

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: Michael Grubb [mgrubb6@adelphia.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 8:08 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb
Subject: Cable a la carte

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sirs and Madam,

Reading recent reports of a la carte, I am disturbed by what I read. And I feel that it is important that you hear from a consumer, not a cable company and not some consumer lobbyist group that are made of academia types but are not in touch with the real world.

It should be clear that I am opposed to cable a la carte, and I feel that the studies, both those done by your department and those done by various cable/channel providers miss the essence of the problem. Let me address various points that the studies make.

1. Most, though not all, will be able to reduce cable bills with a la carte pricing.

I believe your study is hugely flawed in it's assessment of this point. I think a more accurate assessment would be to say that most consumers that are interested in fewer than a certain number of channels, say 5 for arguments sake, will be able to reduce their bill, but only by reducing their service. Cost per channel will rise undoubtedly. And in many cases, such as my family, our interest are diverse enough that I believe we would either end up paying more, or not getting what we like because of expense. We are a typical family I believe. I commonly watch, or flip between 7 or 8 channels(TLC,DISCOVERY[1-3],DIY Network,ESPN,ESPN2,and the local channels). My wife, while she has many of the same likes, doesn't care about ESPN or ESPN2, or even the local channels(which I watch for News). She however is much more of a movie buff than I. So she will watch AMC,Oxygen,HBO [1-7],and a couple of other movie channels that come in the package. Now my daughter really prefers (and we prefer her to watch) the Disney channel, toon disney, nickelodeon, and the kids discovery channel. Now I have always considered our family average, and many of our friends with children have similar likes. For us, even if each channel cost a mere 2 dollars each, we would pay \$40 dollars just for the channels, not including the service charges the provider (ours is Adelphia, soon to be Comcast) would charge just to deliver this. But all indications are that \$2 per channel is unrealistic. ESPN is saying \$20. I don't believe it, but I do believe that we will see something more like what HBO charges, about \$14 dollars extra a month for their channels.

2. Selection. Your study seems to imply that it will be good for smaller companies because people will be able to spend their dollars on that, instead of things they don't want.

The cost to start a cable station is staggering. Many don't make any money until a few years after their release, and it is because to make money, they not only have to be in a lot of homes to get the subscription fees back from the carriers, but because they have to achieve a certain amount of advertising, which they struggle with until they are in enough households and watched by enough people to bring their numbers up to a point where people are willing to advertise on their channel. Without bundling, many new channels would never even try. The deck would be too stacked. And even if they did try, most consumers would never find out about these channels. Sure, there would undoubtedly be some that would try and make it, but not many.

3. Finally, all the emphasis and blame for cost has been leveled at the channel providers with very little blame leveled at the providers such as Cox, adelphia, att, and Comcast. The assumption is that cable is expensive because the channel providers such as ESPN charge outrageous fees.

Ok, the truth is that cable providers are no angels. By offering a la carte, they will be able to charge whatever they like for channels, and they will make a mint. Service will also suffer. Honestly, will cable companies even be willing to provide service in a rural area like the one I live in if most subscribers only subscribe to 2 or 3 channels? The cost of maintaining a network in a sparsely populated area with low channels per set will be too expensive. Either the consumer will pay very expensive premiums for little selection, or will not be able to get service at all.

Bottom line is that both of your studies are wrong, but in the end, an a la cart system will hurt, I believe, more consumers than it will benefit. Is this a perfect world? No. Some will surely pay more than they should. But I believe that more will pay more for less service under an a la carte system than the current system.

Please, for once really consider the people. I know for government that is a little weird. And I know that many in government try to say they are listening to the people, but face it, most in government listen to lobbyist and Pac groups that pretend they represent the people but don't.

Thanks for your time,
Michael Grubb
St. Albans, VT

From: Michael Grubb [mgrubb6@adelphia.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 8:08 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb
Subject: Cable a la carte

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sirs and Madam,

Reading recent reports of a la carte, I am disturbed by what I read. And I feel that it is important that you hear from a consumer, not a cable company and not some consumer lobbyist group that are made of academia types but are not in touch with the real world.

It should be clear that I am opposed to cable a la carte, and I feel that the studies, both those done by your department and those done by various cable/channel providers miss the essence of the problem. Let me address various points that the studies make.

1. Most, though not all, will be able to reduce cable bills with a la carte pricing.

I believe your study is hugely flawed in it's assessment of this point. I think a more accurate assessment would be to say that most consumers that are interested in fewer than a certain number of channels, say 5 for arguments sake, will be able to reduce their bill, but only by reducing their service. Cost per channel will rise undoubtedly. And in many cases, such as my family, our interest are diverse enough that I believe we would either end up paying more, or not getting what we like because of expense. We are a typical family I believe. I commonly watch, or flip between 7 or 8 channels(TLC,DISCOVERY[1-3],DIY Network,ESPN,ESPN2,and the local channels). My wife, while she has many of the same likes, doesn't care about ESPN or ESPN2, or even the local channels(which I watch for News). She however is much more of a movie buff than I. So she will watch AMC,Oxygen,HBO [1-7],and a couple of other movie channels that come in the package. Now my daughter really prefers (and we prefer her to watch) the Disney channel, toon disney, nickelodeon, and the kids discovery channel. Now I have always considered our family average, and many of our friends with children have similar likes. For us, even if each channel cost a mere 2 dollars each, we would pay \$40 dollars just for the channels, not including the service charges the provider (ours is Adelphia, soon to be Comcast) would charge just to deliver this. But all indications are that \$2 per channel is unrealistic. ESPN is saying \$20. I don't believe it, but I do believe that we will see something more like what HBO charges, about \$14 dollars extra a month for their channels.

2. Selection. Your study seems to imply that it will be good for smaller companies because people will be able to spend their dollars on that, instead of things they don't want.

The cost to start a cable station is staggering. Many don't make any money until a few years after their release, and it is because to make money, they not only have to be in a lot of homes to get the subscription fees back from the carriers, but because they have to achieve a certain amount of advertising, which they struggle with until they are in enough households and watched by enough people to bring their numbers up to a point where people are willing to advertise on their channel. Without bundling, many new channels would never even try. The deck would be too stacked. And even if they did try, most consumers would never find out about these channels. Sure, there would undoubtedly be some that would try and make it, but not many.

3. Finally, all the emphasis and blame for cost has been leveled at the channel providers with very little blame leveled at the providers such as Cox, adelphia, att, and Comcast. The assumption is that cable is expensive because the channel providers such as ESPN charge outrageous fees.

Ok, the truth is that cable providers are no angels. By offering a la carte, they will be able to charge whatever they like for channels, and they will make a mint. Service will also suffer. Honestly, will cable companies even be willing to provide service in a rural area like the one I live in if most subscribers only subscribe to 2 or 3 channels? The cost of maintaining a network in a sparsely populated area with low channels per set will be too expensive. Either the consumer will pay very expensive premiums for little selection, or will not be able to get service at all.

Bottom line is that both of your studies are wrong, but in the end, an a la cart system will hurt, I believe, more consumers than it will benefit. Is this a perfect world? No. Some will surely pay more than they should. But I believe that more will pay more for less service under an a la carte system than the current system.

Please, for once really consider the people. I know for government that is a little weird. And I know that many in government try to say they are listening to the people, but face it, most in government listen to lobbyist and Pac groups that pretend they represent the people but don't.

Thanks for your time,
Michael Grubb
St. Albans, VT

From: Michael Grubb [mgrubb6@adelphia.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2006 8:08 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; dtayloratateweb
Subject: Cable a la carte

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sirs and Madam,

Reading recent reports of a la carte, I am disturbed by what I read. And I feel that it is important that you hear from a consumer, not a cable company and not some consumer lobbyist group that are made of academia types but are not in touch with the real world.

It should be clear that I am opposed to cable a la carte, and I feel that the studies, both those done by your department and those done by various cable/channel providers miss the essence of the problem. Let me address various points that the studies make.

1. Most, though not all, will be able to reduce cable bills with a la carte pricing.

I believe your study is hugely flawed in it's assessment of this point. I think a more accurate assessment would be to say that most consumers that are interested in fewer than a certain number of channels, say 5 for arguments sake, will be able to reduce their bill, but only by reducing their service. Cost per channel will rise undoubtedly. And in many cases, such as my family, our interest are diverse enough that I believe we would either end up paying more, or not getting what we like because of expense. We are a typical family I believe. I commonly watch, or flip between 7 or 8 channels (TLC, DISCOVERY [1-3], DIY Network, ESPN, ESPN2, and the local channels). My wife, while she has many of the same likes, doesn't care about ESPN or ESPN2, or even the local channels (which I watch for News). She however is much more of a movie buff than I. So she will watch AMC, Oxygen, HBO [1-7], and a couple of other movie channels that come in the package. Now my daughter really prefers (and we prefer her to watch) the Disney channel, toon disney, nickelodeon, and the kids discovery channel. Now I have always considered our family average, and many of our friends with children have similar likes. For us, even if each channel cost a mere 2 dollars each, we would pay \$40 dollars just for the channels, not including the service charges the provider (ours is Adelphia, soon to be Comcast) would charge just to deliver this. But all indications are that \$2 per channel is unrealistic. ESPN is saying \$20. I don't believe it, but I do believe that we will see something more like what HBO charges, about \$14 dollars extra a month for their channels.

2. Selection. Your study seems to imply that it will be good for smaller companies because people will be able to spend their dollars on that, instead of things they don't want.

The cost to start a cable station is staggering. Many don't make any money until a few years after their release, and it is because to make money, they not only have to be in a lot of homes to get the subscription fees back from the carriers, but because they have to achieve a certain amount of advertising, which they struggle with until they are in enough households and watched by enough people to bring their numbers up to a point where people are willing to advertise on their channel. Without bundling, many new channels would never even try. The deck would be too stacked. And even if they did try, most consumers would never find out about these channels. Sure, there would undoubtedly be some that would try and make it, but not many.

3. Finally, all the emphasis and blame for cost has been leveled at the channel providers with very little blame leveled at the providers such as Cox, adelphia, att, and Comcast. The assumption is that cable is expensive because the channel providers such as ESPN charge outrageous fees.

Ok, the truth is that cable providers are no angels. By offering a la carte, they will be able to charge whatever they like for channels, and they will make a mint. Service will also suffer. Honestly, will cable companies even be willing to provide service in a rural area like the one I live in if most subscribers only subscribe to 2 or 3 channels? The cost of maintaining a network in a sparsely populated area with low channels per set will be too expensive. Either the consumer will pay very expensive premiums for little selection, or will not be able to get service at all.

Bottom line is that both of your studies are wrong, but in the end, an a la cart system will hurt, I believe, more consumers than it will benefit. Is this a perfect world? No. Some will surely pay more than they should. But I believe that more will pay more for less service under an a la carte system than the current system.

Please, for once really consider the people. I know for government that is a little weird. And I know that many in government try to say they are listening to the people, but face it, most in government listen to lobbyist and Pac groups that pretend they represent the people but don't.

Thanks for your time,
Michael Grubb
St. Albans, VT

Angela Boston

From: Neal [nhazen@netzero.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 11:31 PM
To: Michael Copps
Cc: Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylor@tateweb
Subject: TV A La Carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I don't care what the cable companies and their surveys say. I want a la carte TV channel choice. So does everyone I've spoken to. We are willing to pay a higher price for the freedom to select only those channels that fit our interests. It's the way things should have been from the beginning. Please support our wishes in this matter.

Neal Hazen
batsondebelfry@yahoo.com

Angela Boston

From: Neal [nhazen@netzero.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 11:31 PM
To: Michael Copps
Cc: Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylor@tateweb
Subject: TV A La Carte

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I don't care what the cable companies and their surveys say. I want a la carte TV channel choice. So does everyone I've spoken to. We are willing to pay a higher price for the freedom to select only those channels that fit our interests. It's the way things should have been from the beginning. Please support our wishes in this matter.

Neal Hazen
batsondebelfry@yahoo.com

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: Neal [nhazen@netzero.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 11:31 PM
To: Michael Copps
Cc: Jonathan Adelstein; dtaylor@ateweb
Subject: TV A La Carte

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I don't care what the cable companies and their surveys say. I want a la carte TV channel choice. So does everyone I've spoken to. We are willing to pay a higher price for the freedom to select only those channels that fit our interests. It's the way things should have been from the beginning. Please support our wishes in this matter.

Neal Hazen
batsondebelfry@yahoo.com

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: Neal [nhazen@netzero.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 11:29 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: TV A la Carte

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I don't care what the cable companies and their surveys say. I want a la carte TV channel choice. So does everyone I've spoken to. We are willing to pay a higher price for the freedom to select only those channels that fit our interests. It's the way things should have been from the beginning. Please support our wishes in this matter.

Neal Hazen
batsondebelfry@yahoo.com

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: donald salzer [donsalzer@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2006 8:38 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: THANK YOU

APR - 3 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Thank you so much for taking the recent action that you have of fining some networks some fines with real bite. That was very much needed and there is more to do but thank you so much for doing this. I cannot tell you how much we appreciate this. Please continue to be firm with Hollywood as you have done here. Thank you. We recently canceled our cable service altogether and didn't replace it with anything because what was on tv is so bad, with things the vchiip, family friendly tier of channels, rating system, a la carte and other ideas would not have solved. Our Christian beliefs have been assaulted and that is not blocked out by these blocking ideas. Thank you again. Sincerely, Anita Salzer, New Hudson, Michigan

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: Volker Hookala [steelyvolker@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, February 25, 2006 3:35 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Unbundel

APR - 3 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir, please set us free from bundled television service. Thank You
VF Hookala

--
No virus found in this outgoing message.
Checked by AVG Free Edition.
Version: 7.1.375 / Virus Database: 268.1.0/269 - Release Date: 2/24/2006

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: Andras Bandi [andras.band@pobox.com]
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2006 9:59 AM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 24, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mr. Andras Bandi
9019 Gaylord St Apt 75
Houston, TX 77024-2927

Angela Boston

From: Paul Kirchoff [paulk4@optonline.net]
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2006 12:34 AM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 23, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mr. Paul Kirchoff
465 Lincoln Ave
Wyckoff, NJ 07481-3022

Angela Boston

From: Michael Chouinard [mike@kvsc.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2006 10:59 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 23, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mr. Michael Chouinard
340 30th Ave N
Saint Cloud, MN 56303-3754

Angela Boston

From: Sheila Jones [smj36rn@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2006 12:31 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 23, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mrs. Sheila Jones
5 Parkwood Dr
Snyder, NY 14226-4053

Angela Boston

From: Charles Rogers [crogers37@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2006 11:16 AM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 23, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mr. Charles Rogers
37 Monterey Ln
Cheektowaga, NY 14225-4707

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: gerald felsing [cherim6@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2006 9:27 AM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 23, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mr. gerald felsing
2201 Patrick Ln
Waukesha, WI 53188-7302

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: frank jimenez [frankstocks@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 7:56 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 22, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mr. frank jimenez
49ruthplace
si, NY 10305

Angela Boston

From: Robert Aluskewicz [bobeal@optonline.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 7:10 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 22, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mr. Robert Aluskewicz
14 Cove Rd
Southampton, NY 11968-1704

Angela Boston

From: Alanna Louin [anemoneskate@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 5:33 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 22, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Alanna Louin
1141 Lighthouse Ave Apt 432
Pacific Grove, CA 93950-2338

Angela Boston

From: Karen L. Lew [karenllew@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 4:16 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 22, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Karen L. Lew
20733 14th Pl W
Lynnwood, WA 98036-7134

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: Erik Amos [amos@zhonka.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 4:13 PM
To: Jonathon Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

APR - 8 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 22, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--to select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I personally have chosen to pay for the absolute barest of packages because I find few channels of value until you get to the \$80/mo tier. Given a more flexible system, I would likely pay for a few more channels. And I am sure there are other people who would do the same.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Erik Amos
317 Milroy St NW
Olympia, WA 98502-4929

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: Daniel Ryan [onad@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 1:01 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 22, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mr. Daniel Ryan
3720 Marlin Ct
Raleigh, NC 27604-3320

Angela Boston

RECEIVED

From: Mark Woodward [mark@stopwar.us]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 12:04 PM
To: Jonathan Adelstein
Subject: Give me more control over my cable bill

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Feb 22, 2006

FCC Commissioner Jonathon Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Adelstein,

I am writing to let you know that I am angry that cable rates are continuing to rise and I want more control over my cable TV bills. The Federal Communications Commission has said that allowing consumers to choose and pay for only those cable channels they want to watch will save consumers money. Cable companies should adopt this "a la carte" system immediately, and give me more control over what programs come into my home.

Consumers should have more flexibility when it comes to the cable programming that we pay for. Today, the cable companies, not consumers, decide what packages of channels we have to buy. Because of this system, they're able to favor the channels they own. Giving me more choice--either to choose a package or select my own channels--would help break the choke hold cable companies have on programming, and could allow more independent programming to get aired. This "a la carte" system would let me save money and allow me to decide what programming I want to keep out of my home.

Over the past ten years, the average price of expanded basic cable service has increased from just over \$20 to well over \$40 nearly three times the rate of inflation. Today, 98% of consumers can choose from only one cable company and not everyone can get satellite. This lack of competition has hurt consumers and encouraged the industry to lock us into the large packages of channels we don't watch.

I understand the technology already exists to make a cable a la carte system work. While the cable industry is fighting this idea, giving consumers choices is the way most markets work. Imagine Time Warner telling consumers that to buy Time magazine, they also had to buy Time Warner-owned Field & Stream. In the competitive publishing market they couldn't get away with that, but in TV, they make more money by controlling how consumers get cable programming. Bundling lets them squeeze consumers and control content. They may have no incentive to quit unless policymakers step in and get involved.

Please support giving me more control over my cable bill.

Thank you,

Mr. Mark Woodward
104 Spring St
Alexandria, TN 37012-2052