

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

S.M. 9335
9345

RECEIVED

SEP - 1 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: squirrel <squirrel@sprintmail.com>
To: A7.A7(NETMSG)
Date: 9/1/98 4:02pm
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

squirrel (squirrel@sprintmail.com) writes:

Hello there..

I m a satellite owner and have been very happy with the multitude of options available to me now (as those compared to cable). However, I have a question. Why can I not get local broadcast channels from a city other than the one I live in? I live in Texas and want to use my satellite dish to pick up local channels in Denver. I'm a Denver native and have lived there all my life. Only recently, due to job opportunities, I relocated to Texas. Let me ask you. Don t you think its inherently unjust to prohibit someone from receiving a channel(s) he/she legitimately wishes to purchase? I can somewhat (but not totally) understand your viewpoint about getting local broadcasts but inter-state broadcasts really don t make much sense. What sort of rationale can the FCC argue to support this decision and how is my life better that I do not have this option available to me?

Also, why on earth is do you think its fair for users that cannot receive an acceptable signal NOT have any broadcast options besides Cable? Do you honestly think its reasonable that in a country of free choices and liberties, we are told who and where our broadcast channels come from? Isn t it my right to choose where my money goes to and for what services? To this end I request the following:

1. 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. In addition, stop the recent Florida court decision until a standard can be established.
2. Establish a viewing standard that will permit all families to receive broadcast channels in any state, regardless of zip code.
3. Grade B contour was never intended to be a measure of an acceptable picture. Therefore, please define Grade B as such. Acceptable digital quality pictures are now technologically available. Why does the public have to accept second rate cable quality? (Note: MANY cable companies have not upgraded their systems simply because they have no incentive to do so). It is now time for this definition to be accurately established!

You folks (at the FCC) need to seriously think about the public's wishes instead of politics. Everyone should be able to view (and pay for) what he/she wishes to see. Why should we expect anything less?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 157.152.197.7
Remote IP address: 157.152.197.7

041

ORIGINAL

RM-9335
9345

From: Farrell H. McGoohan <fmcgoohan@pintailsw.com>
To: A7.A7(NETMSGs)
Date: 9/1/98 2:16pm
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

RECEIVED

SEP - 1 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Farrell H. McGoohan (fmcgoohan@pintailsw.com) writes:
Commissioner Ness,

I respectfully ask that you support the right of subscribers of satellite-delivered network channels (ABC,NBC,CBS, FOX) to continue to receive those channels. I currently live in an area that receives low-grade broadcast (mostly shadows) signals from 3 of the 4 networks. I have subscribed to a satellite-based service to deliver the broadcast networks to my home. However, I have recently found out that my right to receive broadcast networks has been severely restrained due to recent court rulings and I'm looking at imminent denial of service. I consider this to be an unfair denial of service to me as well as a restraint on competition. It is only through competition that we can be ensured fair and reasonable cable/satellite subscription rates. Therefore, I ask that you do all that you can do to support a fair and reasonable marketplace in television subscription services.

Thank you.

Farrell H. McGoohan

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 208.128.143.121
Remote IP address: 208.128.143.121

2