ORIGINAL

RM-9335
9345

From: "scott henderson" <shen923@surfsouth.com>
To: A7.A7(SNESS)
Date: 8/31/98 1:24pm
Subject: Broadcast Networks via satellite

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

STOP THE CABLE MONOPOLY, why do we have to subscribe to an awful cable provider (lousy service, lousy picture quality, and rates that go up every year) just to receive ABC, NBC, CBS, FOX, & PBS? I bought a DBS satellite system for the service, the picture quality and the good rates. As I understand it the reason for this has to do with the definition of Grade B signals. I live in an area where getting any signal of good quality is impossible, but because of my zip-code I cannot receive the networks via DBS and can only if I subscribe to cable. THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE, the newspapers in my community don't stop me from subscribing to newspapers from other parts of the country. PLEASE ESTABLISH A STANDARD that will ensure that me and my family can receive the broadcast networks via satellite and not be forced into subscribing to a cable tv monopoly

Scott Henderson
327 Sawgrass Dr
Valdosta, GA 31602
shen923@surfsouth.com

RECEIVED
AUG 31 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2

ORIGINAL

DOCKET FILE COPY 2,W 9335 9345

From: "*****" <daisyt@eatel.net>
To: A7.A7(SNESS)
Date: 8/31/98 2:42pm
Subject: WE WANT OUR NETWORKS!!!!!!!

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Susan Ness,
I cannot receive an acceptable network picture using a conventional outdoor rooftop antenna and would like to continue to receive the network stations over my satellite system. I live in an area that the court defines as "predictive Grade B".
Please establish a viewing standard that will ensure that all families who cannot receive an acceptable network picture using an conventional outdoor rooftop antenna can receive network programming via satellite. Please, stop this unfair court order until the new standard is in place.
I am well aware of the fact that the Grade B contour was never intended to be used to determine whether or not a consumer can receive an acceptable picture. It was originally intended as a rough calculation to prevent broadcast signals from interfering with one another.
Congress asked the Commission for purposes of the Satellite Home Viewer Act to define "Grade B" for the purposes of protecting the right of every U.S. consumer to receive high-quality network service. It is now time for this definition to be accurately established!
Thank you for your time,
Tim Dinnel

RECEIVED
AUG 31 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

RM-9335
9345

ORIGINAL

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Tony Corcetto <corcetto@fast.net>
To: A7.A7(SNESS)
Date: 8/31/98 5:04pm
Subject: Repeal SHVA

I am a satellite big dish owner and wish to state that the Satellite Home Viewer Act (SHVA) should be repealed.
Currently, a citizen residing in an area served by a local network affiliate by cable or off-air antenna must receive his networks from his local stations whether he likes it or not. To me this is completely out of tune with free enterprise and the consumer*s freedom of choice. The affiliates should have to compete for consumers just as radio stations and newspapers do. Why should they receive special protection against competition. The local affiliates argue that they invest heavily in local news and community programming. Well, so do the radio stations and newspapers without any special protection.
If the premise of special protection because of investment in local news and community projects is applied to newspapers and radio stations, then we would not be allowed to listen to radio network affiliates or read newspapers from other towns.
On top of that, in many cases determining a viewer*s *local affiliate* is impossible. I can receive off-air antenna network programming from Lancaster, Lebanon, Harrisburg, Philadelphia, York and even Baltimore. If one of these is my *local affiliate*, logic would mean that I should not be permitted to watch any of the other stations. Of course, technologically this cannot be controlled, so they pick on the satellite providers who can.
Also, lets face it, regular off-air antenna network programming is a dinosaur ready for extinction. Why should I wait for the news hour on a local affiliate when I can go to the Internet and get instant gratification and much more in depth news from a huge multitude of sources including a local newspaper*s web page. Some of the network affiliates have already seen the writing on the wall and have established their own web sites to be part of this transition. And streaming video has already made it possible to view channels on the internet. Are these also to be outlawed for viewing?
Finally, I feel SHVA is contrary to the tenets of the First Amendment in relation to abridgement of freedom of speech.
Get rid of this Act.
Thank you.

RECEIVED
AUG 31 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Tony Corcetto
3 Skywind Drive
Reinholds, PA 17569

610 678-0867 corcetto@fast.net

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

DOCUMENT FILED RM 9335 9345

ORIGINAL

From: Valerie Bradshaw <BzB2@aol.com>
To: A7.A7(NETMSGS)
Date: 8/31/98 4:36pm
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

Valerie Bradshaw (BzB2@aol.com) writes:

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Ness,

I feel that the rules about acces to broadcast networks by satellite companies are unfair. These rules infringe upon my rights to freedom of choice. I am being FORCED to watch one local network, with THEIR choice of programming. Previously, I was able to choose between an east or west coast feed of the same network with, often, different programming. I also had a choice of watching the same program at different times. Having two young children made this very helpful to our TV viewing.

Also, we move quite often. Having a satellite dish that only requires one phone call to have immediate service has lessened the stress of moving quite a bit. With cable we would have to make an appointment to have a cable box installed, wait around for the installer to show and pay for a deposit on the box. All of this could quite often take 1-7 days depending upon the cable company. Then, when moving, we would have to drive to the cable company to return the box and get our deposit. All of these inconveniences make having cable a bad choice for us.

Having an antenna is also very inconvenient. As often as we move, it is wiser for us to rent housing. How easy do you think it is to disconnect, move, and reconnect an antenna? Do you think the landlord is happy to see an antenna on their house? An 18" satellite dish is less conspicuous than a 3-5 foot antenna. Also, with an antenna, we cannot get satellite stations such as Nickelodian, ESPN, Discovery Network and many others.

Please reconsider your views on these rules and allow the viewers to have the freedom to choose how they wish to view TV.

Sincerely,
Val Bradshaw

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 152.163.201.207
Remote IP address: 152.163.201.207

RECEIVED
AUG 31 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2

LATE FILED

RM 9335
RM 9345
RECEIVED
AUG 31 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: Carol Marchell <carolm@florida-water.com>
To: A7.A7(NETMSGS)
Date: 8/28/98 6:50pm
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Carol Marchell (carolm@florida-water.com) writes:

I just received notice that I am not allowed to receive CBS and FOX broadcasts on my sattelite dish - which I currently pay for. These two local stations are especially difficult to receive a clear picture. Why am I not allowed to choose what station I want to watch, if I pay for the priviledge? Almost all sports stations are now "pay" broadcasts, unless I want to watch local teams - but I am not a fan! Also, our local affiliates will many times preempt shows for local weather, or other news that I don't particularly care to watch. There is only so many times I care to see what the hurricane is doing, and how to prepare for it! In the interest of competition, what can I do to protest this action?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.77.193.95
Remote IP address: 12.77.193.95

DOCKET FILE COPY DUPLICATE

RM-9335
RM-934

LATE FILED

RECEIVED
AUG 31 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY DUPLICATE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: "Rodan" <rodan@mbay.net>
To: A7.A7(SNESS)
Date: 8/29/98 12:58am
Subject: FCC Rules Governing Access to Broadcast Networks

Dear Ms. Commissioner,

I am writing to express my concern and objection to the rules about access to broadcast networks. I feel these rules are unfair to the consumer!
DIRECTV recently informed me that "to comply with a recent federal court order," it was required to review my eligibility to receive certain network services via satellite. Based on the eligibility criteria the court requires them to use, I am no longer eligible to receive these network services from them.

DIRECTV advised me that "many of (their) customers can get local TV stations with a rooftop antenna." I am in the military and reside in government housing and, in accordance with housing regulations and policies, "external TV antennas to receive local broadcast networks are not permitted. Top-of-set antennas (rabbit ears) must be used."

I tried a rabbit ears antenna before subscribing to DIRECTV*s PrimeTime 24 and found reception at this distance from my "local" broadcasting site (in Salinas, CA) to be extremely poor and totally unacceptable for viewing. Therefore, I feel I should be eligible to receive national networks from DIRECTV and have had to request a "waiver" to allow me to continue to receive national broadcasting services from DIRECTV.

I don't feel it is my responsibility to provide such a waiver in order to receive national broadcasting services from my satellite provider. I firmly believe that it is my right to decide from whom my television services will be provided! As a citizen, I am appalled that the FCC has such power to take that decision out of the consumers' hands! These rules should be reviewed and amended to return the decision-making privilege back to the American citizen!

Dan Harvey, MSgt, USAF

FOR LATE FILED RM-9335
RM-9345

[redacted]

From: Frederick Brown <fredtoby@earthlink.net>
To: A7.A7(SNESS)
Date: 8/30/98 9:04pm
Subject: Recently, a Federal Satellite Television

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
RECEIVED
AUG 31 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Recently, a Federal Court in Florida, at the request of the television networks entered an order that will cause me to lose my network service.

Please establish a viewing standard that will ensure that all families who cannot receive an acceptable network picture using an conventional outdoor rooftop antenna can receive network programming via satellite. Please stop the unfair court order until the new standard is in place.

I live in an area that the court defines as "predictive Grade B" and I cannot get a picture by using a conventional outdoor rooftop antenna, because my reception is blocked by hills.

I am well aware of the fact that the Grade B contour was never intended to be used to determine whether or not a consumer can receive an acceptable picture. It was originally intended as a rough calculation to prevent broadcast signals form interfering with one another.

Congress has asked the Commission for purposes of the Satellite Home Viewer Act to define "Grade B" for the purposes of protecting the right of every U.S. consumer to receive high-quality network service. It is now time for this definition to be accurately established!

PLEASE, I WANT TO KEEP THE HIGH QUALITY NETWORK SERVICE I NOW RECEIVE!!!!!!!!

RM-9335
RM-9345

LATE FILED

RECEIVED
AUG 31 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: "Brendon Woirhaye" <terrapin@inreach.com>
To: A7.A7(SNESS)
Date: 8/30/98 2:33pm
Subject: Satellite Home Viewer Act

I am an american who subscribes to digital satellite broadcasting, which includes delivery of programming from the big four national broadcasters - including NBC, CBS, ABC, and Fox. I live in Southern California, and am within an area where I get a signal of Grade B intensity, which means that my satellite access to these channels will be turned off because I can receive them with an antenna. The Grade B intensity maps, however, do not account for obstructions which hinder broadcast reception, leaving me with a much poorer quality signal than I can get with my satellite dish. There are multiple reasons that I prefer to receive these channels over my normal programming delivery device (my satellite), including:

-- The antenna reception is poor, and I have to constantly adjust the antenna to get anything resembling a reasonable picture
-- The satellite signal provides higher resolution and better sound quality than the local broadcast does, making it more enjoyable to watch
-- My VCR is hooked in to the satellite system, not the antenna system. I cannot set it up to tune both systems at once for timed events.
-- I get two or three chances to see a program with the setup I have now - there are times when I miss a Fox show on satellite, and can tune in the antenna one (through a bit of work and hassle) if I really want to see it. My household watches about 3 to 4 hours per month of NBC/FOX, and no ABC/CBS at all.

I have nothing against local broadcasters, but I do wish they would move more quickly towards hdtv and not spend their money in squabbles over customers who have basically opted out of local broadcasting by going to satellite.

I ask for your support in preserving the quality of our picture signals. Please represent my interests rather than those of the local broadcasting or cable industry.

Brendon Woirhaye
5532 Parmerton Ave.
Temple City, CA 91780