

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

RM-9335

From: Mark Sorensen <accsat@maxinet.com>  
To: "William Kennard" <wkennard@fcc.gov>, "Harold Furt...  
Date: 8/11/98 12:16pm  
Subject: Fw: Satellite TV-Network Channels-White Areas

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark Sorensen <mark@accsat.com>  
To: Kenney Regina (Curtrisha Banks) (Curtrisha Banks) <CUBANKS@fcc.gov>  
Date: Tuesday, August 11, 1998 9:01 AM  
Subject: Re: Satellite TV-Network Channels-White Areas

RECEIVED  
AUG 12 1998  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

>Re: SVHA  
> Satellite Home Viewers Act.  
>  
>  
>Thank you for your reply... I would like to add the following in response  
>to  
>items in your letter:  
>  
>  
>No one that I am aware of is disputing the fact that the networks own their  
>content. However, I believe that SHVA creates a situation where the  
>networks  
>disallow a consumer from paying for a distant signal is anticompetative,  
>copyright, and a level of protectionism that very few industries (in  
>America) enjoy.  
>  
>This is paramount to my local Ford dealer disallowing me from driving to  
>the  
>next town to purchase a Ford, because I live in his area. Clearly  
>anticompetative. Clearly not the free market that should be in place.  
>  
>The consumer ought to be able to PURCHASE NBC's programs (for example) from  
>any carrier. The consumer's ability to purchase the signal from any carrier  
>would certainly solve the problem of having to identify "unserved  
>households". If local stations want viewers they had better offer a good  
>product, quality picture & sound, quality signal, quality content.  
>  
>I have been in the Television equipment business my entire adult life. The  
>notion that "unserved households" can be identified with consumer  
>acceptable  
>accuracy is false. The current plan is clearly unworkable, and is not  
>technically feasible while maintaining anything remotely resembling  
>"orderly" or "user friendly". If the goal was to create a situation where  
>satellite could not compete with cable, the goal was reached.  
>  
>At the very least a network "served household" ought to be a house where a  
>perfect signal, delivering perfect picture and sound can be received 100%  
>of  
>the time, with a receiving antenna no larger than 1 meter in length and 1  
>meter in width, when placed in the attic. This is precisely where consumers  
>what them placed. Or an antenna no larger than an 18" satellite dish when  
>placed on the roof.  
>  
>  
>Sincerely  
>  
>  
>Mark Sorensen  
>ACC Satellite TV  
>1144 W. East Avenue  
>Chico, CA 95926  
>mark@accsat.com

2

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** Geoffrey P. Holmes <gholmes01@snet.net>  
**To:** A4.A4 (SSEGAL)  
**Date:** 8/12/98 8:26am  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

*RM-9335*

Geoffrey P. Holmes (gholmes01@snet.net) writes:

Dear Mr. Kennard,

I am a customer of the NRTC who had my network signal discontinued. I urge the commission to better define Grade B intensity I live in a mountainous area of northwestern Connecticut. The signal I receive is of very poor quality. That is why I bought a DSS system. This injunction has cut me off from receiving important news and weather. How will I be warned if there is a tornado on the way. I had been warned of one recently when I was watching WNBC from New York. Their weather covers my area. I realize this is a crucial issue, but is one that needs to be clarified. I don't believe when the act was created people thought the technology would be able to give people such a high quality picture. If the broadcasters in my area want their copyrights protected then they should be made to provide me with a signal equal to what I can receive with my DSS system. If they have the technology to do so then do it. If they don't then let the satellite companies provide the signal. Again on behalf of people across the US. please clarify the Grade B standard and make the act address clear and viewable images. Thankyou.

Sincerely,  
Geoffrey Holmes

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 204.60.37.66  
Remote IP address: 204.60.37.66

**RECEIVED**

AUG 12 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*2*