

Jose Vigil  
310 Virginia SE  
Albuquerque, NM 87109

RECEIVED  
SEP 17 1996  
FCC MAIL ROOM

Mr. William F. Caton  
Acting Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street NW Room 222  
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulation of Satellite Earth Stations, IB  
Docket No. 95-59 and implementation of Section 207 of the Telecommunications Act of  
1996, CS Docket 96-83.

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on August 6, 1996, which asks for comments "with regard to placement of antennas on common areas or rental properties, property not within the exclusive control of a person with an ownership interest, where a community association or landlord is legally responsible for maintenance and repair and can be liable for failure to perform its duties properly." We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

I own approximately 150 apartments in three locations in Albuquerque, NM. I serve approximately 300 residents.

Granting persons who do not have an ownership interest in the property they rent presumptive right to install a satellite dish or demand a community-based signal will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for many reasons.

The FCC should not extend regulations implementing Section 207 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to situations in which the viewer does not have exclusive use or control and a direct ownership interest in the property where the antenna is to be installed, used and maintained. There are many factors such as safety, security, aesthetics, liability, and insurance costs that a private property owner must consider and manage on a day-to-day basis. All of these factors are vital to the operation of an apartment community and cannot be discounted or properly compensated for on a uniform basis.


The weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and --more importantly--a hazard to the safety of the residents,

building employees, and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening of concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair. Slipshod or faulty contractors could create all kinds of safety problems. Even good installers cannot guarantee against weather damage.

The technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access. And a community-type satellite dish or antenna mounted on the roof of our property is not necessarily the answer because of the great variation in condition and quality of roofs and ITT may be totally impractical and uneconomical to provide service to a small universe of potential subscribers.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,



Jose Vigil  
Owner



September 10, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

SEP 17 1996

FCC MAIL ROOM

Mr. William F. Caton  
Acting Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M. Street, NW, Room 22  
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Preemption of Local Zoning Regulation of Satellite Earth Stations, IB  
Docket No. 95-59 and Implementation of Section 207 of the  
Telecommunications Act of 1996, CS Docket No. 96-83

Dear Mr. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Further Notice on Proposed Rulemaking released on August 6, 1996, which asks for comments "with regard to placement of antennas on common areas or rental properties, property no within the exclusive control of a person with an ownership interest, where a community association or landlord is legally responsible for maintenance and repair and can be liable for failure to perform its duties properly." We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original.

Anderson Management, Inc. is in the multi family real estate business. We manage some 2500 units in two states.

Granting persons who do not have an ownership interest in the property they rent a presumptive right to install a satellite dish or to demand a community-based signal will adversely affect the conduct of our business without justification and needlessly raise additional legal issues. We question whether the Commission has the authority to require us to allow the physical invasion of our property. We must retain the authority to control the use of our property, for many reasons.


The FCC should not extend regulations implementing Section 207 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to situations in which the viewer does not have exclusive or control and a direct ownership interest in the property where the antenna is to be installed, used and maintained. There are many factors such as safety, security, aesthetics, liability and insurance costs that a private property owner must consider and manage on a day-to-day basis. All of these factors are vital to the operation of an apartment community and cannot be discounted or property compensated for on a uniform basis.

The weight or wind resistance of a satellite and the quality of installation may create maintenance problems and more importantly--a hazard to the safety of residents, building employees and passers-by. Damage to the property caused by water seepage into the building interior, corrosion of metal mounts, or weakening of concrete could lead to safety hazards and very costly maintenance and repair. Slipshod or faulty contractors could create all kinds of safety problems. Even good installers cannot guarantee against weather damage.

The technical limitations of satellite technology create problems because all of our residents may not be able to receive certain services. It is our understanding that satellites are only positioned in certain areas, thus limiting access. And a community satellite dish or antenna mounted on the roof of our property is not necessarily the answer because of the great variation in condition and quality of roofs and it may be totally impractical and uneconomical to provide service to a small universe of potential subscribers.

In conclusion, we urge the FCC to avoid interfering in our relationships with our residents. All of the potential problems we cite will adversely affect the safety and security of our property as well as our bottom line and our property rights. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Pauline Knapp". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Pauline Knapp  
Manager