Robert A. Gould
44-365 Kaneohe Bay Drive
Kaneohe, HI 96744-2664
October 18, 2012

Comment on NPRM 11-153, Proceeding Number RM-11-169

DearFCC:

The proposed waiver of encryption rules looks like it was written by the cable companies and is entirely selfserving for them at the expense of the consumer. At the very least the cable companies should be required to continue to carry local broadcast QAM HD and SD channels in the clear!

The cable companies tell you that they need this rule to prevent theft of cable signals, but that is baloney. Even the cable companies say that such 'theft' only accounts for 5% of their material.

New TVs can tune cable QAM channels directly, enabling those who do not want a cable box or multiple cable boxes to at least see the local broadcast stations in the clear.

Where we live it is impossible to get any of the local TV stations over the air due to intervening mountains, so we MUST subscribe to cable or satellite. If we want fast internet service also, we are limited to cable.

We have several televisions in the house along with one cable box and one TiVo with cable card that allows us to receive the full subscribed lineup on the two TVs attached to those devices, and rely on the unscrambled QAM signal to receive the local TV stations in HD or SD on other TVs in the house. To require an additional cable box for each TV at $10 a month is prohibitively expensive. And the $10 a month cost will surely increase, particularly if this proposed rule is enacted and the cable companies get waivers.

You MUST protect the local broadcast stations' signal reception over cable and exempt them from any possibility of waivers.

This is a great step backward for consumers and sounds like it comes from a government who is in the cable companies' pocket. Please, please, do not adopt this rule!

Sincerely,

Robert A. Gould
(808) 254-5242
bob.gould@stanfordalumni.org