

## MASS MAILING

The attached document is part of a mass mailing received in Docket Nos. 96-83 and 95-59. The following list specifies the names of the parties filing formal comment. The number of identical documents as specified in the File Number/City, St. field have been received by the Commission on this same date. You may contact an information technician in the Public Reference Room, Room 239 or 230 to view the documents.

Docket Number	Receipt/Adopted/Issued	Name of Applicant
96-83	9/24/96	ABRAMS PROPERTIES
96-83	9/24/96	ACADIANA APARTMENT ASSOCI
96-83	9/24/96	AMP PROPERTY SERVICES, IN
96-83	9/24/96	ASHBURY RUNS
96-83	9/24/96	AUTUMMN WOODS APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	AUTUMMN WOODS APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	BAVARIAN VILLAGE APARTMEN
96-83	9/24/96	BAVARIAN VILLAGE APARTMEN
96-83	9/24/96	BELL VIEW
96-83	9/24/96	BERSHIRE PROPERTY MANAGEM
96-83	9/24/96	BERSHIRE PROPERTY MANAGEM
96-83	9/24/96	BERSHIRE PROPERTY MANAGEM
96-83	9/24/96	BOCA EAST
96-83	9/24/96	BOZZUTO GROUP, THE
96-83	9/24/96	BRADFORD J. HOUSER
96-83	9/24/96	CALIFORNIA SANSOME CO.
96-83	9/24/96	CB COMMERCIAL REAL ESTAE
96-83	9/24/96	CENTRAL PARK TOWERS APART
96-83	9/24/96	CENTRAL PROPERTY MANAGEMEM
96-83	9/24/96	CHRIS EDEN
96-83	9/24/96	CLEMENT KERN GARDENS
96-83	9/24/96	CONTINENTAL REALTY CORPOR
96-83	9/24/96	CROSSING APARTMENT
96-83	9/24/96	DORIS HOUSER
96-83	9/24/96	DUNWOODY CLUB APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	EAST CHASE
96-83	9/24/96	EASTWOOD
96-83	9/24/96	EDWARD ROSE OF INDIAN
96-83	9/24/96	EDWARD ROSE OF INDIANA
96-83	9/24/96	EDWARD ROSE OF INDIANA
96-83	9/24/96	EDWARD ROSE OF INDIANA
96-83	9/24/96	EDWARD ROSE OF INDIANA
96-83	9/24/96	EDWARD ROSE OF INDIANA
96-83	9/24/96	ENSOR FOREST
96-83	9/24/96	FOREST HILL GARDENS
96-83	9/24/96	GAIN MILLION INVESTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	HARRY L. BRUNSDEN
96-83	9/24/96	HILL VIEW VILLAGE
96-83	9/24/96	HOUSING DEVELOPER'S LLC
96-83	9/24/96	JAMES AND GENICE PROCHASK
96-83	9/24/96	JLM PROPERTIES, INC
96-83	9/24/96	LA FONTENAY APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	LA FONTENAY APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	LAKES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP
96-83	9/24/96	LAKESDALE APARTMENT
96-83	9/24/96	LIBERTY PINES
96-83	9/24/96	MANHATTAN GARDENS LIMITED
96-83	9/24/96	MID AMERICA CENTERSS CORP
96-83	9/24/96	MILLHOPPER VILLAGE
96-83	9/24/96	MILLS, THE
96-83	9/24/96	NOB HILL VILLA
96-83	9/24/96	OCCIENTAL DEVELOPMENT

Docket Number	Receipt/Adopted/Issued	Name of Applicant
96-83	9/24/96	OHIO REAL ESTATE INVESTOR
96-83	9/24/96	ONE LYTLE PALE
96-83	9/24/96	OXFORD GARDENS, THE
96-83	9/24/96	PEMBROKE VILLAGE RENTAL A
96-83	9/24/96	POINTE APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	POLO RUN APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	RODDE MCNELLIS
96-83	9/24/96	SAN MARCO
96-83	9/24/96	SANDALWOOD, MANAGEMENT,
96-83	9/24/96	SANDLEWOOD MANAGEMENT CO
96-83	9/24/96	SCARBOROUGH LAKE APARTMENT
96-83	9/24/96	SCARBOROUGH LAKE APARTMEN
96-83	9/24/96	SPRING CREST APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	SUNDANCE AT THE CROSSING
96-83	9/24/96	TIMBERS APARTMENT, THE
96-83	9/24/96	TIMBERS APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	TRAILRIDGE APRTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	TROPHY CLUB AT BELL GRADE
96-83	9/24/96	VILLAGE EAST TOWERS APRTM
96-83	9/24/96	WATERFRONT APARTMENTS
96-83	9/24/96	WEST ACRES DEVELOPMENT
96-83	9/24/96	WESTBAY PROPERTIES
96-83	9/24/96	WIMNMAR COMPANY INC
96-83	9/24/96	WOODROW & MIDY HOUSER

TOTAL : 76

RECEIVED

9/19/96

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

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL  
SERIAL 4 1996

FCC MAIL ROOM

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 M. Caton:

We write in response to the FCC's Report and Order and Furthur 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,' Six letter copies enclosed!

We are in the residential real estate business as a small family investment; we are not a big operation. We own & manage propertys in the Iowa City, Coralville, and Johnson County Iowa area.

Our property consists of: one duplex unit and one condo unit

We serve a total of 3 tenant families.

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 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 consid and manage on a daily 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 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 contrators 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. A community type satellite dish or antenna on our roof is not the answer because of the great variation in condition, quality of roofs. It is impractical to provide service to a small universe of potential subscribers.

In conclusion, for all the reasons cited above, we urge the FCC to avoid inter-  
fering in our relationships with our residents and create the potential for  
safety hazards, security problems, and economic constraints. Thank you for  
your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,  
*(Signature)*  
Chris Eden  
PO Box 333, Solon, Iowa 52333

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

*046*