Date

The Honorable Ajit Pai, Chairman

The Honorable Michael O’Rielly, Commissioner

The Honorable Brendan Carr, Commissioner

The Honorable Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner

Chairman

Federal Communications Commission

455 12

th

Street, Southwest

Washington, DC, 20544

Dear Chairman Pai:

We write to support the Comments of Massachusetts Community Media, Inc. (MassAccess) [OR

the filing of your choice] and to disapprove of the proposals and tentative conclusions set forth in

the FCC’s September 25 Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making in 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, MB Docket 05- 311.

[Describe your relationship with the PEG stations in your district]

[Support comments made by MassAccess. You may touch on any of the following subjects:

• The FCC lacks authority to impair private franchise contracts

• Section 622 of the Cable Act defines “Franchise Fees” and the FCC has no right to

redefine

• Any attempt to redefine “Franchise Fees” weakens the authority of local municipalities

• The rulemaking invents “Cable-Related In-kind Contributions and “Fair Market

Valuation” where there is no precedent

• Section 622 of the Cable Act states that “[a]ny Federal agency may not regulate the

amount of the franchise fees paid by a cable operator.”]

Community media stations allow the residents of [town, city, county] to watch and create

uniquely local programming about their community and local events and issues of interest to

them. Such 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 Further Notice.

Sincerely
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The Honorable Michael O’Rielly, Commissioner

The Honorable Brendan Carr, Commissioner

The Honorable Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner

Chairman

Federal Communications Commission

455 12

th

Street, Southwest

Washington, DC, 20544

Dear Chairman Pai:

We write to support the Comments of Massachusetts Community Media, Inc. (MassAccess) [OR

the filing of your choice] and to disapprove of the proposals and tentative conclusions set forth in

the FCC’s September 25 Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making in 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, MB Docket 05- 311.

[Describe your relationship with the PEG stations in your district]

[Support comments made by MassAccess. You may touch on any of the following subjects:

• The FCC lacks authority to impair private franchise contracts

• Section 622 of the Cable Act defines “Franchise Fees” and the FCC has no right to

redefine

• Any attempt to redefine “Franchise Fees” weakens the authority of local municipalities

• The rulemaking invents “Cable-Related In-kind Contributions and “Fair Market

Valuation” where there is no precedent

• Section 622 of the Cable Act states that “[a]ny Federal agency may not regulate the

amount of the franchise fees paid by a cable operator.”]

Community media stations allow the residents of [town, city, county] to watch and create

uniquely local programming about their community and local events and issues of interest to

them. Such 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 Further Notice.

Sincerely

December 13, 2018

The Honorable Ajit Pai, Chairman

The Honorable Michael O’Rielly, Commissioner

The Honorable Brendan Carr, Commissioner

The Honorable Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner

Chairman

Federal Communications Commission

455 12

th

Street, Southwest

Washington, DC, 20544

Dear Chairman Pai:

I write to support the Comments of Massachusetts Community Media, Inc. (MassAccess) [OR

The filing of your choice] and to disapprove of the proposals and tentative conclusions set forth in

the FCC’s September 25 Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making in 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, MB Docket 05- 311.

For many years as President of Braintree Youth Basketball, we with the help of BCAM volunteers were able to show many of our citizens the weekly games of their neighborhood kids, grandchildren and children when they could not attend or to keep them for nostalgic reasons. Since then I have workedwith BCAM to announce the yearly 4th of July parade. The feedback from Braintree citizens is remarkable. I also enjoy watching various shows that air daily keeping me up to date on what is going on in our town with government meetings, high school activities and local celebrations.

It is my belifthat:

• The FCC lacks authority to impair private franchise contracts

• Section 622 of the Cable Act defines “Franchise Fees” and the FCC has no right to

redefine

• Any attempt to redefine “Franchise Fees” weakens the authority of local municipalities

• The rulemaking invents “Cable-Related In-kind Contributions and “Fair Market

Valuation” where there is no precedent

• Section 622 of the Cable Act states that “[a]ny Federal agency may not regulate the

amount of the franchise fees paid by a cable operator.”]

Community media stations allow the residents of [town, city, county] to watch and create

uniquely local programming about their community and local events and issues of interest to

them. Such 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.

I appreciate your consideration not to adopt many of the proposals in the Further Notice.

Sincerely,

Carol Kippenhan

37 Kendall Avenue

Braintree MA 02184