Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

Suite 800
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20006-3401

David Oxenford
202.973.4256 tel
202.973.4456 fax

davidoxenford@dwt.com

January 31, 2011

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W., TW-A325
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Ex Parte Notice
MM Docket No. 99-25

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's Rules, this notice of an ex parte presentation in the above-referenced proceeding is being filed on behalf of Educational Media Foundation ("EMF"). On January 28, 2011, the undersigned, together with Joe Miller, EMF's Director of Signal Expansion, and Brian Gantman, Government Relations Director/In-House Counsel at EMF, attended a meeting with Jennifer Tatel, legal assistant to Commissioner Baker, to discuss the impact of the Local Community Radio Act on the relationship between translators and LPFM stations, and ways in which to process many of the remaining applications from the 2003 FM translator window without precluding LPFM opportunities.

EMF reiterated the position that it has taken throughout this proceeding, that the mass dismissal of all but a limited number of FM translator applications is not justified, as such a dismissal will have the result of blocking new service to smaller communities where such translators do not have any preclusive effect on LPFM opportunities. .

EMF also stated its belief that there are opportunities for LPFM service in many communities, even if all the 2003 translator applications were granted, though it conceded that in some markets there may be some preclusive effect. The belief that LPFM and the vast majority of 2003 translator applications were not mutually preclusive underlies the Memorandum of Understanding EMF entered into with Prometheus Radio Project. At the recent meeting, EMF provided the participants with a preliminarily study it conducted of the opportunities that remain for LPFM stations in selected markets, even if all 2003 FM translator applications were granted (assuming that there are no third adjacent channel protections between LPFM and other FM users, but also assuming that the LPFMs are at the full second adjacent channel spacings required by FCC rules). The preliminary report is attached. EMF emphasized that these results were

preliminary, and that a more complete report, with background data and supporting assumptions, would be filed in the near future.

A copy of this notice is being filed in the relevant docket. Should there be any questions concerning this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

David Oxenford

cc: Jennifer Tatel
Enclosure

LPFM Study

	Market Name	Local channels	#	Fringe channels	#	s	#	Notes
			118		103		33	
5	Dallas - Ft. Worth	239	1	238; 296	2		0	
15	Phoenix; AZ	241; 242	2	257	1	230	1	
25	Charlotte - Gastonia - Rock Hill; NC-SC	229; 253; 254; 255; 262; 263; 267; 297	8	222	1		0	
35	San Jose. CA		0	270	1	225	1	
45	Greensboro; Winston-Salem; High Point	277; 286; 295	3	241; 243; 268; 285; 292	5	242; 249; 274	3	241- has 3 fmt apps on scan; however WBBB is blocking
55	New Orleans; LA	236; 250	2	230; 242; 249	3		0	
65	Tulsa; OK	280	1	234; 299; 300	3		0	
75	Wilmington; DE		0		0		0	

85	Daytona Beach; FL	230; 236; 246; 248; 273; 274; 293; 296	8	229; 295	2		0	230 coexists with 3 fmt apps
95	Colorado Springs; CO	248; 271	2		0	228; 229; 268	3	
105	Lexington/Fayette; KY	229; 230; 248	3	213; 265; 266;	3	228	1	229 co-exists with 2 FMT apps and 1 LP; 240 coexists with 2 FMT apps;
115	Roanoke - Lynchburg; VA	224; 225; 226; 252; 253; 254; 293	7	246; 247; 262; 263; 282	5	231; 232; 238; 239	4	231; 232; 238; 239- blocked into Roanoke
125	Lansing; MI	272; 287	2	239; 241; 261; 273; 282; 283; 285; 286	8	295	1	
135	Appleton - Oshkosh; WI	235; 236; 243; 274; 292	5	204; 242; 270; 273; 275; 277; 286	7			
145	Tyler-Longview; TX	271; 278	2	223; 229; 230; 231; 234; 238; 246; 249; 255; 272; 277	11	247; 248; 253; 254; 285; 286	6	
155	Macon; GA	225; 226; 239; 252; 253; 259; 275; 284; 285	9		0		0	
165	Wilmington; NC	220; 225; 226; 242; 244; 257; 270; 271; 290	9	224; 236; 240; 241; 243; 250; 264; 286; 291	9			
175	Wenatchee; WA	226; 227; 246; 252; 254; 255; 277; 291	8	266; 281	2		0	

185	Columbus; GA	222; 230; 234; 235; 242; 243; 247; 248; 254; 269; 270; 272; 282; 288; 289; 293; 294; 300	18	229; 231; 232; 241; 246; 249; 250; 283; 287	9	271	1	
195	Amarillo; TX	223; 262	2	236	1		0	
205	Duluth; MN	228; 251; 252; 258; 259; 266; 294	7	260; 289; 291; 292; 293; 295; 296	7		0	
215	Hilton Head; SC	214; 223; 234; 235; 250; 264; 268	7	233; 265; 267	3		0	
225	Champaign; IL		0	226; 230; 284; 286; 292; 293;	6			
235	Muskegon; MI	272	1	209; 215; 228; 255; 257; 258; 259; 264; 265;273; 277; 278; 290; 292	11		0	
245	Pittsburg; KS	206; 207; 226; 253; 267; 290; 291; 292; 293; 300	10	227; 289; 299	3	233; 239; 240; 241; 242; 260; 261; 262;	8	
255	Columbia; MO	298	1		0	234; 235; 236; 265	4	
265	Texarkana; TX	244; 245; 246; 247; 248; 254; 276	7	264	1	255; 256; 257	3	

275	Williamsport; PA	289; 290	2	254	1	246	1
285	Ithaca; NY		0	293; 294; 296; 297	4	235	1
295	295 Cheyenne; WY	247; 253	2	243; 290; 294	3		0