their traffic and weather. I urge the FCC to reject NAB's petition 04-160, and continue to force healthy competition among the FM, AM, and XM industries, which will continue to bring the top technology to teh consumers.