

July 23, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, District of Columbia 20554

RE: Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as Amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Third Report and Order - MB Docket No. 05-311

Dear Ms. Dortch,

I am writing to express my serious concern and disagreement to the FCC's proposed Third Report and Order requiring Local Franchising Authorities ("LFA's") to treat cable-related, in-kind contributions as franchise fees subject to the statutory five percent franchise fee cap.

This change would be devastating to the PEG facility that I - and my community - rely on.

We rely on having virtually all our municipal meetings broadcast live and subsequently archived. This allows us transparent access to our government, especially for those that are mobility-challenged or otherwise unable to attend meetings.

Our PEG facility also operates a robust TV/Media education program in collaboration with Chelmsford Public Schools. They teach students the skills to be proficient in this media age. Equally important, those students help provide high quality coverage of school sports, concerts and other educational programming to their peers, parents, grandparents and other community members.

Lastly, our access center gives our citizens a platform to express their views to the greater community. In today's day and age, this communication channel is more important than ever.

The loss of revenue caused by the Order will force municipalities to either divert resources away from core municipal and school services to maintain existing PEG programming, suffer a dramatic reduction in the scope of PEG channels, or lose them altogether.

The FCC is a guardian of the public interest, yet the effects of this order seem destined to go against the public interest. Rather, they amount to a windfall for cable providers eager to shed their civic responsibilities under Federal Law.

Decreasing the funding for our PEG facility - which passing this order would do - WIDENS the digital divide; does not help promote innovation; and finally, does not protect consumer interests.

I strongly urge you to reconsider.

Sincerely,

Hana Barker