The Honorable Ajit Pai, Chairman 12/14/18

The Honorable Michael O’Rielly, Commissioner

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

Federal Communications Commission

455 12th Street, Southwest  
Washington, DC, 20544

*RE: MB Docket No 05-311 In the Matter of 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*

Dear Chairman Pai,

I am writing in support of the Comments of the Cable Act Preservation Alliance (“CAPA”) in the Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making and in opposition to the proposals and tentative conclusions reached by the FCC.

As a resident of Arlington, MA I know that our local station, Arlington Community Media, inc. (ACMi), provides vital services to the community. I appreciate their coverage of selectman, school board, and town meetings, community events, and local news. I also appreciate their very talented staff who act not just as producers, but as teachers. My daughter learned to film, edit, interview, and produce over her years of membership - producing a full length documentary on the history of our town in her senior year of high school.

ACMi's local presence enables the residents 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.

Additionally, arguments like that of the Citizens Against Government Waste - saying that cities will use the funds for other than cable uses - is absurd. If that were truly the concern, the appropriate way to deal with that is to put stipulations as to the specific uses of the money into legislation or contracts. This proposal is not directed at that concern. It is an attempt by the cable companies to renege on promises they made when they were trying to gain initial access into communities when cable was new. They cannot be allowed to go back on these promises now simply because they are more powerful than they were in the 1980's.

I hope you will protect community PEG channels by choosing not to adopt the proposals in the Further Notice.

Sincerely,

Nancy Flynn-Barvick

159 Waverley St. Arlington, MA