

EX PARTIAL OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

*RM-9355*

From: "Eileen & Cat" <interzon@gte.net>  
To: A7.A7 (WKENNARD)  
Date: 8/16/98 11:40am  
Subject: Government subsidization of cable -- why?

Dear Mr. Kennard:

Current regulations regarding competition between cable companies and direct broadcast satellite providers are Byzantine, anti-consumer and quite frankly, anti-American. We are currently paying over \$45 a month for basic cable service and have NO choice in the matter. If we want anything beyond NBC, ABC, CBS and FOX, we have to pay this fee to the cable company. We do not even have a choice in which cable company to use. One company serves our area and that is who we get, like it or not. Despite "guarantees" of service, cable companies are notorious for sub-par customer service. After all, what incentives do they have? If we get bad service from any other type of company, we are able to take our business elsewhere. Not so with the cable company; we are at their mercy.

Modern technology provides us a choice: direct broadcast satellite. We would like to use a direct satellite provider, but, with the current laws in place, they cannot rebroadcast network TV stations. Satellite subscribers are forced to install an antenna for local reception. Compare satellite reception to antenna reception. No contest. Digital satellite reception is crystal clear and less subject to atmospheric interference. Antennas also make dandy lightning rods. No joke if you live in central Florida.

We should have the right to use any content provider we choose for all broadcast media.

Sincerely,

Eileen and W. Gray Scheffel  
802 South Ingraham Avenue  
Lakeland, FL 33801  
941-688-2420

RECEIVED

AUG 17 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*2*

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
ORIGINAL

From: "Opaluch, John (PC&CSS)" <John\_Opaluch@exchange.ml.com>  
To: "'wkennard@fcc.gov'" <wkennard@fcc.gov>, "'sness@f...  
Date: 8/14/98 12:02pm  
Subject: ENABLE DBS TO COMPETE FAIRLY WITH CATV

Dear Commisioners;

I am writing to let you know that I feel that current laws prohibiting delivery of local affiliate network television stations via my DBS service are unfair to me as a consumer. Advances in technology which permit clear digital delivery of these services at reasonable cost cannot be exploited due to the protectionist laws that permit only local cable companies to deliver reasonably clear signals at costs nearly twice as high as those that would be charged by my DBS provider.

I am outraged that current regulations dictate that I as a consumer am not allowed the DBS alternative because "acceptable" over the air signals are available in my area over a mast antenna. I have such an antenna, and in my opinion ghosts and static do not equal acceptable signals. Has anyone in Congress or at the House of Representatives or at the FCC ever had to sit in front of a television and tried to view this "acceptable" reception? It had been a frustration for almost my entire life until CATV became available.

So, if my over the air signal reception is "acceptable", and DBS isn't permitted to offer local affiliate network service to me because of this, then why is the local cable monopoly permitted to offer it to me? Is this what my government considers fair? If my over the air signal is so "acceptable", then why would so many consumers, like me, choose to pay a premium to a cable company or a DBS provider for that matter, to have a signal delivered? Choice and variety are certainly factors, but doesn't anyone think that signal quality counts? In my opinion, both CATV and DBS offer very high quality signal reception, but it seems to me that local cable monopolies have an unfair legal advantage.

DBS broadcasters should be on equal footing when it comes to the delivery of local network broadcasting. Because DBS broadcasters are not permitted to deliver local network broadcasting, I as a consumer am made to pay the price: either I live with poor quality network reception or pay a high premium to a cable monopoly to obtain a quality signal. My DBS service provider, EchoStar, who is able and willing to deliver this service to me at affordable rates, is legally prohibited from doing so because of anti-competitive legislation that favors one kind industry over another. DBS is capable of doing a better job more efficiently at delivering a crystal clear high quality signal via an uncomplicated delivery mechanism. Current legislation preventing DBS from doing this is more costly and complicated for me, since I must resort to complex technical solutions involving higher cost local cable monopolies and special wiring and equipment to receive "acceptable" television signals (none of which are free, over the air transmission solutions since these are to me unacceptable).

I support legislation which allows for truly fair market competition. This special interest favoritism granted to cable monopolies should and must come to an end.

Sincerely,  
John Opaluch  
273 Columbus Avenue  
Hasbrouck Heights, NJ 07604

CC: "'jopaluch@aol.com'" <jopaluch@aol.com>

9335  
RECEIVED  
AUG 17 1998  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2

DATE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

AUG 17 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: Ken Hunter <khunter904@aol.com>  
To: A4.A4 (SSEGAL)  
Date: 8/14/98 11:35pm  
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Ken Hunter (khunter904@aol.com) writes:

Chairman Kennard,

Sir, my programming to NBC and CBS was terminated today on Directv. I know local stations have the right to dispute me receiving programming other than theirs, but do I have no rights ? I thought the air waves were public domain. Do the local stations suddenly own them? I would really like a personal response. Thanks,

Ken Hunter  
3965 Barna Ave.  
Titusville, Fla.  
32780

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 152.163.197.63  
Remote IP address: 152.163.197.63

of Co. for rec'd  
JE