Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

Received
MAR 13 2008

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Nancy L. Weber
Signature

3/7/2008
Date

NANCY L. WEBER
Name

2298 Rolling Ridge CT. Holt, MI 48842
Address

(517) 694-0862
Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

Ralph C. Mahar Regional School District

507 South Main Street, Orange, Massachusetts 01364-0680

Superintendent: ***Dr. Reza Namin***
Phone number: *(978) 544-2920*
FAX number: *(978)544-8383*
email address: Dr_Namin@rcmahar.org
Web: http://www.rcmahar.org

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington DC 20554

Received & Inspected

MAR 13 2008

FCC Mail Room

RE: MB Docket No. 04-233.

Dear Secretary Dortch, **March 7, 2008**

As the superintendent of Ralph C. Mahar Regional School District, serving four towns of Orange, New Salem, Wendell, and Petersham, communication with parents, students and members of our community is extremely important. Our Vision 2009: Ralph C. Mahar Regional School District Strategic Plan has identified the communication as a priority.

WJDF, 97.3 FM is an extremely important partner in meeting our strategic plan and Ralph C. Mahar Regional School District relies upon a WJDF broadcast station to advance our mission. The following are some examples:

1. The station includes our events in its community calendar, raising awareness of our issues and events.
2. The station regularly airs news stories concerning issues of importance to our organization and our organization's mission.
3. WJDF, 97.3 FM is a key player in our attempt to provide a safe and nurturing environment for our students such as the Pandemic Influenza Preparedness and All Hazards Communication Planning in partnership with the local police and fire and the Massachusetts Homeland Security Preparedness Initiative. The station has always provided outstanding coverage of a natural disaster or other emergency, alerting many and saving lives and our hope would be the continuation of such crucial service.
4. The station covered debates among candidates for elective office, educating voters.
5. The station aired periodic interviews with local candidates to ensure an informed electorate.
6. The station regularly airs public service announcements (PSAs), such as the food drive, fund raising for needed K9 Police Dog and our students need to raise funds to purchase their cheerleading uniforms and many more.
7. The station regularly airs PSAs concerning issues of importance to our organization and its mission.

I believe that the FCC intervention is not necessary and the new FCC rules could harm instead of help WJDF station's efforts to support our needs. I would appreciate any consideration you may grant this.

Sincerely,

Reza Namin, PhD

Reza Namin, PhD

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Received
MAR 13 2008

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Marilyn Stevens
Signature

March 7-08
Date

Marilyn Stevens
Name

11 Monte Sano Ct, Hanahan, SC 29410
Address

843-569-1762
Phone

Homemaker & Pastors Wife & Artist
Title (if any)

Watercolor Prints by Marilyn Stevens
Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Received
MAR 13 2008

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Robert Jett
Signature

3/8/08
Date

Robert Jett
Name

1715 Royall Ave
Address
Goldsboro, NC 27534

Chairman, Board of Deacons
Title (if any)

Phone 919-735-1500

Grace Baptist Church
Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Received & Inspected

MAR 13 2008

FCC

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Bernard F. Wright
Signature

3/7/08
Date

Bernard F. Wright
Name

1425 Rankin Rd
Address
Greensboro, N.C. 27405

336-621-5844
Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Received & Inspected
MAR 13 2008
FCC Mail Room

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Barbara H. Darbee
Signature

3/9/08
Date

BARBARA H DARBEE
Name

4005 HUCKLEBERRY DR
Address

919-781-5726
Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Received & Inspected

MAR 13 2008

FCC Mail Room

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Elsie L. Cox
Signature

3/7/08
Date

Elsie L. Cox
Name

104 Old Back River Rd
Address
Goose Creek, SC 29445

843-797-8747
Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

March 7, 2008

The Bible Broadcasting Network means so much to me. I have been listening to BBN since 1995. The sermon messages have helped me increase my knowledge of the Bible and helped my grow closer to the Lord.

Since 2000, I have been a caregiver. My time outside the home is very limited. BBN has been a source of strength for me. The all Christian music is very uplifting. At times when I can't sleep, the BBN radio station has calmed me and quieted my soul.

Thank You.

Felsie L. Cox

Received & Inspected
MAR 13 2008
FCC Mail

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

James Strasburg
Signature

3-6-08
Date

James Strasburg
Name

711 Broadway Yankton, S.Dak 57078
Address

605-260-0593
Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Received
MAR 13 2008

Honorable Secretary, (3/7/08)

Current measures and considerations are materializing which will seriously threaten freedoms of speech via Christian and other religious radio programs.

Please do all that is in your power to stop these sinister infringements on our cherished freedom of speech.

Remember, where the bible goes, civilization follows. Our beloved nation has a foundation in the Christian faith, and when this foundation crumbles, we are doomed as a firm beacon of light, hope and morality.

We implore you to use your God-given authority to stem this tide of secular humanism.

Thank you immensely, and may God bless your efforts!

Respectfully submitted.

Joe & Avon Grosso

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Recei...

MAR 13 2008

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature

Name

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

3-08-08
Date

183 Pender Rd., 17pT 1, Johnstown, Pa. 15905
Address

814-254-4493
Phone

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

Received & Inspected
MAR 13 2008
FCC

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature

3/6/08
Date

Frederick E. Roark
Name

820 Waterloo St
Address Charleston, SC 29412

795 6208
Phone

U.S. Citizen
Title (if any)

First Christian Church
Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

Received
MAR 13 2008
FCC

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

John E Stevens
Signature

3/7/08
Date

John E. Stevens
Name

11 Monte Sano Ct
Hanahan, SC 29410
Address

843-569-1762
Phone

Pastor
Title (if any)

Northside Baptist Church
of North Charleston, SC
Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

Received
MAR 13 2008

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Lisa A. Whitney
Signature

Lisa A. Whitney
Name

MRS.
Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

Mar. 6, 2008
Date

5365 VAN NESS CT.
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302
Address

(248) 538-8264
Phone

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

MAR 13 2008

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Tracy L. Bowden
Signature

March 07, 2008
Date

Tracy L. Bowden
Name

2678 Grovenburg Rd. Lansing, MI 48911
Address

MRS.
Title (if any)

(517) 394-4924
Phone

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

MB Docket No. 04-233
Comments in Response to Localism Notice of proposed Rulemaking.

Received & Inspected

MAR 13 2003

The Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th. St., S. W.
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Sir,

It is very distressing to thousands of Christians in America to think that it might be possible for restrictions to be placed against radio stations which would limit or control our **Freedom of Speech.** The **First Ammendment** prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster must present. Surely it is not your intention to interfere with one of our most basic rights!

Presently, one can hear filth spewing from the airways 24/7. Surely, the FCC would not make any rules which would deny us the right to listen to what we want to hear. I urge you to continue to give our Christian stations the right to speak freely, and let us listeners choose to believe or disbelieve what they say!

I attach a list of comments on the matter, with which I wholeheartedly agree, and I urge you to very carefully consider my urgent request.

Very truly yours,

Frances C. Dickens

Frances C. Dickens
2806 Woodmere Dr.
Panama City, Fl. 32405

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Frances L. Huckaby

Signature

Name

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

3-8-08

Date

2806 Woodmere Ave.

Address

Panama City, FL. 32405

850-763-2450

Phone

Received

MAR 13 2008

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Signature

3/8/08
Date

R. A. Jett
Name

P.O. Box 11187, Goldsboro, NC 27532
Address

919-344-9107
Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

March 7 2008

The Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Attn: Chief, Media Bureau
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Received
MAR 13 2008
FCC Mail Room

Gentlemen:

Re: MB Docket No. 04-233

I have just learned that the FCC is considering making certain changed to broadcasting outlets.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

I urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Thanks for your attention and interest in this matter.

Sincerely,

Al Crawford

Al Crawford
5817 Fleming Terrace Rd.
Greensboro, NC 27410-2639

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Received & Inspected

MAR 13 2008

FCC Mail

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Any new FCC rules, policies or procedures must not violate First Amendment rights. A number of proposals discussed in the NPRM, if enacted, would do so – and must not be adopted.

(1) The FCC must not force radio stations, especially religious broadcasters, to take advice from people who do not share their values. The NPRM's proposed advisory board proposals would impose such unconstitutional mandates. Religious broadcasters who resist advice from those who don't share their values could face increased harassment, complaints and even loss of license for choosing to follow their own consciences, rather than allowing incompatible viewpoints to shape their programming. The First Amendment prohibits government, including the FCC, from dictating what viewpoints a broadcaster, particularly a religious broadcaster, must present.

(2) The FCC must not turn every radio station into a public forum where anyone and everyone has rights to air time. Proposed public access requirements would do so – even if a religious broadcaster conscientiously objects to the message. The First Amendment forbids imposition of message delivery mandates on any religion.

(3) The FCC must not force revelation of specific editorial decision-making information. The choice of programming, especially religious programming, is not properly dictated by any government agency – and proposals to force reporting on such things as who produced what programs would intrude on constitutionally-protected editorial choices.

(4) The FCC must not establish a two-tiered renewal system in which certain licensees would be automatically barred from routine renewal application processing. The proposed mandatory special renewal review of certain classes of applicants by the Commissioners themselves would amount to coercion of religious broadcasters. Those who stay true to their consciences and present only the messages they correspond to their beliefs could face long, expensive and potentially ruinous renewal proceedings.

(5) Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. Keeping the electricity flowing is often a challenge. Yet, the Commission proposes to further squeeze niche and smaller market broadcasters, by substantially raising costs in two ways: (a) by requiring staff presence whenever a station is on the air and, (b) by further restricting main studio location choices. Raising costs with these proposals would force service cutbacks – and curtailed service is contrary to the public interest.

We urge the FCC not to adopt rules, procedures or policies discussed above.

Virginia Youngblood
Signature

3/7/08
Date

Jerry + Virginia Youngblood
Name

900 Black Oak Drive Matthews, N.C. 28105
Address

704-575-1007
Phone

Homeschool mom & principal
Title (if any)

Youngblood Christian Academy
Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

93.1 103.5 JACK fm
playing what we want®

Office: 660-882-6686 Fax: 660-882-6688

1600 Radio Hill Road • Boonville, Missouri 65233

March 6, 2008

Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Received
MAR 13 2008
FCC Mail Room

Re: MB Docket 04-233
Comments in Response to Report on Broadcast Localism and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Dear Sirs:

I respectfully wish to comment on your Notice of Proposed Rulemaking as referenced above.

My Family has been in small market radio for 35 years. My sons were 7 and 9 when we mortgaged my mother-in-law's home to buy our station. The 9 year old is now 44 and he along with our daughter-in-law manage our 1000 watt am and 25,000 watt fm stations out of that same small building. We love the radio business.

We have survived by keeping our overhead as low as possible while seeing our competition go from approximately 3 stations in the area to more than 20 now, along with growth of print publications and, of course, now we also compete with satellite radio and I-pods. Our general manager, our son, lives on the same grounds as the station (which is monitored by remote control during evening and overnight hours). Our local law enforcement and emergency management have a working arrangement with him. In the event of an emergency, he is only 30 seconds away. Should we go "backward" to being staffed during all hours of operation, we will indeed by financially impacted. We probably would have to cease overnight operation. How will this be better for the public?

I also feel setting minimum programming requirements for processing license renewal applications would be inherently subjective and given the limited hours in the broadcast day, surely have an effect of forcing broadcasters to eliminate programming they believe is just or more worthwhile.

In regard to mandating permanent community advisory boards: our city has an 8 member city council that often cannot agree. What makes you think an advisory board could (a) agree, (b) wouldn't have hidden agendas. Plus they wouldn't know anything about radio. That's like having me advise how big an incision the surgeon should make because I think it would look better. I think the programs and issues list is sufficient also; we encourage listeners to express their opinions to the station at any time.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

As I stated, we are a very small business and do not have, nor could we afford, staff to peruse Network programming. Don't make us responsible for a few bad apples.

I personally do not feel the FCC should be in the business of choosing what artists' music is played on our stations (as long as it is not obscene). In this highly competitive business, it is not a sound business practice to disclose national play lists.

In closing, I would also plead that you think of the small market broadcasters and their survival. Small stations with only 10 or so employees should be exempted from restrictive rules which will impact their very survival!

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Billings

Patricia A. Billings
BIG COUNTRY OF MO., INC.
BITTERSWEET BROADCASTING, INC.

Pab/b

COMMENTS IN RESPONSOE TO REPORT ON BROADCAST LOCALISM AND NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Received
MAR 13 2008
FCC

To: The Secretary, Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC, 20554
From: Michael Dudding, Owner of KDSN AM and KDSN FM Radio Stations
P.O. Box 670, Denison, Iowa 51442
Date: Wednesday, March 5, 2008

To the Secretary of the Federal Communications Commission:

As owner of the KDSN Radio Stations in Denison, Iowa, I would offer the following input into the **NPRM MB Docket No. 04-233 :**

1. Require that main studios be physically located in a station's community of license. **I see no reason to mandate this as long as the radio station is meeting and serving the needs of the community for which it is licensed. Because society is mobile and with technology, it has become increasingly easy for a listener to contact a radio station. As a one-station owner, this does not affect me – but I see where multiple station ownership could be burdened with incredible fixed expenses with a separate main studio within each community of license.**

2. Eliminate unattended operation of broadcast stations. **This would reduce the effectiveness of local radio to communities they serve. KDSN automates after 8pm but continues to provide news, weather, and information to our listeners throughout the evening. To mandate staff 24-7 would mean increased costs and the probability of reducing broadcast hours – thus reducing continual coverage to our listeners, regardless the time of day. In the event of an emergency, our local law enforcement contacts KDSN personnel to "man" our station – which we are glad to do and cooperate with emergency coverage. It's a great relationship we value and means a LOT to our listeners.**

3. Establish minimum programming requirements for processing license renewal applications.

One of the criteria for an FCC license is to serve the public interest. Our station provides an incredible amount of daily programming to serve the public interest such as: Public affairs weekly programming with local legislators, public affair weekly programming with "area news makers", weekly public affairs programming with area chamber of commerce. In addition, you'll hear "lost & found" for pets. School News programs, local community event live broadcasts. All of these programs are during normal broadcast times (7am-6pm). KDSN already documents these broadcasts. I feel it is very unnecessary to establish minimum requirements –

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

this will only increase the amount of unnecessary additional time and paperwork. Aren't we working for smaller government?

4. Mandate Permanent Community Advisory Boards. This is totally unnecessary! If a radio station is concerned about maintaining and increasing listenership, they will have done their homework by seeking input from the community. For example, KDSN was programmed based on a survey in which over 1,500 people participated. We took the comments and preferences from the majority of the respondents and formed our regular programming. This has helped make KDSN the sound within practically every home and business on a daily basis. To allow a small selection of individuals to meet at specific times of the year would be futile. Additional costs could be incurred such as payment to these individuals – what about insurance liability – what about the concern of losing "trade secrets" to a competitive radio station. Who will develop criteria for advisory board? Who is going to mediate any challenges from the community regarding advice or direction from this advisory board? I believe radio stations and eventually the F.C.C. is opening itself up to ridiculous lawsuits. Wow – this would be an absolute disaster.

In conclusion, I believe the F.C.C. already has a "watchdog" policy already in place. A very large percentage of radio station owners are doing their best to serve the public interest the best way they can. Please tell me why the Federal Communication Commission feels Docket No. 04-233 is necessary. Is it because a very small percentage of radio stations fail to serve the public interest? If one lawyer in Washington violates the legal code – is it appropriate to remove all lawyers from ever practicing law again?

I've been an owner for 15 years and a broadcaster for 35 years. I would invite any member of the Federal Communications Commission to spend a week at my radio station. If, after one week of being located at our radio station, you feel necessary to impose new regulations and mandates, a lot of broadcasters like myself will sadly begin to end our careers.

Respectfully,

Michael Dudding
President/Owner/General Manager
KDSN AM and KDSN FM Radio Stations
Denison, Iowa