

RM9335

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL RECEIVED

SEP - 2 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: "Stan Jackson Jr." <inxces@cyberportal.net>
To: J1.J1(RKEENEY)
Date: 9/1/98 6:33pm
Subject: Local Stations via Satellite

Dear Ms. Keeney,

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.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List A B C D E CCB

PM9335

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: "Marilynne W. Stout, PhD" <mbf@psu.edu>
To: B4.B4 (COMPLAINTS-ENF)
Date: 9/2/98 4:37pm
Subject: Satellite viewing vs Off-Air Letter

98090035

RECEIVED

SEP - 2 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am the recipient of a letter from DirecTV (account 000070001) telling that in 30 days I will no longer be eligible to receive CBS and FOX off my dish... Apparently some third party looked at my Zip code and said I live close enough to Altoona, PA so cut off her service. My mailing address is RD #!, Box 665, Petersburg, PA 16669

I believe that this decision to use Zip Codes without any regard to topography or how far away I live from my post office (15 miles, 6 valleys and mountains farther away from the station) is very inappropriate. Then, upon calling my local TV station to request the formal letter to waive the ineligible status, I was switched to a recording which stated that the TV station (WJAC-TV in Altoona, PA 814-942-1010) has received too many requests and can't possibly get to all the requests in time. This means I can't get a waiver in a reasonable time and my service is being terminated automatically in 30 days. This recent decision does not appear to be in the consumers best interest.

Please offer a suggestion to the rural person who is caught in the middle!
Thank you.

Marilynne W. Stout, Ph D
Manager, Education Technology Services

Penn State

Center For Academic Computing
227-B Computer Building
University Park, PA 16802

mbf@psu.edu
Telephone: 814-863-2271
Fax: 814-863-7049

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List A B C D E COB