EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

From: Craig Horrell <cih@mindspring.com>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Wed, Feb 17, 1999 2:21 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

Craig Horrell (cih@mindspring.com) writes:

A consumer's right to choose.

I have spent a large amount of hard earned money on audio/video equipment. I do not believe that the government should dictate to me what is an acceptable signal when it comes to local stations. Grade 'B' does not compare to digital. This is archaic.

My local cable company is unwilling or unable (or both) to provide a satisfactory signal to my home. I have made numerous calls to get my service to the quality I expect, but to no avail.

I cannot consider satellite because of the current ruling prohibiting me from receiving FOX/CBS et al from the DBS provider. I cannot get BellSouth's direct line of sight digital system because my house does not have direct line of sight to their transmitter.

So here I sit, bad service from a cable monopoly and really no way out of my predicament.

What do I, the consumer want ?
I want to be able to choose my provider without restrictions. I want the best possible picture and sound quality with the latest technology (e.g. Dolby Digital and/or DTS surround sound).

Thank you for your time. Please get the government out of the way and let consumer driven competition lead the way.

Thanks,
Craig Horrell.

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

98-201

From: David Norris <dwnmd&Megsinet.net@infoserver.fcc.gov>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Fri, Feb 12, 1999 3:40 AM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

David Norris (dwnmd&Megsinet.net) writes:

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

I urge you to support and work dilligently for passage of S.247 and S.303 and similarly intended legislation in the House of Representatives to allow satellite systems to carry locally broadcast stations. Cable television is too expensive and lags far behind the abilities of today's technology due to their near monopoly. Please end this unfair advantage the unresponsive cable conglomerates have in offering exclusive clear local signals. We need real competition in the television industry and the arrogant cable industry (especially TCI) needs to be prodded by companies offering superior service to move quickly to provide inexpensive internet connections through their cable lines so that their links will again offer a true value to consumers.

I have felt strongly about this for some time due to escalating cable rates without commiserate service improvements (especially in Baltimore City) and was motivated to write you tonight by this website: http://www.dishnetwork.com/promos/local2local/index.html

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.81.243.212
Remote IP address: 209.81.243.212

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: Robert Foster <robert.foster@acm.org>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Wed, Feb 10, 1999 7:24 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

Robert Foster (robert.foster@acm.org) writes:

I wish to express my extreme dissatisfaction with current FCC rules and federal legislation restricting satellite broadcasters from carrying network stations. I technically live within range of Seattle, Washington, TV stations, however hilly terrain results in a poor picture. It is my right as a citizen to receive whatever broadcasts I wish. I am very unhappy that the federal government is interfering with that right. In fact, this reminds me of tactics used in Communist countries to control communications. It is not right.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 208.229.228.19
Remote IP address: 208.229.228.19

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY DUPLICATE

From: Dave & Jill Mills <davem@wctc.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Tue, Feb 9, 1999 10:54 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

Dave & Jill Mills (davem@wctc.net) writes:

February 10, 1999

Dear Commissioner Susan Ness,

We cannot receive an acceptable network picture using a conventional outdoor rooftop antenna. We need to continue to receive the clear reception that DBS satellite service provides.
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. In addition, I ask you to stop this unfair court order until the new standard is in place.
We live in an area that the court defines as "predictive Grade B" and you cannot get an acceptable picture by using a conventional outdoor rooftop antenna, because we live too far from the broadcast tower, and for ABC and CBS our reception is blocked by hills, and 60 foot tall trees.
I am 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.
Congress asked the Commission for purposes of 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.
It is now time for this definition to be accurately established!
WE WANT OUR NETWORK CHNNELS AVAILABLE TO
ALL WHO WANT AND NEED THEM BY D.B.S.!

Sincerely,
Dave & Jill Mills
1912 Wood Duck Dr.
Stevens Point, WI. 54481-9541

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.94.165.60
Remote IP address: 209.94.165.60

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

From: Dave & Jill Mills <davem@wctc.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Tue, Feb 9, 1999 10:54 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

Dave & Jill Mills (davem@wctc.net) writes:

February 10, 1999

Dear Commissioner Susan Ness,

We cannot receive an acceptable network picture using a conventional outdoor rooftop antenna. We need to continue to receive the clear reception that DBS satellite service provides.
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. In addition, I ask you to stop this unfair court order until the new standard is in place.
We live in an area that the court defines as "predictive Grade B" and you cannot get an acceptable picture by using a conventional outdoor rooftop antenna, because we live too far from the broadcast tower, and for ABC and CBS our reception is blocked by hills, and 60 foot tall trees.
I am 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.
Congress asked the Commission for purposes of 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.
It is now time for this definition to be accurately established!
WE WANT OUR NETWORK CHNNELS AVAILABLE TO
ALL WHO WANT AND NEED THEM BY D.B.S.!

Sincerely,
Dave & Jill Mills
1912 Wood Duck Dr.
Stevens Point, WI. 54481-9541

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.94.165.60
Remote IP address: 209.94.165.60

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: Nunzio Al Sergi <thebestradioguy@yahoo.com>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Tue, Feb 9, 1999 8:33 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

98-201

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

(Nunzio) Al Sergi (thebestradioguy@yahoo.com) writes:

I recently sold my Class A radio station, WTUS-FM Mannington,WV
after two years of fighting an overwhelming monopoly...West Virginia Radio, Inc. I have proof on paper that shows them with 68% of the revenue in my market. They have all the Class B & B1 outlets. The WV AG office squashed invest due to political reasons in-state and DOJ says we are too small. The limit set by the FCC is 50%, they surpassed it up to 68% in 1997 and more in 1998. Will anyone please help me uphold the law? I really need someone from your office to call me so I can explain and send you documented proof of what is going on. This should be stopped, it cost me $250,000 in 1998 in lost money and expenses plus the sale of my station on 2-1-99. I can't believe no one will help me when I have proof that laws have been broken! Has big business taken over every sane person in government or does it just look this way? Please call me at
1-304-363-8888 WTUS (I'm working for a while as their consultant) or at my home 1-304-825-6283. All I want is some help to uphold the law set by the government in the first place. Thank You for your time and consideration.

(Nunzio) Al Sergi

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 205.245.79.52
Remote IP address: 205.245.79.52

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: Mitchell Wagner <wagsmd@wagner-webworks.com>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Tue, Feb 9, 1999 8:30 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

98-201

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Mitchell Wagner (wagsmd@wagner-webworks.com) writes:

What ever happen to capitalism. We are in an area that does not qualify for recieving networks by satelite. Hence you want them removed from my service. We recieve poor signal from rabbit ears and house over $50,000 worth of computer equipment for web developing and hosting. Putting up an areial antenna is not an option with all of this equipment due to potential lightning problems. In addition, we long ago terminated TCI due to worst service, quality, value, and largely intermittent service. DishNetwork provides excellent service, uninterupted service, superior quality, and an excellent value, now the FCC wishes to punish DISH and it's customers because they are doing something right compared to the rest of the broadcast media. It looks like it is a dark day for capitalism. We urge you to do something right....STOP this non sense and let capitalism takes its course. Who knows, maybe the local affiliates will get the hint and improve their quality.

Sincerely,
Mitchell Wagner
Wagner WebWorks

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.152.64.134
Remote IP address: 209.152.64.134

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

98-201

From: Kristin Ann Gierach <kristinann@webtv.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Sat, Feb 13, 1999 9:43 AM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

Kristin Ann Gierach (kristinann@webtv.net) writes:

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

I would like to request that the satilite bill for local networks be passed. I went to Satilite for more selection and half the cost of the local cable franchise, Warner Cable. I then tried to put up an antenna for local broad casts, but since I live next to a freeway, and in a sort of valley, there are good pictures and bad pictures. I'm also not able to get all the channels without a lot of turning of the antenna, outside, because none of the towers are in the same locations. So, I went with the local Cable for "Basic" service and feel I am getting ripped off. They know I have no choice, and they are right, so let us bleed the customer. I feel that I should have the right to get my local broadcast channels from the most economical source available, and have the freedom to choose. I guess that is what America is about. I should not have to pick something I have no ghoice of, just because someone will make more or less money. Thank you for hearing me out, and I hope that you'll!
I vote so that the satilite comp
anies will be able to show local channels.....I really don't understand all the legal stuff in the bill itself.....I'll leave that up to you.
Kristin Ann Gierach

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.240.197.30
Remote IP address: 209.240.197.30

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

98-201

From: Jack R Dunham <Karshopper@aol.com>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Tue, Feb 9, 1999 2:12 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Jack R Dunham (Karshopper@aol.com) writes:

I am sending the following to let you know that I agree with what is said in the statements below and would like you to vote for my rights as a satellite TV Customer. I should be able to get ALL the stations INCLUDING Network TV. I use one dish in an RV and its nice to be traveling around the country and get HOME LOCAL NEWS. This should NOT be taken away from me. IT should be made EASIER to get MORE Stations not less.
Thank you
Jack Dunham
Kent WA 98031

We need you to write to your Congressman and let them know that this is unacceptable. You should have every right to network stations and should not be penalized because you want to enjoy the best video technology today.

Urge Congress not to support the new version of H.R. 2921, passed by Mr. Henry Hyde's Committee. The new bill would kill satellite's ability to be competitive because it has a "must carry" rule.
Tell Congress "must carry" shouldn't apply to the DBS industry because it's a new industry. When cable was new they didn't have a must carry law. In fact, it was thirty years before they had to carry all the broadcaster stations in their markets and that happened because they became such a powerful local monopoly.
Support Congressman Billy Tauzin's efforts to give satellite providers a chance to become competitive before they have to do "must carry". Support a transition period for satellite companies.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 152.163.232.31
Remote IP address: 152.163.232.31

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

From: Jason <WagJaws@AOL.COM>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Sat, Feb 20, 1999 10:42 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

Jason (WagJaws@AOL.COM) writes:

If everyone switches to satellite TV, local networks will not be watched as much anymore. If locals were on satellite TV it would make Broadcast Stations popular again.

If cable lost their locals they would loose a lot of customers because the locals tell our News, Sports, and Weather Conditions.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 205.188.195.47
Remote IP address: 205.188.195.47

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

From: Bernadette Issa <nadettemj@bigfoot.com>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Sat, Feb 20, 1999 8:20 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

Bernadette Issa (nadettemj@bigfoot.com) writes:

Please 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, please stop this unfair court order until the new standard is in place.

Please know that we live in an area that the court defines as "predictive Grade B" and you cannot get a picture by using a conventional outdoor rooftop antenna, because of the distance we livevfrom the broadcast tower, or because our reception is blocked by hills, mountains, or even tall buildings.

We are 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.

Finally, Congress asked the Commission for purposes of 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. It

is now time for this definition to be accurately established!

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 205.188.196.23
Remote IP address: 205.188.196.23

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: Lisa Rich <lrich@ibm.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Fri, Feb 19, 1999 10:37 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

Lisa Rich (lrich@ibm.net) writes:

I recently purchased a satellite dish and have learned about the 90 day rule. I am prohibited from ordering network programming through my dish BECAUSE MY HUSBAND SUBSCRIBED TO CABLE TV IN THE PAST 90 DAYS. This is outrageous. I feel as though my constitutional rights are being trampled. I wasn't even the one who subscribed to cable. Further, when my husband subscribed, I do NOT recall that he received any warning that he was forfeiting rights to purchase other products for 90 days beyond the termination of his Cable subscription. Please put a stop to this ruling as it is clearly unconstitutional!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 129.37.129.182
Remote IP address: 129.37.129.182

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: Cindy Genadry
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Thu, Feb 18, 1999 3:42 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

Cindy Genadry () writes:

I do not think that DBS services should be allowed to provide local signals without being subject to the same must carry rules as cable.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 165.237.62.114
Remote IP address: 165.237.62.114

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

98-201

From: Simon N. Spiers <thebare@bellsouth.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Wed, Feb 17, 1999 12:50 AM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Simon N. Spiers (thebare@bellsouth.net) writes:

I would like to state my support for allowing the public to use whatever means they choose to receive local TV. The antennas are a thing of the past. New technology has, as in every other aspect of living, changed and improved. TV antennas can be equated to the unpleasant technology of "the other end of the horse" Though horses are still a form of transportation we now have new, improved & more reliable options for transportation. Options seem to be the problem here. I feel I should be entitled to choose my own. My experience of cable companies equates to my choice of cell phone carriers. You choose not the one that offers the best but the one you hate the least. As an American, a consumer and a father I expect my options to be mine and not depicted by a corporation or group of. As a businessman who pays large sums to advertise I have chosen my option to drop TV advertising until such times that I can reach all the watching public and not just the ones with antennas or cab!
le

Very truly yours
Simon N. Spiers.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.214.185.184
Remote IP address: 209.214.185.184

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

98-20

From: Mike Stanford <stanford@rightathome.com>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Tue, Feb 16, 1999 2:08 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Mike Stanford (stanford@rightathome.com) writes:

I would like to urge you to do Spokane. We do not recive either with a conventional antenna. We would appreciate any help everything you can to enable us to receive local seattle networks in our area. We live in the central cascade mountains of Washington State. We currently have five feet of snow on the ground, so we live and work in the weather. Having the ability to get local weather reports would help us. We are about 165 miles from Seattle and about 295 miles from that you could give us.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 4.20.170.105
Remote IP address: 4.20.170.105

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

98-201

From: Chris Wheeler <tvchris@aol.com>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Mon, Feb 15, 1999 10:19 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Chris Wheeler (tvchris@aol.com) writes:

Please don't ask me to go back to my inferior cable co. and their inferior signal. My area will not work on an outside antenna due to the mountains.Zip is 91739. Dish network provides an excellent signal. Cable was just passable. We should not have to step backwards. I'd appreciate the input if I'm completely missing something here.
Thank You.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 205.188.192.47
Remote IP address: 205.188.192.47

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: Robert & Sherri Tomlinson <tomlinsonrsr@webtv.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Mon, Feb 15, 1999 7:00 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

Robert & Sherri Tomlinson (tomlinsonrsr@webtv.net) writes:

We are writing in response to the legislation regarding local broadcast networks being provided by satellite companies. We feel we should be able to pay a satellite provider for these services if we choose, as we are unable to access St. Louis networks via a regular TV antenna. Bottom line, we should be able to choose to pay for broadcast networks of our choice.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.240.200.104
Remote IP address: 209.240.200.104

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: Donald B. Lott <MRSANDERS@prodigy.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Sun, Feb 14, 1999 10:18 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

Donald B. Lott (MRSANDERS@prodigy.net) writes:

My wife and I find the current regulations regarding receipt of network broadcasts via satellite unfair. We live in an urban area that ostensibly receives "grade B" signals. However, our ETV station is over 160 miles from us, and its nearest relay station is over 60 miles away. Our CBS affiliate is over 50 miles away, and the nearest NBC station is over 80 miles away. Moreover, the signals from our ABC and FOX affiliates are not very good. Our only alternative is cable, but our local company (CABLE ONE) will not provide basic cable service. It only offers 'extended basic cable' at over $32 per month. We have written Senator Hatch, Senator McCain, Senator Lott and Congressman Gene Taylor expressing our extreme dissatisfaction with the current situation. We are consumers being prevented by our own government from accessing a higher quality signal for which we are willing to pay. Your support to obtain relief from the present constraints would be greatly appreciated. We are at a point where if we do not see some form of relief developing, we intend to forsake broadcast and cable TV altogether. We are tired of being ripped off by the cable company, and we will not subject ourselves to pathetically inferior broadcast signals.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.252.103.182
Remote IP address: 209.252.103.182

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

From: David Havron <dhavron@mpinet.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Sun, Feb 14, 1999 11:30 AM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

David Havron (dhavron@mpinet.net) writes:

I would like to express my oppinion about the 4 networks not available via Sattlelite. I currently do not watch any programming on the networks because I cannot view them over the air due to a weak signal. I live in the eastern portion of Orlando and I use an outdoor antenna. I currently cannot pick up the Orlando affiliate WESH-TV at all. They have their broadcast studios in Orlando to give a local presence. However their transmission tower is not in Orlando it is in DELAND Florida which is over 100 miles from me. So as you can see the current rules are unfair to me. I would prefer to beable to recieve my local signals, preferably over the sattleite. I beleive that with the growth of Sattleites, that either if the Network feeds are not aallowed to be transmitted....that their importance in our viewing habits will begin to wane.
David Havron
2550 N Alafaya Tr #2307
Orlando, Fl
32826
407-2821-6400

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 207.203.248.13
Remote IP address: 207.203.248.13

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

98-201

From: Thomas J. Solimeo <soli0810@dpnet.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Tue, Feb 9, 1999 7:36 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

Thomas J. Solimeo (soli0810@dpnet.net) writes:

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear Commissioner Ness,
I'm very distressed that the issue of Comcast Spectacor not releasing their Philadelphia sports feed to satellite service at any cost has not made any progress yet. Isn't Comcast acting as a monopoly without regard to the public interest?
I believe that every company deserves to make a profit and I am willing to pay my satellite TV company for the service.
I live in an area that cannot get the Comcast feed via cable and satellite distribution of the sports feed is my only recourse.
I hope that you have some information that weill enable me to keep my hopes up for a fair resolution in the very near future.
Thank you for your valuable time.
Thomas J. Solimeovaluable
soli0810@dpnet.net

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 38.30.21.91
Remote IP address: 38.30.21.91

RECEIVED
FEB 26 1999
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

98-201

From: David M. Pujals <david_m_pujals@msn.com>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Thu, Feb 18, 1999 11:52 AM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

David M. Pujals (david_m_pujals@msn.com) writes:

February 18, 1999

TO:

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ATTN:

Honorable Chairman Kennard
Honorable Commissioner Tristani
Honorable Commissioner Ness
Honorable Commissioner Powell
Honorable Commissioner Furchgott-Roth

The House Committee on Commerce
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-2927
Commerce@mail.house.gov

In the Matter of

Proposal for Creation of the Low Power FM
(LPFM) Broadcast Service
Docket No. MM 95-25

I implore you to please pass Docket No. MM 95-25 and allow the use and function of Low Power FM radio service. It is the only voice left in the small community atmosphere. We have been harassed enough by the national and international forms and formats of media‡s. The small community needs it ‡s own *Free¶ and *Unique¶ voice absent of Corporate influence. Please allow small, responsible, and caring use of Low Power FM operators to identify community function and need.

I thank you in advance for your careful review of this very important matter.

David M. Pujals
1403 Locust Avenue
Fairmont, WV 26554
304-366-9298 (Office)
304-366-6054 (Home)
Email: david_m_pujals@msn.com

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 63.10.89.130
Remote IP address: 63.10.89.130

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Gilles Desaulniers <pontex@slip.net>
To: K2DOM.K2PO1(NETMSGS)
Date: Tue, Feb 16, 1999 4:36 PM
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

98-201

RECEIVED

FEB 26 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Gilles Desaulniers (pontex@slip.net) writes:

February 16, 1999

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN @ the FCC

Help us to view satellite feeds of local stations.

I was recently cut off from viewing primetime television after moving to a high rise building. I cannot get any picture that is worth anything to view since I have moved here. The rules for qualifying are very problematic and do not relect actual reality and situations. There is no way I can or even will attempt to view these stations. The picture is extremely horrible and NBC and ABC I cannot even get on my TV. I am furious and I will not switch off my clear digital picture, to watch some crazy grainy local picture. It is a fact that most viewers receive clear picture through cable networks. The idea that satellite viewers should have to abide by an antiquated system and rule is totally reprehensible.
The air waves in most cities are clogged with radio signals and high buildings. In San Francisco less than 5% of viewers I am sure get their network stations with air antennas. Most viewers get them from cable. That implies that the quality of the picture is already so bad that most people will watch cable feeds of these stations. To expect satellite viewers and much more degraded picture will only alienate network stations from viewers by forcing satellite viewers to forget and eventually wean themselves of network programming and stick to satellite programming only.
This only helps in their own demise. I will ABSOLUTELY NOT WATCH ANY NETWORK PROGRAMMING WITH THESE STUPID AND BAD ANTENNAES. They do not work well enough to get a local picture. I HAVE NOT AND WILL NOT WATCH ANY LOCAL NETWORK STATION FROM AIR SIGNAL FEEDS. TO THIS DAY I HAVE NOT. It is important to remember that now I have not been exposed to any network programming at all. The end result is that the networks will only accelerate their own demise.
-First they have alienated me.. their viewer.
-Secondly, they have made it very difficult to watch their programming.
-Thirdly, it is extremely arrogant of them to assume that most viewers would think nothing of switching to air antennas to view their networks. Most satellite viewers will not do that.. I will not and have not. There is enough content to view television comfortably.
-Fourth.. I am no longer viewing their Logos and therefore their importance in my daily life diminishes accordingly.
Our nation has changed and technology has changed. Your rules that are in effect are no different than allowing the New York Times to be sold in New York Only... Nobody would tolerate that. You should be able to view the NEW YORK TIMES in any city in the Nation. I should be able to view New York programming as a resident of the nation. Our interest in different areas of the country are relative to our own migration within the country. We are often interested in events from where we came.
You should recommend sweeping changes in FCC rules governing local markets. Broadcasting is not limited to local areas anymore. Just like transportation or publishing of papers like the NEW YORK times where information is transmitted by satellite and printed in markets far away from their own local markets. TV signals are much the same. They should not be limited to local areas. The prime time stations have an exclusive power of broadcasting that infringes on the rights of American Viewers to view content at their leisure about any area of the country.
Can you imagine if the San Francisco Chronicle times sued a satellite transmitter for transmitting information used to publish the New York times in San Francisco. There would be an uproar. San Francisco Chronicle advertisers just have to suffer that many local San Franciscans read the New York times instead of the Chronicle and therefore do not get to view there local ADS .. too bad. Our right to information should not be limited by outdated FCC Rules. We have the technology to transmit mountains

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

of information every where in the world. It should be our right to view any programming anywhere in the U.S. I should have the luxury of watching the local News In New York City on NBC if I would like to. Choice should be Nation Wide. Viewers should have choice for TV programming. I should be able to order any station I want to view in the U.S. whether I live in California and if a station is offered on the satellite feed. I should be able to watch a local station in Washington D.C.!
That would make for a much more
informed public and keep us abreast of current events in other areas our of our country. This local market scenario was adapted for very limited programming options and transmission of signals. WELL THAT HAS ALL CHANGED IN THE LAST 20 YEARS. IT IS TIME TO CHANGE YOUR RULES. HTEY ARE BEGINNING TO INTERFERE WITH OUR ABILITY TO VIEW OUR OWN INFORMATION WHEN WE WNAT AND WHERE WE WANT. TRANSMISSION OF PROGRAMMING AND NEWS IS NOT LIMITED TO LOCAL MARKETS ANYMORE.

HELP US TO KEEP OUR CHOICE OF VIEWING BY HELPING US TO
REFORMULATE FCC‡S GIFTS OF MARKET SHARE PPROTECTION. NATIONAL NETWORKS SHOULD BROADCAST NATIONALLY. THEY SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO DIVIDE UP LOCAL AREAS. THEN EVERY STATION WHETHER DISCOVERY CHANNEL HBO WOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO DIVIDE UP LOCAL AREAS AND HAVE AFFILIATES OF THEIR WN NETWORKS IN EACH MARKET.

There should be National versions of the primetime stations. ABC, CBS, NBC FOX should have a National Station that would broadcast to the country and we could pick up these feeds if you are unwilling to see the clarity of my argument.
IT IS TIME TO CHANGE....
HELP US.

THE SATELLITE SITUATION IS BECOMING CRITICAL AND CAUSING MANY SENIOR CITIZENS UNDUE AGGRAVATION AND PAPER WORK JUST TO VIEW TELEVISION.
-
IT IS VERY UNREASONABLE.

THANK YOU

GILLES
415-626-0805
Please use my resources for comments to FCC meetings or inquiries. I am available whenever you would like.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 209.209.6.92
Remote IP address: 209.209.6.92