Ms. Dana Mancuso
506 Mumford Dr.
Urbana IL 61801

December 11, 2006

Dear FCC Commissioners:

I strongly urge you when taking action on MB 05-311 to consider that going forward with the rules as proposed will result in a very NEGATIVE impact on public discourse, public access and availability of certain types of media to entire segments of the public. This goes against the FCC's overriding mission to provide high-quality services at reasonable cost to EVERYONE in the U.S. on a nondiscriminatory basis.

I believe that electronic communication has become ESSENTIAL to the way we live as 21st century Americans. Telecommunications firms should continue follow rules established by the FCC many years ago that ensure access to everyone. Just because technology changes, it does not mean that those technologies can be selectively offered. The "no build out" requirement set out in the proposed rules means that anyone choosing to create new construction in certain areas not currently developed will have fewer choices, or even no service, when it comes to many telecommunications services. I cannot imagine that this sets a good precedent.

Arbitrarily assessing a flat franchise fee without the ability to EXCEED it if requested by the local citizens will be detrimental to those communities with existing franchise agreements with higher rates. In Urbana, Illinois we have a negotiated rate of 7%. If a 5% flat fee were implemented, we'd lose much of our PEG budget and be less able to offer public access services and programming on the local PEG channel.

And, most importantly, why would the FCC give the ability to anyone to go ahead with any proposed contract if it was not resolved within 90 days? Would you approve this for any other area of telecommunications? Would the FCC approve a rule that allowed media company A to go ahead and buy out media company B if a deal was not reached within 90 days? No. This is purely a way for telecommunications firms to sidestep negotiating a fair deal by going in the back door when things move too slowly for their liking. If one allows this ridiculous measure to go forward, I suggest **the FCC add language to the rules that states any municipality has a 90 day window to CANCEL its contract if not satisfied with the terms or service.** Many types of contracts give you an out window (mortgage loans, cell phone contracts), why should contracts of this magnitude not have one?

Overall, these three proposed changes to the video franchise rules are for the benefit of the telecommunications companies. Again, I urge you to NOT agree to them. They limit access, limit funding to local PEG channels and create situations in which municipalities must rush to agree to terms or be hit over the head with whatever contract the telecommunications company is offering.

NONE of these proposed rule changes helps provide equal access to everyone. I urge you **not** to move them forward.

Sincerely,
Dana Mancuso