Date: 7/24/19

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary

Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street, SW

Washington, District of Columbia 20554

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I write to express our concern about and disapproval of the proposals and tentative conclusions set forth in the FCC’s *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*

I am a member of a local TV Group (Andover Chroniclers) who broadcasts a ½ hour TV Show each month (“There’s Something About Andover”)

This local presence enables the residents of our Andover to watch uniquely local programming about their community and local events and issues of interest to them.  And that was the intent of the PEG provisions of the 1984 Cable Act – to enhance local voices, serve local community needs and interests, and strengthen our local democracy. By defining “franchise fee” in an overly broad fashion to include “in-kind” support, the FCC’s proposals will shift the fair balance between cable franchising authorities and cable operators and will force communities to choose between franchise fees and PEG channels, – something that was never the intent of the Act.

We appreciate your consideration and hope you will protect PEG channels in our community and others by choosing not to adopt many of the proposals in the Third Report and Order..

Sincerely, Frederick W Hohn, 6 Pioneer Circle, Andover, MA 01810

CC: The Honorable Ajit Pai, FCC Chairman

The Honorable Michael O’Rielly, Commissioner

The Honorable Brendan Carr, Commissioner  
The Honorable Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner

The Honorable Geoffrey Starks, Commissioner