



DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

**WEIGAND-OMEGA MANAGEMENT, INC.**

RECEIVED  
AUG 17 1999  
FCC

August 16, 1999

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W. TW-A325  
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: Promotion of Competitive Networks In Local telecommunications Markets,  
WT Docket No. 99-217; Implementation of the Local Competition  
Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98

Dear Ms. Salas:

I write in response to the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on July 7, 1999, regarding forced access to buildings. We enclose six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to the original. I am concerned that any action by the FCC adversely affects the conduct of our business and needlessly raises additional issues. The Commission's public notice also raises a number of other issues that concern me.

Weigand-Omega Management, Inc. is a real estate management firm that primarily manages property for others. We operate in four states and manage approximately 4,500 apartment units and 2,000,000 sq. ft. of office and commercial space. We manage over 80 different pieces of real estate. Our properties range from fourplex buildings to regional shopping malls.

First and foremost, we do not believe the FCC needs to act in this field because we are doing everything we can to satisfy our residents' demands for access to telecommunication services. In addition, the FCC's request for comments raises the following issues of particular concern to us: "nondiscriminatory" access to private property; expansion of the scope of existing easements; location of the demarcation point, exclusive contracts; and the expansion of the existing satellite dish or "OTARD" rules to include nonvideo services.

**FCC ACTION is not Necessary!!** We are aware of the importance of telecommunications services to our residents, and would not jeopardize our rental revenue by actions that displease our residents. We compete against many other properties in our market, and we have a strong incentive to keep our properties up-to-date in an effort to compete.

**"Nondiscriminatory" Access:** We must have control over space occupied by providers, especially when there are multiple providers involved. We must have control over who enters a building because we face liability for damage to the building, leases premises, and facilities of other providers and for personal injury to residents and visitors. We are also liable for safety

No. of Copies rec'd 076  
list ABCDE

code violations. Qualifications and reliability of providers are also a real issue. What does "nondiscriminatory" mean? Contract terms vary because each contract is different. A new company without a track record poses greater risks than an established one.

**Scope of Easements:** If we had known governments would allow other companies to piggy-back, we would have negotiated different terms. Expanding rights now would be a taking.

**Demarcation Point:** Current demarcation point rules work fine because they offer flexibility – there is not need to change them.

**Exclusive Contracts:** They generally work to the benefit of our residents and they give competitors a chance to establish a foothold in our area.

**Expansion of Satellite Dish Rules:** We are opposed to the existing rules because we do not believe Congress meant to interfere with our ability to manage our property. The FCC should not expand the rules to include data and other services.

We believe that no further action on these key issues is needed.

Thank you for your attention to our concern.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Daryl Williams", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Daryl Williams CPM®  
Weigand-Omega Management, Inc.