

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Received & Inspected

MAR 28 2006

FCC Mail Room

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

ORDER

Adopted: March 7, 2006

Released: March 7, 2006

Reply Comment Date: March 28, 2006

By the Chief, Media Bureau:

1. On November 18, 2005, the Commission released its *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (“*NPRM*”) in the above-captioned proceeding.¹ The Commission set a deadline of March 14, 2006 for reply comments (90 days after publication in the Federal Register).²

2. On March 3, 2006, the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Alliance for Community Media, and the Alliance for Communications Democracy (collectively, the “Parties”) filed a motion seeking a 14-day extension of time to file reply comments in response to the *NPRM* so that the deadline for filing reply comments would be March 28, 2006.³ The Parties state that more time is needed to respond to the large number of filings in this proceeding. Specifically, the Parties state that, at the time they filed their Motion nearly 4,000 comments had been filed, creating a record of nearly 14,000 pages. The Parties contend that the 30-day period allotted to draft reply comments is insufficient to allow them to provide a meaningful response to these comments. Of particular concern to the Parties is the fact that comments “that criticize ... the local cable franchising process typically exceed

¹ *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*, FCC 05-189, MB Docket No. 05-311, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (rel. Nov. 18, 2005).

² The *NPRM* was published in the Federal Register on December 14, 2005. 70 FR 73973-01.

³ National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors, *et al.* Motion for Extension of Time (filed Mar. 3, 2006) (“Motion”). Also on March 3, 2006, two other Motions for Extension of Time consistent with the Motion were filed with the Commission. Anne Arundel County, Maryland, *et al.* Motion for Extension of Time (filed Mar. 3, 2006) (supporting the Parties’ Motion); Greater Metro Telecommunications Consortium, *et al.* Motion for Extension of Time (filed Mar. 3, 2006).

50 pages.”⁴ Moreover, the Parties argue that their local franchise authority and municipal members will be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding, and that additional time is needed to ensure that their members are able to provide input for the Parties’ reply comments.

3. We find that there is good cause for a limited extension of time to file reply comments in response to the *NPRM*. Given the voluminous record that exists in this proceeding, we believe that extending the reply comment period to March 28, 2006 is appropriate to afford the Parties and their members, who will be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding and whose opponents have submitted extensive filings, sufficient time to review and reply to such filings. Accordingly, we conclude that a short extension of time is warranted. We therefore extend by two weeks the reply comment deadline in this proceeding to March 28, 2006.

4. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to Sections 4(i), 4(j) and 5(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 154(j) and 155(c), and Sections 0.61, 0.283, and 1.46 of the Commission’s rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.61, 0.283, and 1.46, the date for filing reply comments in MB Docket No. 05-311 is extended to March 28, 2006.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Donna C. Gregg
Chief, Media Bureau

⁴ Motion at 2.