The following are comments with respect to the NPRM('s) proposed changes to the LPFM rules:

SECOND ADJACENT WAIVERS:

In many areas, there will no LPFM availability unless the commission acts on 2nd adjacent waivers, with rules similar to that for translators. While that rule, as is, could work, something simpler, such as requiring the encapsulation of the LPFM's 100 dBu contour (or some other contour) inside the full-power stations 70 dBu contour. While a "no population zone" in the area where an unsatisfactory D/UD ratio exists is certainly the gold standard for "no interference," the height limits on LPFM are going to dictate rooftops more than towers for transmitter sites. It would be better, therefore, if a concept from the old NCE-FM TV-6 rules were borrowed, allowing for a population minimum (with promise to ameliorate) to exist in the "problem" area.
If 2nd adjacent waivers to full-power stations are adopted, the spacing to translators will need to be modified as well, as translators may wind up with more protection than full-power stations, which I don't think anyone is suggesting. The two ways to do this would be protecting them all as Class D, or to have a different D/UD ratio and/or population minimum in the interference area.

LP-250:

One of the encouraging signs in the NPRM was the commission’s concern with "viability" issues with LPFM. Enough coverage to be viable for listener donations and underwriting support is, in most cases, problematic for even an LP-100. LP-250 certainly helps.
The point to restricting LP-250 in larger markets is lost on this commenter. Unless there is a preclusion issue, this change should be permitted for existing and new stations. Restricting new applicants from applying for LP-250 seems to fly in the face of the viability concern, as no LP would be more vulnerable than a NEW one. Also, it sems a regulatory departure as applicants for no other class of AM or FM station has ever been held to a standard of demonstrating proof that they "can build and operate" stations. For example, applicants for Class A NCE-FM have not been drawn exclusively from the ranks of Class D NCE-FM's. Also, it should be remembered here that the distinction here is between stations with a 5.6 or 7.1 km 60 dBu radius....
Also, the commission asks in the NPRM if such waivers could actually REDUCE interference. Of course, the answer is "yes."
Many LPFM's are operating on legal, but questionable, co-channels, which threaten their viablity. Operation on an appropriate 2nd adjacent could eliminate the LPFM's incoming interference problem, and allow service from the distant station
to continue. A similar argument can be made in mountainous terrain for first- and co-channel waivers.

TRANSLATORS:

There is no reason to restrict LPFM stations from having translators. In order to preserve localism, and prevent the repetition of past abuses by other classes of stations, the number should be limited, and their transmitter locations restricted to within the SMSA, or in areas not defined by the Census Bureau as SMSA's, to within 50 km. of the main station. Of more concern here is how LPFM's will obtain translators. Given the commoditized state of the translator market (now including every AM station), it seems there will be no opportunity for LPFM's to get them unless they are allowed to apply for at least one in the upcoming filing window, or in some subsequent "protected" window.

LOCAL PROGRAMMING:

Several entities who have been involved in what some would refer to as "abuse" of the translator rules in the past (and at least one which missed the boat on this "opportunity") are now actively planning to recruit local applicants to become licensees of facilities whose main, or even sole, purpose will be to retransmit programming from afar, even if technology is involved in time-shifting or otherwise re-arranging it. The commission needs to not only takes steps to discourage these applications, but to make it clear to those tempted to file applications falsely claiming that there will be local programming and programming decisions (all the while hoping no one will notice when it does not materialize), that there will be consequence beyond which some of these operators have experienced when doing this with full-power stations...that is to say no consequences at all.

OTHER ISSUES:

1- Establish a 10-watt minimum. There is not enough power density for a 2 watt station at whatever height, despite how similar it may look on a contour map to 100 or 250 watts @ 30m on a contour map. In certain terrain, this makes stations choose between "seeing" the whole market with non-viable power density, or serving only half of it with good density. If this is seen as problematic in urban situations, it can be restricted to rural areas outright, the height above ground can be limited, and/or it can be limited to counties with a minimum terrain relief.

2- Open 87.9 mHz, especially in areas where no LPFM opportunities exist. It already has a channel number (200), a couple of wavered occupants, and is adjacent to the NCE FM band. Some want to push for this in the future as part of 76-88 mHz band expansion, which we support, but this can be done now with little apparent downside.

3- Protect TV-6's that are legitimate TV stations, not basically illegally operated FM stations.

4- Allow flexibility in the 3rd or 2nd adjacent channel on-air announcements to allow the full-power station to sign a waiver for this if it wishes. No "replacement" interference is possible. The communication will allow the full power station to be informed of the new operation, and to broadcast, if it thinks some noise or interference could result, announcements which the affected station's listeners might actually hear.