

14-261

I live about 60 miles north of San Francisco. In theory I cannot receive any stations broadcasting from the Bay Area, but with two antenna I can sometimes receive most, and sometimes none. I used to get local channels for a \$5 additional fee when I subscribed to DirecTV but it annoyed me to have to pay \$50/month for a bunch of channels that were of no interest to me just to be able to pay another \$5 to get the local channels. Annoyed me to the point that I became a "cord cutter". I'm retired so have better uses for the \$45/month I saved. I get plenty of entertainment from Netflix for under \$10/month and would be very happy to pay \$5/month again to get the SF Bay Area local stations, and would probably pay as much as \$10 for the cost of streaming over the internet.

I don't understand the economics of local channels or why they objected to Aero. Whichever transport is used when I view a local channel, I see their advertisements (that I always assumed were their source of revenue). If I lived 20 miles closer to SF I could get them all free OTA. (OT PUBLIC Airwaves). It's not obvious to me why I shouldn't be able to simply go to a station's website and click on a "View Live" button in the same way that I can with local radio stations - in fact I suspect that streaming via the internet must be a lot cheaper than operating a high power broadcasting service.

Not looking for a subsidy here - just a rational decision.