

BEFORE THE

Federal Communications Commission

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

AUG 6 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of)
Annual Assessment of the Status of)
Competition in Markets for the)
Delivery of Video Programming)

CS Docket No. 99-230

To: The Commission

**COMMENTS OF THE
NATIONAL RURAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE**

Steven T. Berman, Senior Vice President
Business Affairs and General Counsel
NATIONAL RURAL
TELECOMMUNICATIONS
COOPERATIVE
2201 Cooperative Way, Suite 400
Woodland Park
Herndon, Virginia 20171

Jack Richards
Paula Deza
Keller and Heckman, LLP
1001 G Street, N.W. Suite 500 West
Washington, D.C. 20001

Dated: August 6, 1999

No. of Copies rec'd 674
List ABCDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	i
I. BACKGROUND	2
II. COMMENTS	4
A. The Commission Should Ensure That All Americans May Receive Distant or Local Broadcast Signals By Satellite.	4
1. The Commission Should Resolve the Distant Network Signal Problem by Adopting More Realistic “Grade B” Standards and Testing Procedures	5
2. The Commission Should Ensure That Rural Viewers Have the Choice of Receiving Local Television Signals by Satellite	11
B. DBS Capacity Should Be Set Aside for the Rural Public Interest	15
C. DIRECTV Has Refused to Make Essential Premium Programming Available to NRTC.	16
III. CONCLUSION	18

SUMMARY

The National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative (“NRTC”), a Multichannel Video Programming Distributor (“MVPD”), markets and distributes cable and broadcast programming via satellite to more than 1,200,000 rural households. As an MVPD, NRTC is frustrated in not being able to offer rural America a service truly competitive to cable. Time and time again, as the Commission has prepared its “Annual Reports,” NRTC has recommended changes to Commission regulations and policies which would make DBS service more competitive to cable. While the Commission has adopted some of NRTC’s recommendations, serious competitive problems remain unaddressed.

NRTC first urged the Commission to resolve the distant network signal satellite retransmission problem in an Emergency Petition for Rulemaking filed last July. Although the Commission conducted a rulemaking proceeding responsive to NRTC’s petition, the Commission refused to reassess and update its Grade B signal strength values for purposes of the Satellite Home Viewer Act (“SHVA”). As a result, millions of satellite subscribers have lost or will lose their distant network signals as a result of a Florida District Court’s injunction. NRTC urges the Commission to reconsider its Grade B order and to use its ample statutory authority to establish more realistic, more modern and more consumer-friendly Grade B values, prediction models and measurement techniques specifically for purposes of determining “unserved” households under the SHVA.

In light of legislative and technological developments, the retransmission of local television signals by satellite to “served” households appears likely in the near future. Because the retransmission of local signals in sparsely populated markets will be less lucrative than in urban markets, NRTC is concerned that local signals will be unavailable by satellite to most rural viewers. Not only will rural viewers be deprived of access to local signals by satellite, but satellite as a technology will be unable to compete fully with cable offerings which include local signals in smaller markets. The lack of local satellite service also could endanger the economic viability of those broadcast stations in smaller markets that are not uplinked and retransmitted locally by satellite. The Commission should ensure that local-to-local service is available throughout rural America.

NRTC also urges the Commission to ensure that rural Americans benefit from the FCC’s DBS Public Interest Programming rules. Farm, weather and other programming of special interest to rural Americans should be available under the rules.

Lastly, NRTC brings to the attention of the Commission a pending lawsuit by NRTC against DIRECTV regarding certain actions by DIRECTV which jeopardize the level and diversity of video programming services available through NRTC in rural America. DIRECTV has refused to recognize NRTC’s right to distribute premium, “marquee” programming. Without access to this programming, the ability of NRTC, its members and affiliates to provide a competitive package of programming to rural America is severely undercut.

BEFORE THE
Federal Communications Commission

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Annual Assessment of the Status of) CS Docket No. 99-230
Competition in Markets for the)
Delivery of Video Programming)

To: The Commission

**COMMENTS OF THE
NATIONAL RURAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COOPERATIVE**

Pursuant to Section 1.430 of the Rules and Regulations of the Federal Communications Commission ("Commission" or "FCC"), the National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative ("NRTC"), by its attorneys, hereby submits these Comments in response to the Notice of Inquiry ("NOI") issued by the Commission in the above-captioned proceeding on June 23, 1999.^{1/} NRTC is concerned that the Commission's rules and policies continue to prevent consumers, especially those in rural areas, from enjoying the benefits of a fully competitive Multichannel Video Programming Distribution ("MVPD") market. NRTC encourages the Commission to amend its rules

^{1/} 64 Fed. Reg. 36013.

and adopt policies which will ensure that all Americans benefit from advances in MVPD technology.

In particular, the Commission should update and revise its "Grade B" standards, so that viewers across the country may receive distant network signals by satellite when their local network signals are unacceptable. The Commission also should ensure that rural Americans are not "left out" of the local-to-local signal plans of DBS licensees, and that they receive the benefits of DBS Public Interest programming as well. Lastly, the Commission should be aware of actions by DIRECTV, the nation's largest DBS provider, that undermine NRTC's ability to continue providing a diversity of DBS programming services to rural America.

I. BACKGROUND

1. NRTC is a non-profit cooperative association comprised of 550 rural electric cooperatives and 279 rural telephone systems, as well as several non-member affiliate organizations, located throughout 48 states. NRTC's mission is to meet the telecommunications needs of more than 60 million American consumers living in rural areas. In furtherance of that mission, NRTC paid DIRECTV more than \$100,000,000 in 1992 to capitalize the launch of the DIRECTV satellite business in 1994. In return, through a DBS Distribution Agreement between NRTC and Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. (DIRECTV's predecessor-in-interest), NRTC received program distribution and other rights to market and distribute DIRECTV programming services throughout large portions of rural America. Pursuant to that Agreement, NRTC, its members and

affiliates currently market and distribute DIRECTV programming to more than 1,200,000 rural households (more than 20% of all DIRECTV's current subscribers) using DBS technology. NRTC also distributes C-band satellite programming to some 50,000 subscribers.

2. During the 13 years since its inception, NRTC has participated extensively in Congressional hearings and Commission and Copyright Office proceedings to ensure that rural America receives the same access to programming as is available in urban areas. As satellite technology has developed and flourished, NRTC has decried the slow development of competition in providing rural consumers with choices in video program delivery. In each of the previous five years that the FCC has sought input from the public to prepare its assessment to Congress of the status of competition in markets for the delivery of video programming, NRTC has filed Comments and Reply Comments urging the Commission to amend its rules and promote competition. Unfortunately for rural America, many of the issues raised by NRTC years ago remain unaddressed by the Commission today.

II. COMMENTS

A. The Commission Should Ensure That All Americans May Receive Distant or Local Broadcast Signals By Satellite.

3. In previous Video Competition Reports, the Commission has identified the lack of network signals as a significant reason given by consumers for not subscribing to DBS service.²⁷ Without the ability to provide network broadcast stations by satellite, DBS simply cannot compete fully with cable. In its most recent Notice of Inquiry, the Commission again recognized this competitive restraints imposed by the copyright law and again asked for comment on how the copyright law's restrictions on satellite retransmission of network signals affect the ability of DBS to provide a service that truly competes with, and can be viewed as a substitute for, incumbent cable systems. NOI at ¶11(b).

4. For years, NRTC has been denouncing the anti-competitive effect of the current copyright law and has urged the Commission to foster competition in the MVPD market by providing a more realistic means of identifying which subscribers cannot receive their local network stations over-the-air and should be eligible to receive distant network signals by satellite. The solutions provided to date by the Commission are not sufficient to

²⁷ Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in Markets for the Delivery of Video Programming, Fifth Annual Report, CS Docket No. 98-102, ¶ 63 (Dec. 23, 1998). (Stating “[c]onsumers continue to report that the biggest drawbacks of DBS service are the difficulties associated with the provision of local broadcast signals. . .”)

remedy deficiencies in current procedures or to make DBS an effective substitute for or strong competitor to cable. Furthermore, as satellite technology--and legislation--is developing to the point of permitting satellite retransmission of local signals, the Commission will be faced with a related issue: ensuring that rural Americans are not disenfranchised by satellite operators choosing to provide "local-to-local" service only in more populated, more lucrative urban markets.

1. The Commission Should Resolve the Distant Network Signal Problem by Adopting More Realistic "Grade B" Standards and Testing Procedures.

5. On July 8, 1998, NRTC filed an Emergency Petition for Rulemaking that initiated a proceeding to explore the matter of defining "Grade B signal strength" for purposes of the SHVA. NRTC's intent was to prevent the massive termination of satellite network service to millions of satellite subscribers as a result of the then-imminent Preliminary Injunction of a Miami District Court.^{3/} In its Petition, NRTC urged the Commission to address this crisis facing viewers across the country by establishing a modern, consumer-friendly, understandable and fair definition of "an over-the-air signal of

^{3/} CBS, Inc. et al. v. PrimeTime 24 Joint Venture, Order Affirming in Part and reversing in Part Magistrate Judge Johnson's Report and Recommendations, 9 F.Supp.2d 1333 (S.D. FL. May 13, 1998); CBS, Inc. et al. v. PrimeTime 24 Joint Venture, Supplemental Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Case No. 96-3650-Civ (S.D. FL. July 19, 1998) ("Supplemental Order").

Grade B intensity” for purposes of applying the “unserved household” restriction of the SHVA, 17 U.S.C. §119.^{4/}

6. NRTC pointed out that the Commission’s Grade B signal strength standard was badly out-of-date. It was developed in the 1950’s and reflected viewers expectations during an era of small black-and-white television receivers. Moreover, the Longley-Rice model used by the Miami District Court to determine subscriber eligibility for satellite network service under the SHVA was woefully inadequate. It did not accurately reflect which subscribers actually received an acceptable over-the-air picture from the local network affiliate. NRTC argued that the court’s interpretation of an “unserved household,” based on the Commission’s deficient signal strength levels and Longley-Rice model, would cause the unnecessary and inappropriate disenfranchisement of millions of satellite subscribers, many of them located in rural areas served by NRTC.

7. As a result of NRTC’s Emergency Petition and support from the satellite industry and members of Congress, the Commission released a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, supposedly to facilitate a means to determine which households do not in fact

^{4/} Definition of an Over-the-Air Signal of Grade B Intensity for Purposes of the Satellite Home Viewer Act, Emergency Petition for Rulemaking of the National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative, Rm No. 9335, July 8, 1998. According to the terms of the SHVA, satellite carriers may retransmit network signals only to “unserved households” (*i.e.*, households that, among other things, “cannot receive through the use of a conventional rooftop receiving antenna, an over-the-air signal of grade B intensity (as defined by the Federal Communications Commission) of a primary network station affiliated with that network”). 17 U.S.C. §119(a)(2)(B), §119(d)(10)(emphasis added).

receive an acceptable local signal for purposes of the SHVA and should be entitled to receive distant network signals by satellite.^{5/} The “unserved household” crisis escalated once the Florida District Court issued its Permanent Injunction.^{6/}

8. The court prohibited PrimeTime 24, the satellite carrier, from providing CBS and Fox network programming to any customer within an area shown on Longley-Rice propagation maps as receiving a signal of at least Grade B intensity from a CBS or Fox primary network station.^{7/} The court’s Preliminary Injunction, which forced satellite carriers to terminate the CBS and FOX network service distributed by PrimeTime24 to subscribers signed up after March 11, 1997 (the date the networks brought suit against PrimeTime24) became effective on February 28, 1999. The Permanent Injunction, which applies to satellite network subscribers signed up before March 11, 1997, was to become effective on April 30, 1999. Prior to the April 30, 1999 effective date, the parties entered into a settlement agreement applicable to subscribers signed-up before March 11, 1997. According to the terms of this agreement and subsequent amendments, current subscribers who are predicted to receive a signal of “Grade A” intensity lost receipt of CBS, Fox, ABC and NBC on July 31, 1999. Current subscribers who are predicted to receive a signal of

^{5/} Satellite Delivery of Network Signals to Unserved Households for Purposes of the Satellite Home Viewer Act, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CS Docket No. 98-201, FCC 98-302 (November 17, 1998).

^{6/} Supplemental Order; CBS Inc., et al., Final Judgement and Permanent Injunction, Case No. 96-3650-CIV-NESBITT (S.D. FL., December 30, 1998).

^{7/} Supplemental Order at pp. 2-3.

“Grade B” intensity will lose receipt of CBS, Fox, ABC and NBC signals by December 31, 1999.

9. NRTC, believing that the NPRM presented a vehicle for the Commission to prevent the disenfranchisement of millions of households resulting from the Miami District Court’s Preliminary Injunction, eagerly participated in this proceeding. Joining with members of the satellite industry and the Satellite Broadcasting and Communications Association (“SBCA”), NRTC made wide ranging, consumer-friendly recommendations to the Commission. NRTC, and the majority of the satellite industry, recommended that the Commission adopt a revised Grade B signal strength standard of 70.75 dBu for low-band VHF, 76.5 dBu for high-band VHF, and 92.75 dBu for UHF which reflects today’s more sophisticated operational and viewing environment. The Commission was also urged to adopt the Terrain Integrated Rough Earth Model (“TIREM”) as a vastly improved predictive model to qualify viewers for distant network service by satellite, along with a revised measurement procedure to resolve disputes. The measurement procedure recommended by NRTC and the satellite industry featured: (1) measurements taken at an accessible location, as close as possible to the residence, at actual roof-top height; (2) signal strength readings taken approximately every thirty seconds for a period of five minutes; and (3) adjustment of those readings for signal strength loss due to the actual length of the antenna line and the actual number of splitters per household.

10. NRTC and others in the satellite industry were understandably disappointed when the Commission released its Grade B Order.^{8/} The only actual amendment to the FCC's rules was the creation of a revised methodology for measuring signal strength at an individual household. The methodology, which requires a tester to make at least five measurements in clusters as close as possible to the location being tested, with the median value being taken as the signal intensity at the home, did not fundamentally affect the Florida District Court's ordered termination of satellite network service to households it deemed "served." The new predictive model, "Individual Location Longley-Rice" ("ILLR") endorsed by the FCC, can only be used at the discretion of the satellite carriers, networks and local affiliates in determining the status of satellite consumers and potential satellite consumers. It basically reiterates the existing Grade B standard and will have little practical impact on the millions of households who have lost or will lose their distant network satellite service.

11. In its Order, the Commission declined to address the central issue before it: the definition of Grade B signal strength for purposes of the SHVA.^{9/} Apparently, the Commission believed it lacked authority to create a special Grade B standard solely for purposes of the SHVA. Instead, the Commission opted to make recommendations to

^{8/} Satellite Delivery of Network Signals to Unserved Households for Purposes of the Satellite Home Viewer Act, Report and Order, CS Docket No. 98-201 (February 2, 1999) ("Grade B Order").

^{9/} Grade B Order at ¶ 42.

Congress for changes in the copyright law to allow satellite companies to retransmit local television stations to local markets, to eliminate the 90-day waiting period for consumers to receive satellite network service after subscribing to cable, and to adopt a predictive model for creating rebuttable presumptions of service or lack of service, along with a loser pays mechanisms when the presumption is challenged.^{10/}

12. NRTC expressed its disappointment with the Commission's Grade B Order in its Comments in support of Petitions for Reconsideration of the Order. In these filings, NRTC pointed out (as it had pointed out in its original Emergency Petition) that the Commission has ample statutory authority to define a signal of Grade B intensity and to make changes in its rules concerning the prediction and measurement of Grade B signal strength which will more accurately determine which households can receive a Grade B signal over-the-air from the local network affiliate. The Commission has yet to respond to Petitions for Reconsideration and related comments concerning its Grade B Order.

13. NRTC urges the Commission to reconsider its Grade B Order and to use its ample statutory authority to establish new Grade B signal strength values specifically for purposes of the SHVA that more accurately reflect signal strength actually required to receive an acceptable over-the-air picture. The Commission also should adopt new prediction models and measurement techniques that will determine more accurately which

^{10/} Id., at ¶¶ 50-60, 71-85, 92, 94, and 96-97.

households can receive a Grade B signal from the local network affiliate. These changes would have a significant, positive impact on millions of consumers who have been deemed “ineligible” to receive distant network service by the Miami District Court. The Commission’s failure to act on their behalf will effectively guarantee their disenfranchisement.

2. The Commission Should Ensure That Rural Viewers Have the Choice of Receiving Local Television Signals by Satellite.

14. Congress currently is preparing to modify the copyright laws to permit the retransmission of local broadcast signals by satellite. The bills currently being debated by Congress would permit satellite operators to retransmit local television signals without payment of a copyright fee to consumers within a station’s Designated Market Area (“DMA”). The proposed legislation does not require DBS operators to provide local-to-local service in every DMA, and DBS operators currently do not have the satellite capacity necessary to provide local-to-local service in every DMA. While the proposed legislation would permit satellite operators to offer a seamless broadcast network service in some markets--and therefore to compete more effectively with incumbent cable operators in those markets--consumers outside the top urban markets are not expected to enjoy the benefits of local-to-local legislation.

15. The economic reality is that local-to-local service will not be as financially viable in smaller, rural markets as it is in urban America. If “local- to-local” service is only available in lucrative, urban markets, NRTC is concerned that rural Americans who rely on local television programming to stay informed of pressing local matters, will be left behind in the Information Age. To prevent a divide between information “haves and have nots,” NRTC urges the Commission to aggressively pursue all options to ensure that rural local-to-local satellite service occurs in the immediate future.

16. The Commission is already aware that consumers in smaller markets are in danger of being left behind those in larger markets once local-to-local satellite service is implemented. In its Report and Order in the Grade B proceeding, the Commission expressed enthusiasm that the distant network signal problem could be eased with legislation that would permit the retransmission of local network signals by satellite. Grade B Order at ¶ 93. Bearing in mind the importance of local broadcasting services to consumers and to the furtherance of a competitive MVPD market, the FCC responded to an informal Congressional request by suggesting changes to the copyright law that would allow satellite companies to retransmit local television stations to local markets. *Id.* at ¶94. The FCC recognized, however, that “local-into-local cannot provide the solution for every community in the immediate future, due to limitations in the satellites' capacity to carry every local channel.” *Id.* Based on information provided by at least one DBS licensee, the FCC estimated that only about half the United States' population would be likely to receive

local-to-local satellite services.^{11/} Furthermore, it stated that “smaller cities would not be able to receive service, even under the best scenario, for about 5 years. . . . [and as such] [v]iewers who live in communities where local-into-local service is unavailable will need other solutions . . .” Id.

17. According to the trade press, DIRECTV has announced plans to provide local channels by satellite to approximately 50 million homes located in major metropolitan areas. EchoStar has announced that it will provide local-to-local service only to the top 20 markets.^{12/}

18. The Commission must take all possible steps to ensure that all Americans--not just those located in more densely populated urban areas-- receive to the fullest extent possible the benefits of educational, informational and entertainment programming resulting from the retransmission of local television signals by satellite. If DBS licensees are permitted to serve only a handful of the largest markets--and if

^{11/} Grade B Report and Order at ¶ 94 citing Charlie Ergen Testimony before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, January 27, 1999, *as reported in* Communications Daily, January 28, 1999.

^{12/} Ted Hearn, “DIRECTV Follows EchoStar’ local-to-local lead,” Multichannel News, p.3 (May10, 1998); “DIRECTV to Remain ‘TV centric’,” SKYREPORT.com E-news (May 13, 1998); “Satellite Rewrite Could Come Quickly” Communications Daily, pp. 3-4 (Jan. 28, 1999) (“Ergen said that with new spectrum, and without full must-carry requirements, his company will be able in about 3 years to serve 20 major cities using spot beam technology for local signals.”)

legislative and regulatory steps are not taken to require the provision of local signals by satellite in rural areas--there is a real danger that rural America will be "left out."

19. Local news, information and entertainment programming is a key element of an MVPD's complete program package. Without local signals, it is unlikely that satellite program packages will be fully competitive with cable--which offers local signals--in smaller markets.

20. There is also a real danger that commercial television stations serving rural markets may fail to survive in a satellite local-to-local world. Urban stations that are uplinked and locally retransmitted by satellite may thrive, but smaller, rural stations dedicated to serving their less populated communities may not. Without satellite carriage, the long-term viability of small market, rural stations is in question.

21. In implementing their plans to retransmit local-to-local signals by satellite, the Commission should not permit DBS licensees to ignore rural America. Rural consumers should not be forced to forfeit local news, information and entertainment programming available from their local stations simply because they choose to receive MVPD service via satellite. Likewise, rural television stations should not be placed in financial jeopardy simply because they are located in markets that satellite providers have deemed unprofitable for local satellite service.

22. The Commission should consider all possible opportunities to foster the delivery of local-to-local signals via satellite throughout rural America. Whether by requiring the retransmission of a certain number of rural signals for every urban market carried, by expanding the DBS Public Interest requirement to include the delivery of rural local-to-local signals, or by some other means, the Commission must ensure that rural America is not denied access to local signals via satellite.

B. DBS Capacity Should Be Set Aside for the Rural Public Interest.

23. In its Notice, the FCC inquired as to plans for the DBS channels required to be set aside for “noncommercial programming of an educational or informational nature.” NOI at ¶26. According to the FCC’s rules, DBS providers must reserve four percent of their channel capacity exclusively for use by qualified programmers for non-commercial programming of an educational or informational nature. Qualified programmers include non-commercial entities with an educational mission.

24. In evaluating applications for “Public Interest” programming, NRTC believes that DBS licenses should be required to consider the interests of the nation’s many rural viewers. As mentioned above, the delivery of rural local-to-local signals pursuant to the DBS Public Interest requirements would promote the public interest of rural Americans. Additionally, national news and information programming bearing directly on the special perspectives of rural Americans across the country--ranging from farm news to

weather reports--should be provided. To that end, NRTC encourages the Commission to ensure that rural America's interests are included in the public interest programming provided by DBS licensees.

C. DIRECTV Has Refused to Make Essential Premium Programming Available to NRTC.

25. In its Notice, the Commission requested comment on whether there are certain programming services (*i.e.*, "marquee" program services) that an MVPD needs to provide to subscribers in order to be successful. See NOI at ¶ 22. The answer is "yes".

26. On June 3, 1999, NRTC filed suit in the United States District Court for the Central District of California alleging, among other things, that DIRECTV has wrongfully refused to allow NRTC to distribute HBO, Showtime, The Movie Channel, and Cinemax (the "Premium Programming") in NRTC's service territory under a DBS Distribution Agreement with DIRECTV.^{13/} Without access to the Premium Programming, NRTC, its members and affiliates will be unable to offer full program packages that their subscribers demand and that are necessary to compete fully against cable operators.

^{13/} Complaint for Breach of Contract and Declaratory Relief, National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative v. DIRECTV, Inc.; Hughes Communications Galaxy Inc.; and DOES 1-10 (C.D. Cal.) (No. CB 99-5666 LGB CWX).

27. Although NRTC's lawsuit against DIRECTV is a private contractual matter not generally requiring the Commission's intervention, it raises issues of importance to the Commission in its review of the state of MVPD competition. In essence, NRTC's contractual claim against NRTC is based on a provision in its Distribution Agreement with DIRECTV stating that if DIRECTV acquired the rights to distribute HBO, Showtime, The Movie Channel or Cinemax, NRTC would have the option to substitute that programming into its program distribution package. DIRECTV acquired the rights to that programming when it acquired United States Satellite Broadcasting Co. ("USSB"), a transaction that was approved by the Commission on April 1, 1999.^{14/} When NRTC attempted to exercise its option to substitute the Premium Programming into its own package, however, DIRECTV refused.

28. Without access to the Premium Programming--the "marquee" programming referenced in the Commission's Notice--NRTC will be unable to offer the comprehensive programming packages necessary to compete fully against cable operators. NRTC's rural subscribers, unable to purchase the Premium Programming from NRTC, will be required to deal with two MVPDs, two customer service accounts and two billings systems in order to obtain the full complement of programming they demand.

^{14/} United States Satellite Broadcasting Co., Inc. and DIRECTV Enterprises, Inc., Order and Authorization, DA 99-633 (Int'l Bur., rel. April 1, 1999).

29. NRTC believes that DIRECTV's refusal to provide the Premium Programming to NRTC is in violation of NRTC's Distribution Agreement with DIRECTV and, more importantly from the public policy perspective of the Commission, prohibits NRTC, its members and affiliates from offering "marquee" programming that is needed to compete fully against cable. It deprives NRTC of access to programming necessary to succeed as an MVPD distributor, and encumbers rural subscribers with unnecessary administrative burdens in dealing with dual MVPDs, dual customer service accounts and dual billing systems.

III. CONCLUSION

30. Some of the Commission's current rules and policies are prohibiting consumers, especially those in rural areas, from enjoying the benefits of a fully competitive MVPD market. Until the Commission resolves the distant network signal problem by adopting modern, realistic, consumer-friendly and understandable "Grade B" standards, millions of rural viewers will remain disenfranchised throughout the country. The Commission also has to take concrete steps to ensure that all Americans, not just those living in urban areas, receive the benefits of local signal retransmission by satellite once authorized by Congress. Further, the unique programming interests of rural America should be reflected by DBS licensees in their satisfaction of the Commission's Public Interest programming requirements. These types of regulatory and legislative

developments are critical to ensure rural America's access to competitive MVPD programming services.

31. DIRECTV's refusal to provide Premium Programming to NRTC is also undermining NRTC's ability to provide a diversity of programming services to rural America. Although NRTC's pending federal lawsuit against DIRECTV involving this issue is a private contractual matter not generally requiring the Commission's intervention, DIRECTV's treatment of NRTC is adversely affecting NRTC's ability to compete with cable in providing MVPD services to rural America.

Respectfully submitted,

**Steven T. Berman, Senior Vice President
Business Affairs and General Counsel
NATIONAL RURAL
TELECOMMUNICATIONS
COOPERATIVE
2201 Cooperative Way, Suite 400
Woodland Park
Herndon, Virginia 20171**

By: 
**Jack Richards
Paula Deza
Keller and Heckman, LLP
1001 G Street, N.W. Suite 500 West
Washington, D.C. 20001**

Dated: August 6, 1999