

ORIGINAL

RM 9335/9345

RECEIVED

OCT - 2 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Ryan S. Yusko <Rsy74@cwix.com>
To: A7.A7(NETMSGGS)
Date: 10/2/98 3:08am
Subject: Comments to Commissioner Ness

Ryan S. Yusko (Rsy74@cwix.com) writes:

Dear Ms. Ness,

I am concerned with the upcoming decision that the Federal Communications Commission must make regarding satellite delivered network programming.

Currently assigned to Training Wing Four, NAS Corpus Christi, TX, I am a commissioned officer and student naval aviator. As a member of the Armed Services, I frequently relocate to new duty stations. In the past sixteen months, I have moved three times. Appropriately, I have chosen digital satellite companies DirecTV and U.S. Satellite Broadcasting to provide certain cable service(s) to my home. In addition, PrimeTime 24 is a company that delivers network programming to DirecTV for eligible subscribers.

Digital satellite bills come directly to my home, wherever I reside. Changes to my service, no matter how complex, are made instantly over the phone. As a result, I do not deal with unreliable cable companies or pay excessive nonsensical fees; nor do I have to worry about finding a new cable company every time I relocate. Overall, the services I subscribe to through digital satellite companies are less expensive than the same services I could receive from any local cable company. Therefore, satellite programming offers a simple and convenient cable solution not only for service members but also for American citizens who move frequently.

Unfortunately, a federal court recently ordered PrimeTime 24 to terminate CBS and Fox programming to a large number of subscribers. According to the federal court, many current subscribers are ineligible to receive network satellite service, maintaining that satellite television viewers in certain areas may only obtain network programming from local network stations.

Television networks have made the following proposal concerning eligibility: subscribers would be ineligible in areas where a mere 50% of the households are predicted to get a signal that is theoretically sufficient to produce acceptable reception. Factually speaking, 50% of households are predicted not to receive such a signal in these areas. This reasoning is unfair to consumers, and makes little sense.

I feel that the federal court's decision to terminate said programming violates basic American freedoms. Citizens have a right to choose their cable provider; 50% of the households in my area MAY BE predicted to receive an adequate signal that provides acceptable reception. However, it is my decision whether to tune that signal, or to receive the same network programming from another network cable provider.

Please collaborate with the other commissioners and establish a fair standard of consumer eligibility for satellite delivered network programming, reject the television networks' proposal regarding eligibility, and oppose those who are trying to limit subscribers' ability to view satellite network television.

Very respectfully,
Ryan S. Yusko
Ensign USNR

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 166.55.83.2
Remote IP address: 166.55.83.2

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

2