

January 2006

Commissioner Michael Copps
 FCC
 445 12th Street SW
 Washington, DC 20554
 Fax 866-418-0232

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RE: CABLE FRANCHISE LEGISLATION

ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Copps,

I write to request your leadership in opposing any legislation that undermines local government's ability to protect our residents and to ensure fair competition in cable.

We want fair competition and for like services to be treated alike. Telephone companies should not be allowed to enter the cable market without comparable obligations to those of the incumbent cable providers. These obligations have resulted in public programming which has been a benefit to all.

Preserve Local Authority and Leave No Constituent Behind. Local rights-of-way management authority is needed to ensure public safety and efficient use of the rights-of-way. Local oversight in cable has resulted in ALL citizens, regardless of economic status, being served. Telephone companies are promoting statutory changes that would allow them to cherry-pick rich consumers while redlining other neighborhoods. Absent local oversight, a Texas or New York based company would determine who is important and who isn't. This could result in such economic uncertainty in the cable industry that some residents might wind up *without any provider at all*, let alone competition.

The current system works and it works well. Here's why:

- Cable franchises provide for public, educational and governmental access TV, which provides important information to residents including school news, public safety information, participation in city council meetings and MGTV (Michigan Government TV).
- Cable franchises support public infrastructure.
- Cable franchises provide cities and townships with just compensation for use of public rights-of-way. Michigan alone could lose \$100 million in direct revenues to local governments. The revenues are spent on right-of-ways, local public access channels, public education, and public safety. With local governments struggling to make ends meet, any revenue cut would be painful.
- Cable franchises enable customers to quickly and completely resolve service issues at the local level, instead of seeking relief from new Federal or Statewide agencies.
- Local government is *not* an impediment to new cable entrants. Cities and townships promptly grant additional franchises. Existing franchise agreements can be very quickly amended to simply add any qualified newcomer. The fact is, however, the Telcos have not bothered to ask.

I urge you to oppose legislation that takes away any local government cable franchising, franchise fees and local authority.

Sincerely,




Yolanda Lambert
 22730 Mayfield St
 Farmington, MI 48336

No. of Copies rec'd
 List A B C D E

0

05-311

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

January 2006

Commissioner Michael Copps
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
Fax 866-418-0232

ORIGINAL

RE: CABLE FRANCHISE LEGISLATION

Dear Commissioner Copps,

I write to request your leadership in opposing any legislation that undermines local government's ability to protect our residents and to ensure fair competition in cable.

We want fair competition and for like services to be treated alike. Telephone companies should not be allowed to enter the cable market without comparable obligations to those of the incumbent cable providers. These obligations have resulted in public programming which has been a benefit to all.

Preserve Local Authority and Leave No Constituent Behind. Local rights-of-way management authority is needed to ensure public safety and efficient use of the rights-of-way. Local oversight in cable has resulted in ALL citizens, regardless of economic status, being served. Telephone companies are promoting statutory changes that would allow them to cherry-pick rich consumers while redlining other neighborhoods. Absent local oversight, a Texas or New York based company would determine who is important and who isn't. This could result in such economic uncertainty in the cable industry that some residents might wind up *without any provider at all*, let alone competition.

The current system works and it works well. Here's why:

- Cable franchises provide for public, educational and governmental access TV, which provides important information to residents including school news, public safety information, participation in city council meetings and MGTV (Michigan Government TV).
- Cable franchises support public infrastructure.
- Cable franchises provide cities and townships with just compensation for use of public rights-of-way. Michigan alone could lose \$100 million in direct revenues to local governments. The revenues are spent on right-of-ways, local public access channels, public education, and public safety. With local governments struggling to make ends meet, any revenue cut would be painful.
- Cable franchises enable customers to quickly and completely resolve service issues at the local level, instead of seeking relief from new Federal or Statewide agencies.
- Local government is *not* an impediment to new cable entrants. Cities and townships promptly grant additional franchises. Existing franchise agreements can be very quickly amended to simply add any qualified newcomer. The fact is, however, the Telcos have not bothered to ask.

I urge you to oppose legislation that takes away any local government cable franchising, franchise fees and local authority.

Sincerely, *Jerry Lambert*

 Jerry Lambert
22730 Mayfield St.
Farmington, MI 48336-3959

No. of Copies _____
List A B C D E _____

05-311

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED FILE COPY ORIGINAL

January 2006

Chairman Kevin Martin
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
Fax 866-418-0232

ORIGINAL

RE: CABLE FRANCHISE LEGISLATION

Dear Chairman Martin,

I write to request your leadership in opposing any legislation that undermines local government's ability to protect our residents and to ensure fair competition in cable.

We want fair competition and for like services to be treated alike. Telephone companies should not be allowed to enter the cable market without comparable obligations to those of the incumbent cable providers. These obligations have resulted in public programming which has been a benefit to all.

Preserve Local Authority and Leave No Constituent Behind. Local rights-of-way management authority is needed to ensure public safety and efficient use of the rights-of-way. Local oversight in cable has resulted in ALL citizens, regardless of economic status, being served. Telephone companies are promoting statutory changes that would allow them to cherry-pick rich consumers while redlining other neighborhoods. Absent local oversight, a Texas or New York based company would determine who is important and who isn't. This could result in such economic uncertainty in the cable industry that some residents might wind up *without any provider at all*, let alone competition.

The current system works and it works well. Here's why:

- Cable franchises provide for public, educational and governmental access TV, which provides important information to residents including school news, public safety information, participation in city council meetings and MGTV (Michigan Government TV)
- Cable franchises support public infrastructure.
- Cable franchises provide cities and townships with just compensation for use of public rights-of-way. Michigan alone could lose \$100 million in direct revenues to local governments. The revenues are spent on right-of-ways, local public access channels, public education, and public safety. With local governments struggling to make ends meet, any revenue cut would be painful.
- Cable franchises enable customers to quickly and completely resolve service issues at the local level, instead of seeking relief from new Federal or Statewide agencies.
- Local government is *not* an impediment to new cable entrants. Cities and townships promptly grant additional franchises. Existing franchise agreements can be very quickly amended to simply add any qualified newcomer. The fact is, however, the Telcos have not bothered to ask.

I urge you to oppose legislation that takes away any local government cable franchising, franchise fees and local authority.

Sincerely, *Yolanda Lambert*



Yolanda Lambert
22730 Mayfield St
Farmington, MI 48336

No. of Copies 0
List A B C D E

05-321

January 2006

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

FEB 22 2006

Chairman Kevin Martin
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
Fax 866-418-0232

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20541

RE: CABLE FRANCHISE LEGISLATION

ORIGINAL

Dear Chairman Martin,

I write to request your leadership in opposing any legislation that undermines local government's ability to protect our residents and to ensure fair competition in cable.

We want fair competition and for like services to be treated alike. Telephone companies should not be allowed to enter the cable market without comparable obligations to those of the incumbent cable providers. These obligations have resulted in public programming which has been a benefit to all.

Preserve Local Authority and Leave No Constituent Behind. Local rights-of-way management authority is needed to ensure public safety and efficient use of the rights-of-way. Local oversight in cable has resulted in ALL citizens, regardless of economic status, being served. Telephone companies are promoting statutory changes that would allow them to cherry-pick rich consumers while redlining other neighborhoods. Absent local oversight, a Texas or New York based company would determine who is important and who isn't. This could result in such economic uncertainty in the cable industry that some residents might wind up *without any provider at all*, let alone competition.

The current system works and it works well. Here's why:

- Cable franchises provide for public, educational and governmental access TV, which provides important information to residents including school news, public safety information, participation in city council meetings and MGTV (Michigan Government TV).
- Cable franchises support public infrastructure.
- Cable franchises provide cities and townships with just compensation for use of public rights-of-way. Michigan alone could lose \$100 million in direct revenues to local governments. The revenues are spent on right-of-ways, local public access channels, public education, and public safety. With local governments struggling to make ends meet, any revenue cut would be painful.
- Cable franchises enable customers to quickly and completely resolve service issues at the local level, instead of seeking relief from new Federal or Statewide agencies.
- Local government is *not* an impediment to new cable entrants. Cities and townships promptly grant additional franchises. Existing franchise agreements can be very quickly amended to simply add any qualified newcomer. The fact is, however, the Telcos have not bothered to ask.

I urge you to oppose legislation that takes away any local government cable franchising, franchise fees and local authority.

Sincerely,

Jerry Lambert



Jerry Lambert
22730 Mayfield St.
Farmington, MI 48336-3959

No. of Copies received
List A B C D E

6

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

05-311

January 2006

Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
Fax 866-418-0232

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

RE: CABLE FRANCHISE LEGISLATION

Dear Commissioner Taylor Tate,

I write to request your leadership in opposing any legislation that undermines local government's ability to protect our residents and to ensure fair competition in cable.

We want fair competition and for like services to be treated alike. Telephone companies should not be allowed to enter the cable market without comparable obligations to those of the incumbent cable providers. These obligations have resulted in public programming which has been a benefit to all.

Preserve Local Authority and Leave No Constituent Behind. Local rights-of-way management authority is needed to ensure public safety and efficient use of the rights-of-way. Local oversight in cable has resulted in ALL citizens, regardless of economic status, being served. Telephone companies are promoting statutory changes that would allow them to cherry-pick rich consumers while redlining other neighborhoods. Absent local oversight, a Texas or New York based company would determine who is important and who isn't. This could result in such economic uncertainty in the cable industry that some residents might wind up *without any provider at all*, let alone competition.

The current system works and it works well. Here's why:

- Cable franchises provide for public, educational and governmental access TV, which provides important information to residents including school news, public safety information, participation in city council meetings and MGTV (Michigan Government TV).
- Cable franchises support public infrastructure.
- Cable franchises provide cities and townships with just compensation for use of public rights-of-way. Michigan alone could lose \$100 million in direct revenues to local governments. The revenues are spent on right-of-ways, local public access channels, public education, and public safety. With local governments struggling to make ends meet, any revenue cut would be painful.
- Cable franchises enable customers to quickly and completely resolve service issues at the local level, instead of seeking relief from new Federal or Statewide agencies.
- Local government is *not* an impediment to new cable entrants. Cities and townships promptly grant additional franchises. Existing franchise agreements can be very quickly amended to simply add any qualified newcomer. The fact is, however, the Telcos have not bothered to ask.

I urge you to oppose legislation that takes away any local government cable franchising, franchise fees and local authority.

Sincerely, *Yolanda Lambert*



Yolanda Lambert
22730 Mayfield St
Farmington, MI 48336

0

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

05-311

January 2006

Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
Fax 866-418-0232

RE: CABLE FRANCHISE LEGISLATION

ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Taylor Tate,

I write to request your leadership in opposing any legislation that undermines local government's ability to protect our residents and to ensure fair competition in cable.

We want fair competition and for like services to be treated alike. Telephone companies should not be allowed to enter the cable market without comparable obligations to those of the incumbent cable providers. These obligations have resulted in public programming which has been a benefit to all.

Preserve Local Authority and Leave No Constituent Behind. Local rights-of-way management authority is needed to ensure public safety and efficient use of the rights-of-way. Local oversight in cable has resulted in ALL citizens, regardless of economic status, being served. Telephone companies are promoting statutory changes that would allow them to cherry-pick rich consumers while redlining other neighborhoods. Absent local oversight, a Texas or New York based company would determine who is important and who isn't. This could result in such economic uncertainty in the cable industry that some residents might wind up *without any provider at all*, let alone competition.

The current system works and it works well. Here's why:

- Cable franchises provide for public, educational and governmental access TV, which provides important information to residents including school news, public safety information, participation in city council meetings and MGTV (Michigan Government TV).
- Cable franchises support public infrastructure.
- Cable franchises provide cities and townships with just compensation for use of public rights-of-way. Michigan alone could lose \$100 million in direct revenues to local governments. The revenues are spent on right-of-ways, local public access channels, public education, and public safety. With local governments struggling to make ends meet, any revenue cut would be painful.
- Cable franchises enable customers to quickly and completely resolve service issues at the local level, instead of seeking relief from new Federal or Statewide agencies.
- Local government is *not* an impediment to new cable entrants. Cities and townships promptly grant additional franchises. Existing franchise agreements can be very quickly amended to simply add any qualified newcomer. The fact is, however, the Telcos have not bothered to ask.

I urge you to oppose legislation that takes away any local government cable franchising, franchise fees and local authority.

Sincerely, *Jerry Lambert*



Jerry Lambert
22730 Mayfield St.
Farmington, MI 48336-3959

No. of Co. _____
List A B C D E

0

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
055

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

January 2006

Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
Fax 866-418-0232

RE: CABLE FRANCHISE LEGISLATION

ORIGINAL

Dear Commisllsioner Adelstein,

I write to request your leadership in opposing any legislation that undermines local government's ability to protect our residents and to ensure fair competition in cable.

We want fair competition and for like services to be treated alike. Telephone companies should not be allowed to enter the cable market without comparable obligations to those of the incumbent cable providers. These obligations have resulted in public programming which has been a benefit to all.

Preserve Local Authority and Leave No Constituent Behind. Local rights-of-way management authority is needed to ensure public safety and efficient use of the rights-of-way. Local oversight in cable has resulted in ALL citizens, regardless of economic status, being served. Telephone companies are promoting statutory changes that would allow them to cherry-pick rich consumers while redlining other neighborhoods. Absent local oversight, a Texas or New York based company would determine who is important and who isn't. This could result in such economic uncertainty in the cable industry that some residents might wind up *without any provider at all*, let alone competition.

The current system works and it works well. Here's why:

- Cable franchises provide for public, educational and governmental access TV, which provides important information to residents including school news, public safety information, participation in city council meetings and MGTV (Michigan Government TV).
- Cable franchises support public infrastructure.
- Cable franchises provide cities and townships with just compensation for use of public rights-of-way. Michigan alone could lose \$100 million in direct revenues to local governments. The revenues are spent on right-of-ways, local public access channels, public education, and public safety. With local governments struggling to make ends meet, any revenue cut would be painful.
- Cable franchises enable customers to quickly and completely resolve service issues at the local level, instead of seeking relief from new Federal or Statewide agencies.
- Local government is *not* an impediment to new cable entrants. Cities and townships promptly grant additional franchises. Existing franchise agreements can be very quickly amended to simply add any qualified newcomer. The fact is, however, the Telcos have not bothered to ask.

I urge you to oppose legislation that takes away any local government cable franchising, franchise fees and local authority.

Sincerely, *Yolanda Lambert*



Yolanda Lambert
22730 Mayfield St
Farmington, MI 48336

No. of Copies
List A B C D 0

January 2006

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

05-311

RECEIVED
FEB 1 2006
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein
FCC
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554
Fax 866-418-0232

RE: CABLE FRANCHISE LEGISLATION

ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

I write to request your leadership in opposing any legislation that undermines local government's ability to protect our residents and to ensure fair competition in cable.

We want fair competition and for like services to be treated alike. Telephone companies should not be allowed to enter the cable market without comparable obligations to those of the incumbent cable providers. These obligations have resulted in public programming which has been a benefit to all.

Preserve Local Authority and Leave No Constituent Behind. Local rights-of-way management authority is needed to ensure public safety and efficient use of the rights-of-way. Local oversight in cable has resulted in ALL citizens, regardless of economic status, being served. Telephone companies are promoting statutory changes that would allow them to cherry-pick rich consumers while redlining other neighborhoods. Absent local oversight, a Texas or New York based company would determine who is important and who isn't. This could result in such economic uncertainty in the cable industry that some residents might wind up *without any provider at all*, let alone competition.

The current system works and it works well. Here's why:

- Cable franchises provide for public, educational and governmental access TV, which provides important information to residents including school news, public safety information, participation in city council meetings and MGTV (Michigan Government TV).
- Cable franchises support public infrastructure.
- Cable franchises provide cities and townships with just compensation for use of public rights-of-way. Michigan alone could lose \$100 million in direct revenues to local governments. The revenues are spent on right-of-ways, local public access channels, public education, and public safety. With local governments struggling to make ends meet, any revenue cut would be painful.
- Cable franchises enable customers to quickly and completely resolve service issues at the local level, instead of seeking relief from new Federal or Statewide agencies.
- Local government is *not* an impediment to new cable entrants. Cities and townships promptly grant additional franchises. Existing franchise agreements can be very quickly amended to simply add any qualified newcomer. The fact is, however, the Telcos have not bothered to ask.

I urge you to oppose legislation that takes away any local government cable franchising, franchise fees and local authority.

Sincerely, *Jerry Lambert*



Jerry Lambert
22730 Mayfield St.
Farmington, MI 48336-3959

No. of Copies _____
List A B C D E

6