

Ref: Docket

I voice strenuous objection on economic grounds to the proposal to add BPL services which would create interference with amateur radio and shortwave listening in the HF spectrum.

The Commission is undoubtedly aware that there are sufficient broadband access methods available to those of us who live in the rural areas of America. However, as my personal experience has shown, the available satellite earth station technology is relatively high priced due to low demand, and telephone company providers such as Sprint (our local carrier) fail to make sufficient investment in capital equipment to bring DSL to rural areas because it would diminish their profit.

From a pure economics perspective, BPL will introduce yet another technology which will serve to eliminate potential market-share of existing providers.

The outcome is obvious: Because there will not be sufficient numbers of BPL users in rural areas given the existing competing services (rural cable, telephone DSL, and satellite-based systems), the addition of BPL will not make economic sense. Further, BPL will tend to make ALL rural Internet services uneconomic by fracturing the Total Available Markets (TAM's) into Served Available Market segments (SAM's) to small justify investment.

The furtherance of competition for services such as BPL specifically removes incentives for local land line providers (such as Sprint) to bring rural telephone service to contemporary standards including DSL.

Sincerely,

George A. Ure, MBA
www.urbansurvival.com
AC7X