

ORIGINAL

3/11/98  
9343

**From:** Stan Jackson Jr. <inxces@cyberportal.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(NETMSG)  
**Date:** 9/1/98 6:27pm  
**Subject:** Comments to Commissioner Ness

RECEIVED

SEP - 2 1998

Stan Jackson Jr. (inxces@cyberportal.net) writes:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Commissioner Ness,

I understand why satellite services cannot provide network feeds to people who can acceptably receive their local channels via rooftop antenna -- it would be unfair competition to the local affiliates to do so. However, where I live in New Hampshire, there is only one "local" affiliate(WMUR channel 9 ABC). When we built our house (almost 20 years ago), we installed an antenna in the top of a massive tree on top of a hill so that we could receive the Boston network affiliates in addition to WMUR channel 9. A conventional rooftop antenna would struggle to even bring in WMUR where we are located. Cable television did become available a couple of years ago, but we have a 1/4 mile private driveway with underground electric -- it would cost us a fortune to bring in cable television.

Due to recent atmospheric and industrial changes, we can no longer acceptably receive the networks via our antenna. We have decided to install a satellite system, but to our dismay, we have discovered that we are not allowed to receive the Boston affiliates we were formerly able to receive via our huge antenna. There are no local stations which would be losing our viewership. In fact, we consider the Boston stations to be our local affiliates, since we do not have any of our own. How does it make sense that we cannot receive the Boston affiliates by law? Even worse, our neighbors in southern New Hampshire can receive the Boston affiliates, even though that robs WMUR of some of its viewers.

I agree, for the most part, with preventing satellite services from providing network feeds where local stations are readily available, but locking us out of the Boston affiliates is not protecting anyone, and in fact, is hurting the Boston stations. I do not know how this law reads, but please explain to me how it could make such a clear error.

I await your response.

Sincerely,

Stan Jackson Jr.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 208.210.87.109  
Remote IP address: 208.210.87.109

rec'd 041

ORIGINAL

FOR LATE FILE

~~98-120~~

RECEIVED

SEP - 2 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

R.M. - 9335  
9345

**From:** Matthew Paul Creech <mcreech@in.net>  
**To:** A7.A7(NETMSGs)  
**Date:** 9/1/98 11:15pm  
**Subject:** Comments to Commissioner Ness

Matthew Paul Creech (mcreech@in.net) writes:

I am writing this letter to express my concern over the possibility of losing my network feeds from my satellite provider, Dish Network. I am unable to receive QUALITY local broadcast with conventional antennas even though I am in a grade B signal area.

I ask you to 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. I can only receive NBC and FOX at respectable viewing levels part of the time. I cannot install a roof top antenna due to legal neighborhood covenant restrictions. Only 18 satellite dishes may be affixed to any home s exterior in my area. In addition, ask them to 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 form interfering with one another.

Please support satellite subscribers and 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.

Sincerely,

Matthew P. Creech

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 198.69.15.152  
Remote IP address: 198.69.15.152

2