RECEIVED

MAR 15 1996

FCC MAIL ROOM

CORUM REAL ESTATE GROUP, INC.

ONE DTC
5251 DTC PARKWAY
SUITE 275
ENGLEWOOD, CO 80111
FAX 303 796 2015
303 796 2020

March 6, 1996

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Telecommunications Services -- Inside Wiring, Customer Premises Equipment, CS Docket No. 95-184

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on January 26, 1995, regarding telephone and cable wiring inside buildings. We enclose four (4) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

We are concerned that any action by the FCC regarding access to private property by large numbers of communications companies may inadvertently and unnecessarily adversely affect the conduct of our business and needlessly raise additional legal issues. The Commission's public notice also raises a number of other issues that concern us.

Corum Real Estate Group, Inc., as Managing Agent for Fire and Police Pension Association, is in the commercial real estate business. We manage on behalf of the above referenced owner, one 190,000 square foot, mixed use property located in Denver, Colorado. Per the guidelines of the Small Business Administration, this property qualifies as a small business with an annual gross revenue of under $5,000,000.

The FCC's request for comments raises the following issues of concern to us: access to private property, location of the demarcation point, standards for connections, regulation of wiring, and customer access to wiring.

1) Access to Private Property

We are sure you will appreciate that modern telecommunications is critically important to our commercial tenants. No business can survive in today's economy without effective and up-to-date telecommunications services. For that reason, it is equally important for us to ensure that our tenants receive all the services they desire at a reasonable cost. The commercial real estate business is fiercely competitive, and if we did not provide our tenants with access to the latest telecommunications services, we could not survive ourselves.

Government intervention, however, is neither necessary nor desirable to ensure that telecommunications service providers can serve our residents. Indeed, we believe that such

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

intervention could have the unintended effect of interfering with our ability to effectively manage our properties. Building owners and managers have a great many responsibilities that can only be met if their rights are preserved, including coordination among residents and service providers; managing limited physical space; ensuring the security of residents and visitors; and compliance with safety codes. Needless regulation will not only harm our interests, but those of our tenants and the public at large.

A building owner must have control over the space occupied by telephone lines and facilities, especially in a multi-occupant building, because only the Landlord can coordinate the conflicting needs of multiple residents and multiple service providers. Large scale changes in society -- everything from increased telecommuting to implementation of the new telecommunications law--are leading to a proliferation of services, service providers and residential telecommunications needs. With such changes, the role of the Landlord or manager and the importance of preserving control over riser and conduit space will only grow. For this reason, we believe that the best approach to the issues raised in the request for comments is to allow building owners (if they choose) to retain ownership and control over their property--including inside wiring--so long as they make sufficient capacity available to meet all the needs of the occupants of a building.

A building has a finite amount of physical space in which telecommunications facilities can be installed. Even if that space can be expanded, it cannot be expanded beyond certain limits, and it can certainly not be expanded without significant expense. Installation and maintenance of such facilities involves disruption in the activities of residents and damage to the physical fabric of a building. Telecommunications service providers are unlikely to consider such factors because they will not be responsible for any ill effects.

We are also concerned about the security of our buildings and our residents. Telecommunications service providers have no such obligation. Consequently, any maintenance and installation activities must be conducted within the rules established by a building's manager, and the manager must have the ability to supervise those activities. Given the public's justified concerns about personal safety, we simply cannot allow service personnel to go anywhere they please in our buildings at anytime of the day, without our knowledge.

Finally, we are responsible for compliance with local safety and building codes, and we are the front line in their enforcement. We cannot ensure compliance with such requirements if we do not have control over who does what work in our buildings, or when and where they do it. Limiting our control in this area will unfairly increase our exposure to liability and adversely affect public safety.

In short, we are fully capable of meeting our obligations to our residents. As keen competitors in

the marketplace, we will continue to make sure they have the services they need. It is unnecessary for the government to interject itself in this field, and any action by the government is likely to prove counterproductive.

2) Demarcation Point

The Notice also asks for comment regarding the need for a common demarcation point, and the location of such a demarcation point. We believe that the only criterion for the location of the demarcation point should be the nature of the property, and not the specific technology involved. There should be a uniform demarcation point for all commercial properties, and a different demarcation point for residential properties. In the case of commercial buildings, the demarcation point should be inside the premises, preferably at the telephone vault or frame room.

3) Connections

The Notice asks whether the FCC should issue technical standards for connections. We believe that government action in this regard is unnecessary. The telecommunications industry has already established standards that are widely followed, and we believe that it is in the interests of the companies and their customers that they continue to be followed.

4) Regulation of Wiring

We have no comments on the merits of any particular scheme for regulating inside wiring, because we are not service providers but users of telecommunications. In general, however, we think it important to note that there are substantial differences between residential and commercial buildings, and while it may make sense to account for the convergence in technologies, it probably does not make sense to adopt uniform rules for all kinds of property.

We are also concerned that the government might impose a huge new expense on telecommunications service providers and building owners by requiring retrofitting of existing buildings. We believe such matters should be left to the ongoing discussions regarding amendments to the Model Building Code. Except where safety is involved, amendments to the building and electrical codes are seldom retroactive.

We also note that the Notice treats residential and commercial buildings as distinct entities. Mixed use buildings, however, are becoming increasingly common and must be considered in any regulatory scheme.

We have no objections to permitting a customer to install or maintain its own wiring or buy the

wiring from a service provider, provided that the rights of the owner of the premises are taken into account. A tenant's rights in wiring should not extend beyond the limits of the demised premises, and the Landlord must retain the right to obtain access to the wiring and control the type and placement of such wiring. In any case, a tenant's right to acquire or install wiring should be governed by state property law and the terms of the tenant's lease. We must retain the right to control activities on our own property, if need be.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to consider carefully any action it may take. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

Dennis A. Adams

Dennis A. Adams, RPA, CSM, CMD
Vice President

DAA/bg