**DA 16-70**

**Released: January 20, 2016**

Charles R. Meeker

5377 Dry Creek Road

Healdsburg, CA 95448

Re: KRET-CD, Cathedral City, CA

Facility ID: 10536

FRN: 0006199038

Dear Licensee:

This letter is in reference to the license renewal application for KRET-CD, Cathedral City, CA (“Station”), which is licensed to Charles R. Meeker (“Licensee”). We hereby admonish the Licensee for its violation of Section 73.3526(b)(2) of the Commission’s rules (“Rules”).[[1]](#footnote-1)

Section 73.3526 of the Rules requires each commercial broadcast licensee to maintain a public inspection file containing specific types of information related to station operations.[[2]](#footnote-2) In particular, Section 73.3526(e)(11)(ii) of the Rules requires each commercial television broadcast station to place in its public inspection file records sufficient to allow substantiation of the licensee's certification, in its renewal application, of its compliance with the children's television commercial limits imposed by Section 73.670 of the Rules (“commercial limits certification”).[[3]](#footnote-3) A station’s commercial limits certification must be placed in its public inspection file on a quarterly basis by the tenth day of the succeeding calendar quarter.[[4]](#footnote-4) In 2012, the Commission adopted Section 73.3526(b)(2) of the Rules requiring licensees to upload elements of stations’ public files to an online Commission hosted website (*i.e.,* a Station’s “e-pif”).[[5]](#footnote-5) This requirement included uploading copies of a station’s quarterly commercial limits certification.[[6]](#footnote-6) Broadcasters’ e-pif requirements were phased in between August 2012 and February 2013.[[7]](#footnote-7)

On August 1, 2014, the Licensee filed its license renewal application (FCC Form 303-S) for the Station.[[8]](#footnote-8) A staff inspection of the Station’s e-pif revealed that the Licensee did not comply with Section 73.3526(b)(2) of the Rules by failing to upload copies of its quarterly commercial limit certifications for the entire license term.[[9]](#footnote-9) Following a request by staff, the Licensee promptly uploaded all missing commercial limit certifications to the Station’s e-pif. On January 11, 2016, the Licensee amended its license renewal application and certified that while it did not upload copies of its commercial limit certifications to the Station’s e-pif in a timely manner, the documents were prepared and placed in the station’s physical local public inspection file on-time and were available to the public for inspection.[[10]](#footnote-10)

While these late filings constitute a violation of Section 73.3526(b)(2) of the Rules, we have determined that an admonition is appropriate at this time.[[11]](#footnote-11) Therefore, based upon the facts and circumstances before us, we **ADMONISH** the Licensee for its violation of Section 73.3526(b)(2) of the Rules. We do not rule out more severe sanctions for similar violations of this nature in the future. We also remind the Licensee that the Commission expects all television licensees to comply with the Commission’s public inspection file rules, including the requirement to upload certain public file documents to a Station’s e-pif in a timely manner.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that, a copy of this Letter shall be sent by First Class and Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested to the licensee at the address listed above.

 Sincerely,

 Barbara A. Kreisman

 Chief, Video Division

 Media Bureau

Cc:

James Primm, Esq.

James Primm Attorney at Law

P.O. Box 547

Arroyo Grande, CA 93421
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