T. J. ADAM & COMPANY
480 Eagle Drive • Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007
(847) 228-RENT • Fax (847) 364-4822

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

August 10, 1999

Ms. Maggie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th 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:

We 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 this original. We are concerned that any action by the FCC regarding access to private property by large numbers of communications companies may inadvertently and unnecessarily adversely affect the conduct of our business and needlessly raise additional legal issues. The Commission's public notice also raises a number of other issues that concern us.

T.J. Adam & Co. is in the real estate business. We manage 10 properties in the Northwest and Western suburbs of Chicago. These being Westbrook in Hillside (313 units), The Eagles in Elk Grove Vlg (192 units), Yorkville in Yorkville (72 units), Butterfield Towers in Elmhurst (55 units), Glenwest in Glenview (44 units), Townsquare in Wheeling (72 units), Glen Ellyn in Glen Ellyn (156 Units), Greenbrier in Alrington Hts (156 units), Lake Louise in Palatine (120 units), and Elmdale in Des Plaines (189 units).

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 telecommunications. 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 expansion of the existing satellite dish or "OTARD" rules to include non video services.

FCC Action is Not Necessary: We are aware of the importance of telecommunications services to our residents, and would not jeopardize our rent revenue stream by actions that would 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.

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

CERTIFIED PROPERTY MANAGER®

AUG 1999
RECEIVED
FCC
GETTYSBURG

TJA 101

T. J. ADAM & COMPANY
480 Eagle Drive • Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007
(847) 228-RENT • Fax (847) 364-4822

"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, leased premises, and facilities of other providers, and for personal injury to residents and visitors. We are also liable for safety code violations. Qualifications and reliability of providers are a real issue. What does "nondiscriminatory" mean? Contract terms vary because each contract is different. A new company without a proven 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 no 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 no further action on these key issues is needed.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

Thomas Ragauskis
President

CERTIFIED PROPERTY MANAGER®

THE BOZZUTO GROUP
Bozzuto Brings You Home.™
Apartment/Homebuilding • Construction • Mortgage Lending • Management • Landscaping

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

August 9, 1999

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
TW-325
Washington, DC 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:

We 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 this original. We are concerned that any action by the FCC regarding access to private property by large numbers of communications companies may inadvertently and unnecessarily adversely affect the conduct of our business and needlessly raise additional legal issues. The Commission's public notice also raises a number of other issues that concern us.

The Bozzuto Group is in the real estate business. We manage/own 26 apartment communities in the Washington Metropolitan Area. At all of these communities we make a tremendous effort to be certain that our buildings are secure and that our residents benefit from the many measures we take in an effort to afford them a secure and safe home. We also are very aware of the importance of telecommunications services to our residents and are pursuing different resources to meet their needs.

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 telecommunications. 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 expansion of the existing satellite dish or "OTARD" rules to include non-video services.

AUG 1999
RECEIVED
PWD
GETTYSBURG

"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, leased premises, and facilities of other providers, and for personal injury to residents and visitors. We are also liable for safety code violations. Qualifications and reliability of providers are 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 no 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 no further action on these key issues is needed.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

Thomas S. Bozzuto, President
Bozzuto & Associates, Inc.

TSB:mo

Mid-America Management

August 9, 1999

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas, Sec.
Federal Communications Commission
442 12th St., 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:

We 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 this original. We are concerned that any action by the FCC regarding access to private property by large numbers of communications companies may inadvertently and unnecessarily adversely affect the conduct of our business and needlessly raise additional legal issues. The Commission's public notice also raises a number of other issues that concern us.

Mid-America Management is currently managing 14,000 units in 75 different locations, primarily in the five-county Chicago metropolitan area. We are currently the largest nonsubsidized property manager in the Chicago metropolitan area, and feel very strongly concerning this matter.

First and foremost, we do not believe the FCC needs to act in the field because we are doing everything we can to satisfy our residents' demands for access to telecommunications. 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 expanse 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 residents, and would not jeopardize our rent revenue stream by actions that would 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.

"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, leased premises, and facilities of other providers, and for personal injury to residents and visitors. We are also liable for safety code violations. Qualifications and reliability of providers are a real issue. What does "nondiscriminatory" mean? Contract terms vary because each contract is different. A new company without a trace 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 right now would be a taking.

Demarcation Point: Current demarcation point rules work fine because they offer flexibility --- there is no need to change term.

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 manager our property. The FCC should not expand the rules to include data and other services.

We believe no further action on these key issues is needed. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,
MID-AMERICA MANAGEMENT

Thomas P. McGuinness
President

Mid-America Management Corp.
2901 Butterfield Road, Oak Brook, Illinois 60523 (630) 574-2400

RECEIVED

GENERAL GROWTH PROPERTIES, INC.

AUG 1 2 1999

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

August 9, 1999

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street Southwest
TW-A 325
Washington, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

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

Dear Ms. Salas:

I am writing in reponse to the FCC's notice of proposed rule making released on July 7, 1999 regarding forced access to buildings. I am enclosing six copies of this letter as requested.

General Growth Properties is concerned that any action by the FCC regarding access to private property by large numbers of communication companies may adversely affect the conduct of our business and needlessly raise additional issues. The Federal Communications Commission's public notice on this issue raises a number of concerns for us.

General Growth Properties is a Real Estate Investment Trust, which owns and/or manages 125 large regional shopping malls throughout the United States. The average number of retail tenants in any one property is approximately 110. We see no need for the FCC to act on this issue as we, as the building owner, are doing everything we can to satisfy our retail tenant's demands for access to telecommunications. To do otherwise would be counterproductive to both General Growth Properties and the success of our retail tenants.

I can assure that our retail tenants would let us know in no uncertain terms if they felt we were denying them access to telecommunications. On the contrary, we have established reasonable rules and lease language to allow tenants to use telecommunications to enhance their business operations. Their success is our success. We do, as a building owner, give competitive access to our buildings for tenant telecommunication needs. We select the communication provider based on their financial strength and ability to serve the greatest number of retail tenants. We do not accept exclusive clauses in our agreements. We do charge a small monthly fee for allowing the communications provider to have access to our building and to sell their service to our retail tenants for a profit.

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE

400 South Highway 169
Suite 800
Minneapolis, MN 55426
612/525-1200

AUG 1999
RECEIVED
FMD
GETTYSBURG

Secondly, what is the definition of non-discriminatory access to private property. We cannot allow five or six satellite dishes on our roofs and still maintain the security, safety, and integrity of our roofing system. We have strict guidelines that prohibit unrestricted access to our building roofs. History has taught us that contractors will, if given the opportunity, do great damage to the roofing system. Unless we know which contractor caused the damage, the cost to repair the building is the building owners. It is important as a building owner that we limit the access and use of our roofs to protect the property security, the safety of those who are allowed access to the roof, and the protection of the building roof from damage.

Finally, if the FCC would rule that building owners must allow non-discriminatory access to their property, it would be an invasion of our private property rights, a fundamental right to property ownership. This issue is raised by the telecommunication providers based on a profit motive only. It is a one-sided issue. There is no groundswell by tenants and lessees of building space that their rights to telecommunication access are being denied. The system is working. There is no need for the FCC to issue new rules on this issue.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

Stan Saddoris
Sr. VP, Director of Operations
(612) 525-2164 Phone / (612) 525-2194 Fax
email: ssaddori@generalgrowth.com

THE ALTMAN GROUP OF COMPANIES

115 New Street • P.O. Box 6
Glenside, PA 19038
(215) 884-0500 • FAX (215) 884-7372

RECEIVED
AUG 12 1999

August 9, 1999

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W., TW-A325
Washington, DC 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 1966, CC Docket No. 96-98

Dear Ms. Salas:

We write in response to the FCC's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking released on July 7, 1999, regarding forced access to buildings. We enclosed six (6) copies of this letter, in addition to this original. We are concerned that any action by the FCC regarding access to private property by large numbers of communications companies may inadvertently and unnecessarily adversely affect the conduct of our business and needlessly raise additional legal issues. The Commission's public notice also raises a number of other issues that concern us.

The Altman Group of Companies is in the real estate business. We own over thirty-five hundred (3,500) units at twenty-eight (28) locations, and manage in excess of seventy-seven hundred (7,700) multifamily units.

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 telecommunications. 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 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 residents, and would not jeopardize our rent revenue stream by actions that would 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.

"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, leased premises, and facilities of other providers, and for personal injury to residents and visitors. We are also liable for safety code violations. Qualifications and reliability of providers are 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.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

AUG 1999
RECEIVED
FWD
GETTYSBURG

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 no 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 in clue data and other services.

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

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

Steve Altman

SA/bp