


04-233

April 28, 2008



To whom it may concern,

I am saddened by the possible changes in Radio Stations.

K LOVE, KDRY and other Christian Radio Stations are all we have. These are not profit. \$ why can't we keep our radio stations as they are.

If people choose not they don't have to listened to them.

If you take them away or change

what will we have?

Secular doesn't encourage me.

when I can't get to church, I rely on television & Radio, stations that are Christian for my message. (Sermon).

K LOVE is on my house 24/7.

I truly believe it invites the presence of the Holy Spirit.

For our God inhabits praise!
C Wagner

Dear FCC : Commission Bureau.

I am an active listener of K-Love Christian Radio and I believe in the message and encouraging music air-
ing over the station. I believe in our motto of One Nation under God and I strongly believe that our heavenly Father in Heaven can heal our Great Nation. I am a Viet-Nam Veteran and many of my close brothers in arms gave their lives Blood for the cause of freedom and I believe the Freedom all of ^{us} appreciate and deeply love; can only remain if we remain; one Nation Under God.
Thank you.

yours sincerely,

Mr
Joshua Robledo

ATTENTION MEDIA BUREAU

04-233

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I WRITE THIS LETTER, TO LET YOU KNOW I
"DEMAND" THAT YOU LEAVE LOCAL RADIO
STATIONS ALONE. ALL THE RULES AND
REGULATIONS THAT THE FCC IS THINKING
ABOUT CREATING WILL BE VERY BURDENSOME.
IT WILL CREATE UNNECESSARY PAPERWORK FOR
OWNERS. ALSO, MAKING RADIO STATIONS HAVE
TO BE MANED 24 HOURS IS UNNECESSARY
BECAUSE THEY HAVE AUTOMATED EQUIPMENT
THAT IS ABLE TO PLAY MUSIC WITHOUT THE
NEED OF REAL PEOPLE. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT
THE FCC WANTS TO TAX RADIO STATIONS
TO THE POINT OF FORCING THEM TO GO
OUT OF BUSINESS. FUTHERMORE, HAVING
RADIO STATIONS PAY OUTRAGEOUS ROYALTY
FEES TO THE RECORDING INDUSTRY DOES NOT
HELP EITHER. RADIO STATIONS ARE DOING
RECORDING ARTISTS A FAVOR BY PLAYING
THEIR MUSIC WHICH IN TURN MAKES IT
HEARD BY THE PUBLIC WHO IN TURN GOES
OUT AND PURCHASES IT AT THEIR
FAVORITE MUSIC STORE. AGAIN I URGE
YOU SECRETARY OF THE FCC TO LEAVE
LOCAL RADIO STATIONS ALONE

SIGNED: Armand J. Gautreau
DATE: APRIL 12, 2008



Mr Armand J Gautreau
914 Main St # A
Waltham MA 02451-7402

APR 23 2008

4/22/08

Dear Chief of Media Bureau or to whom it
may concern,

I am writing concerning K-Love
radio station. I'm a devoted Christian radio
fan, who's been faithfully listening for
the past five years. I am happy with
the way things are done and don't wish
to see them changed. I don't think
it appropriate for the government to
regulate in anyway what is broadcast
on public radio. I appreciate you taking
time out of your busy schedule to
read this.

Sincerely,

Autumn Brown

4-21-08

APR 28 2008

REC-00000000

Dear Chief of the FCC . Com Media bureau

I am writing this letter in reply to
Doc. 04-233.

In this day and age as we struggle to
better our Lives and live in peace K Love
and other Christian stations provide a deep
well of Living water to our Spirit. To us
who are Born again understand how important
and precious what they provide is.

You have been given great authority
in your position, with many responsibilities.
I hope and pray that all your burdens have
not harden your heart. To make it harder to
operate and provide this gift of positive &
encouraging music is not a good regulation.

For I was lost but now am Saved, but
those who are lost may one day be touched
by Gods Love through these Christian Radio
stations.

Carlos Injil

MB Docket # 04-233

Comments in response to localism notice of proposed rulemaking.

Jan 25 2008

Please don't put restrictions on Christian radio stations. Air one radio station is an important asset to my family. I live in San Jose, California and I hear Air One radio on the frequency 100.9 FM.

We enjoy and are uplifted when hearing this station. It is an encouragement for us when times are bad and offers a different perspective that I believe we need.

Sincerely,

Brenda A. Castro

4-21-08

Received & Inspected

APR 28 2008

FCC Mail Room

To Whom it May Concern,

As a U.S. Citizen, I should be
A concern. ON Docket 04-233. I under-
stand, these are persons who want to
remove Christian Radio Stations.

Please let them know, I have my
rights also + I want to keep them.

If it bothers others, tell them to change
the station. I get Rock music I dont
care for, I just change the station.
This is America, we all should have
options! EVEN Christians.

Thank You

Lore Cromwell

88016 9th St

Veneta, Ore 97487

Received & Inspected

APR 28 2008

FCC Mail Room

4/21/08

Dear Sirs

I am a concerned citizen - I want
K Love radio to stay on the air!

I understand according to Docket #
04-233 some people want this station
off the air! They can change
stations or turn radios off - but
I have the same right to want it
on the air. It brings me peace
joy + uplifts me - This is America
we at least have equal rights!

Docket # 04-233

Thank you

Ken Cromwell

88016 9th St

Veneta Ore 97487

04-233

7608 Island Rd

Venters, La. 70783

April 22, 2008



Dear Sir:

It's our understanding your Commission is considering new regulations that would impact Christian stations.

We respectfully request no new regulations. We appreciate our freedom of choice in radio programming and its ready availability.

Thank you,
Larry, Peile

&
Sarah
Fabre

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

APR 28 2008

FCC-MAIL ROOM 4/28/08

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my concern about MB-Docket 04-233 and the changes you are planning for Christian radio.

I do not agree with what you are suggesting. I also have some questions. Why are you attacking Christian radio specifically? Why are you expanding their expenses and not all radio? Why are you dictating what they can say on radio, when there seems to be no control on what is said on public radio. Why would you force some of the translator stations to leave the air?

Please, send your answers to my questions to the following address.

Thanks,

Glenn Ashwin
1200 S. Mary
Crane, IA 49731

RECEIVED APR 28 2008


APR 28 2008

**FCC PROPOSALS COULD SILENCE
CHRISTIAN RADIO STATIONS !**

**Tell the FCC to keep FREE SPEECH FREE
and not to tamper with Christian and religious programming!**



Help spread the word!



Monday, April 21, 2008

Chief, Media Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

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

My name is Kevin Merriman and I live in Tualatin Oregon. The K-Love programming in my area is of the utmost importance to me and my family. I cannot tell you how important having the positive encouraging words from K-Love in my home at all times.

I recently heard about the potential for rulemaking that poses a risk in changing how K-Love currently operates in my area, so I decided to 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.

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.

Many Christian broadcasters operate on tight budgets, as do many smaller market secular stations. 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.

Sincerely,

Kevin Merriman
20074 SW 71st Ave
Tualatin, OR 97062
Phone 503-692-3957

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

APR 28 2008

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

FCC Mail Room

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

04/18/08
Date

Kenneth Rodriguez
Name

Name

~~(209)~~ 9213 Norwegian Ave #55
Address

Address

Radio Listener
Title (if any)

Title (if any)

(209) 534-6188
Phone

Phone

Organization (if any)

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE 0

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

APR 28 2008

FCC Mail Room

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

Merinna May

Name

RN & Radio Listener
Radio Listener

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

4-17-08

Date

PO Box 473 Angels Camp, Ca. 95222

Address

209-736-9061

Phone

**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

MARVIC MANLUCU

Name

RN

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

4-15-08

Date

3209 VANAVEN DR. MIDDLETOWN, CA 91305

Address

209-552-8960

Phone

APR 28 2008

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

FCC Mail Room

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.

Eddie Matt

Signature

4/23/08
Date

Eddie Matt

Name

2140 Mission St
Address

Inspector
Title (if any)

(209) 838 3226
Phone

Organization (if any)

APR 28 2008

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

FCC Mail Room

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.

Dena Matt

Signature

4/23/08
Date

Dena Matt

Name

2140 Mission St
Address

OR tech
Title (if any)

209 838 3226
Phone

Organization (if any)

APR 28 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.

Sarah Garber

Signature

4/23/08

Date

289 mt. Airy Ct.

Ripon, CA 95366

Address

Sarah Garber

Name

Registered Nurse

Title (if any)

Phone

Organization (if any)

APR 28 2008

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

FCC Mail Room

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

Howard D. Wesley

Name

04/23/08
Date

P.O. Box 473 Angels Camp, CA
95222
Address

(209) 936-9061
Phone

Title (if any)

Organization (if any)

APR 28 2008

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

FCC Mail Room

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

4/25/2008
Date

Joshua Astorquia
Name

409 W. Yukon Dr. # 4
Address

MC.
Title (if any)

480-208-9636.
Phone

Organization (if any)

APR 28 2008

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

FCC Mail Room

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.

Deborah T. Newland

Signature

23 April 2008

Date

Deborah T. Newland

Name

37650 North 9th Street

Address

Desert Hills, AZ 85086

Business Owner

Title (if any)

623-465-7795

Phone

Juice Plus Rep/Realtor Assoc.

Organization (if any)

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

FCC Mail Room

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.

M. J. Newland

Signature

4-24-08

Date

Michael Newland

Name

37620 N. 9th ST
Rosary Hills, AZ 85086

Address

SERVANT MINISTER

Title (if any)

623-465-7795

Phone

CENTRAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Organization (if any)

