

MM 87-268

From: <Davidtork@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo),FCCMAIL.SMTP("president@whitehouse....
Date: 1/1/96 7:11pm
Subject: Digital TV Format

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECURITY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

12-30-95

I recently read a newspaper article about the TV stations wanting to phase out their current transmission system and replace it with a more efficient digital system. This will make obsolete every television now operating in America. This will cost us \$187 million as TV viewers.

In addition because stations can't send their signals on the same channels, they want the government to give them a second channel free of charge for 15 years. This comes after the cellular and pager industry paid more than \$8 billion for new channels at government auctions.

Now I'm not necessarily against the switch to the digital system, I don't spend a lot of time watching TV, but I think the TV channels should be auctioned just like the pager and cellular channels where. The auction could generate up to \$100 billion, according to the Federal Communication Commission. This money could be applied to the federal budget deficit.

I would appreciate you looking into this matter and insist that the TV stations pay for the use of the "public airwaves" just like other commercial industries.

Sincerely,

David Torkelson

The newspaper article I referred to appeared in the Oceanside North County Times front page on 12-27-95.

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("NCTOpinion@scn.com")

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

1

MM 87-268

From: Eric Kurman <kurman@a.crl.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/31/95 12:31am
Subject: digital TV broadcast transmission

509 Matheson Street
Healdsburg, CA 95448
707-433-7246 email: kurman@a.crl.com

December 30, 1995

Mr. Reed E. Hundt
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20554-0001 email: fccinfo@fcc.gov

Dear Chairman Hundt:

I am writing about licensing proposals for HDTV now under consideration by the Federal Government. I got your email address from a newspaper article produced by Knight-Ridder and published in the Santa Rosa, California Press-Democrat on December 27. From this article I understand that network television broadcasters are asking for dual bandwidth, free of charge, to support transmission of digital HDTV signals in addition to broadcast using analog bandwidth.

The real question to be addressed: is it in the public interest to obsolete essentially every television set in the US, requiring people to buy new sets or set-top boxes? I say no.

Alternately, is this something we should do simply because technology permits us to do it? Again, I don't see a compelling rationale in favor. However, I assume that conversion to digital transmission will inexorably occur. As a result, I support the Clinton Administration proposal to reclaim the old analog channels and re-auction them.

It's not clear to me who benefits from the transition from analog to digital TV broadcast transmission under current proposals. I think that the cost should be borne primarily by those who do benefit and roughly in proportion to what they stand to gain.

Perhaps the greatest potential benefit that I can see would be to *decrease* the overall bandwidth used in television transmission and thereby to create new bandwidth available for public use, for example, mobile telephony.

I don't see how I or other members of the public benefit from the current broadcast network proposal. If the only increase in performance is marginally improved picture quality, it doesn't make sense to spend money on an upgraded set. The quality of programming on broadcast channels is so poor that I cannot see spending the money required to upgrade to digital. I suppose many others are in the same position I am - even if the money is available, I would rather spend it on something else.

If there is improvement of reception in fringe broadcast areas, then this is potentially significant to many people. However, it would seem that this potential improvement would address a group of people who are least economically qualified to take advantage of it. After all, in urban areas, broadcast reception is generally good; in urban areas and in small towns such as mine, most people have cable; in rural areas, many people have satellite reception. Those who don't have the money for cable or satellite rigs will be the least able to pay for upgraded sets or set-top boxes.

In my opinion, broadcasters should certainly pay in some fashion for the ability to use the increased bandwidth. If not in direct fees to the government, then indirectly - for example, by having broadcasters underwrite the production and distribution costs of set-top digital to analog conversion boxes.

Broadcast distribution is fundamentally different from cable distribution in that broadcasters are making use of valuable signal bandwidth. As such, they should pay for the value they receive and they should be held to fairly strict public-service standards.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the future direction of broadcast TV.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

MM 87-268

Sincerely,

Eric Kurman

cc:

Senator Barbara Boxer
112 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510 fax 415-956-6701

Senator Dianne Feinstein
331 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510 fax 202-228-3954

Representative Frank Riggs
1714 Longworth Building
Washington, D.C. 20515 email repringgs@hr.house.gov

Representative Lynn Woolsey
439 Cannon Building
Washington, D.C. 20515 email woolsey@hr.house.gov

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("repringgs@hr.house.gov","woolsey@hr.h...

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Sharon Shipley <Sharon.Shipley@cch.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 7:13pm
Subject: HDTV and public consumer considerations

I read in an article in the Bradenton Herald, a Bradenton, FL, newspaper that proposed changes to television studios would provide high-definition digital programming. The article also went on to say the TV industry is not considering the public opinion in this arena, as the proposed restructuring among TV studios would require every television owner to abandon their TV sets and purchase new, very expensive digital sets.

The newspaper article suggested the public provide information to the FCC, to let them know consumer opinion on this issue.

I looked over the proposed rulemaking regarding digital television, and I have to say it is a two-sided coin. I would not want to stand in the way of new, emerging television, but I am highly concerned over the impending high costs that would face the consumer.

Particular at issue is the high cost of replacing existing TVs with the new ones. I myself have avoided large-screen TVs in part because of cost but also because of other factors--the set being too large for most houses/rooms, price, eyestrain and so forth. I hear that the new digital would demand the consumer buy only top of the line large-sreen TVs. One can get a television now for less than \$200. I would not want the television industry now dictating to me that I have to spend thousands of dollars on a piece of furniture such as a TV. I imagine costs of repairs and other factors are of concern as well.

Will the TVs be compatible with existing VCRs and other equipment hooked up to TVs that we now own, or would we also need to go out and buy all new other equipment?

How does this affect cable TV? Will costs skyrocket there as well? and What about existing programming and videotapes, movie cameras and so forth? The cost of such technology is just now becoming affordable. If digital dictates, all of these things--VCRs, video tapes, CDs, home movie cameras and so forth will suffer a domino effect, since some compatibility here is required to use all these systems together.

I would propose that these issues be considered and that there should be things done up front before digital becomes standardized. Namely, there should be a phase-in period so that people could buy the new digital sets when their old tvs become old and need replacing. The costs of new digital sets should not be prohibitive, and should have more affordable models. Impact studies should be done on safety, such as what impact would these digital large screens have on things like radiation, eye strain, and also look at energy cost factors. Will it not just cost more to buy, but will it cost more to use on a daily basis as well?

Furtermore, will digital tv drive out smaller networks who can't afford to make the change? This then could have certain networks monopolizing the industry.

Finally, another factor no one seems to consider is that the quality of television goes beyond high-resolution pictures that look good; what about the quality of the programming itself?

Will quality decrease because more money is being spent on the flashy stuff that has more eye appeal but nothing behind it? Right now, television quality in programming is at an all time low. I find there is less and less every year worth watching. What makes the TV industry think I want to jump at the chance to pay more for what is essentially less? Dressing up the package in frills is a temporary diversion to the real issue at hand at best; quality needs to be improved. I don't know about other consumers, but I do not want to pay a lot more money to get a clearer program if the program still stinks--over the years I have dropped tv viewing considerably because of the quality, even though there are more programs and channels than ever before.

If the TV industry continues to decline in quality of programming, and then demands that my old set is no good, and I will have to pay a lot of money to get TV reception at all, most likely my response will be to unplug the TV, get rid of the cable, and resort to other forms of entertainment, like watching old videos on my old TV, going to the movies more, or, better yet, reading books.

What is worse, is, it seems the industry has not even decided on a standard. If there will be continuous changes over the years, where TV sets constantly become obsolete and need replacing, things will get worse.

Most consumers thing hard about expensive purchases like video cameras and computers, and share the same sort

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

M

of worries in such purchases that impending digital TV does--should I buy now, or will it become obsolete before I get it home? Television, on the other hand, has been one of those purchases that for most of us has been cheap enough to not think too much about.

The TV breaks, you go get a new one, you plug it in. It has been relatively inexpensive for no-frills TV; Extras came with the nonnecessary stuff like Cable, wide screen, color and so forth. BUT, if you couldn't afford those, you could always get a good old use TV, plut it in the wall, attach rabbit ears, and get some sort of reception. New technology will dicate that is no longer an option. I fear digital

TVs will be sold the way other high-end electronics now are sold, with all the frills that cause the price to be way up high, even if the frills are stuff you dont want and won't use. Take my digital portable wireless telephone, for instance, ...while there are many analog models from 1 cent up, the cheapest digital phone was \$147; the annoying part of that was there are more features I care to mention on the digital. Because I wanted the digital phone service, I had to buy the digital phone that does millions of things...even though I only want the phone to do one--place simple telephone calls. The options are there, even if I never use them. There are no streamlined, scaled down digital phones on the market that are the equivalent of a simple dial out, receive call type like the phones of olden days. Will this be the way with digital TVs? Will they make only a few models that do everything at a high end, forcing the consumer to buy something far beyond the consumer's needs and paycheck?

I hope these things will be considered, or the TV industry may find it is obsolete before it even hits the marketplace. I think consumers will learn to just say no, and that some of the proposed changes at this time, as is, are not feasible or cost effective.

--Sharon Shipley, Bradenton, Florida.

No. of Copies rec'd _____ /
LIST ABCDE

MM87-268

From: <rice@net2.netacc.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 6:58am
Subject: forcing public to buy higher price T. V.

I heard on the News networks that the T.V. stations are not making enough money and they are going to change the transmission signal to a digital system. The story went on to say that Congress is going to accept this new system. This will cost the public over 200 BILLION dollars because the public has to buy a new television 35" or over. Am I correct so far. Please respond. My house is in a quandry.

Richard W.Rice
E-Mail: rice@netacc.net
Web Page: <http://net2.netacc.net/public/red-apple>

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

1

MM 87-268

From: Kyle Dilday <kyled@nando.net>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("fccinfo@fcc.gov.")
Date: 12/27/95 6:27pm
Subject: Comment on digital televisions

I feel that the FCC should never allow such an obvious raping of the consumer. It is unbelievable that our money would go to individuals who would so foolishly agree to such by the TV industry. The TV industry clearly wants to make a bundle of money and I strongly oppose the change to digital systems.

Kyle Dilday
Raleigh, NC

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Kyle Dilday <kyled@nando.net>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("fccinfo@fcc.gov.")
Date: 12/27/95 6:27pm
Subject: Comment on digital televisions

I feel that the FCC should never allow such an obvious raping of the consumer. It is unbelievable that our money would go to individuals who would so foolishly agree to such by the TV industry. The TV industry clearly wants to make a bundle of money and I strongly oppose the change to digital systems.

Kyle Dilday
Raleigh, NC

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Kyle Dilday <kyled@nando.net>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("fccinfo@fcc.gov.")
Date: 12/27/95 6:26pm
Subject: Comment on digital televisions

I feel that the FCC should never allow such an obvious raping of the consumer. It is unbelievable that our money would go to individuals who would so foolishly agree to such by the TV industry. The TV industry clearly wants to make a bundle of money and I strongly oppose the change to digital systems.

Kyle Dilday
Raleigh, NC

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <GA3643@SIUCVMB.SIU.EDU>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 5:48pm
Subject: HDTV

Do not be influenced by the naysayers. The great benefit of HDTV is the increased effective bandwidth, making possible the simultaneous transmission of many more programs. The sharper picture (which may require a 35 in. screen to be noticeable) is a secondary consideration. The \$200 cost of a D to A converter is reasonable, and this figure will come down as demand for the product increases. Let's not keep TV off the information superhighway!

As a bonus, this new technology will create JOBS for skilled American workers!

Walter C. Henneberger
ga3643@siucvmb.siu.edu

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Gary Schepp <71363.2047@compuserve.com>
To: FCC <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 12/27/95 4:42pm
Subject: HDTV & language on airwaves & loud volume

Gary Schepp
1831 Billy Dr
Ft Wayne IN 46818

Sir
Two points of concern.

First, the new HDTV system which will make the current televisions obsolete. I consider any changes to the new system need to be done in a way that allow the consumers to convert to the new televisions without requiring excessive expenses. Many households now have two or more televisions. That would be a burden on those households. Then there is the matter of what happens to those televisions once the conversion takes affect. We have enough of a problem with our landfills without having to consider the mass disposal of the televisions.

Second, the language on the televisions is inappropriate. I am not a right-wing moron conservative or of the Christian "Right". It is inappropriate for the use of some words on the commercial stations. Likewise it is abhorrent for the content on the soap shows that exist today. What is wrong with the women today that watch that trash? I would not want to have anything to do with the women who watch the soaps or the talk shows.

I personally feel that the movies don't need to be using language considered bad for kids. If the movie industry should produce more movies suitable for a wider audience (children). There have been movies that I would let my child watch if the language was cleaned up.

Third, the volume changes on the stations is inexcusable. With today's technology monitoring the volume should be easy to control. Inability as an excuse to implement such technology only indicates stupidity on the part of the industry.

Thank you

Gary

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Joseph Holtzmann <sturm@ohana.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 3:47pm
Subject: HDTV

To whom it may concern:

I read an article in today's newspaper (Honolulu Advertiser, 12/27/95) regarding HDTV and the "billions" it will cost the consumer. The paper carried the story via Knight-Ridder Service and the author is a Frank Greve.

He seems to think that this new technology will require the public to buy a whole new TV set. Nonsense! A converter box could be made to convert digital to analog, and be made fairly cheaply. In addition, cable companies could handle the conversion, offering both analog and digital service, and therefore there would be no need to auction a separate channel to the broadcast companies. I know this means some lost revenue for the federal government, but I think this could be totally off-set in the following way.

Since Digital HDTV is an American innovation, pursued by American companies such as Zenith and AT&T, the FCC could stipulate manufacture of the new hardware domestically, and having a 75% US-made content and final assembly in the USA. The expansion of the tax base via sales and jobs will provide billions in the long run, I am sure. I say to proceed full-speed ahead with Digital HDTV, and keep the industries at home, where it does America the most good.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Holtzmann
1235 Manu-Mele St.
Kailua, HI 96734

Sturm@ohana.com

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: MR WILLIS T BIRD <LZEM12A@prodigy.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 3:16pm
Subject: HDTV

Mr. Reed E. Hundt,
Chairman,
FCC
1919 M St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20554-0001

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Mr. Hundt:

I am writing in regards to the "planned" change-over to HDTV. WHILE I AM SURE THIS WILL BE A MORE PRODUCTIVE AND EFFECIENT SYSTEM, I HAVE A PROBLEM WITH IT. I UNDERSTAND THAT IT WILL MAKE ALL MY TV'S USELESS. I HAVE WORKED FOR YEARS TO BE ABLE TO RETIRE. I GOT MY HOUSE AND CAR PAID FOR SO THAT I COULD RETIRE AND NOT HAVE TO WORRY. MY CHIEF FORM OF ENTERTAINMENT NOW IS FROM TV. I SAVED AND PURCHASED A BIG-SCREEN TV AND MY WIFE PURCHASED A SMALLER, BUT NICE TV FOR THE BEDROOM. WE CANNOT AFFORD TO PURCHASE A WHOLE NEW SYSTEM. NOT ONLY THAT, BUT WE WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO GET ANYTHING FOR THOSE WE NOW HAVE, BUT WHICH WILL BE RENDERED "JUNK" IF I UNDERSTAND THE PROBLEM CORRECTLY. PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THE NEW SYSTEM WITHOUT HAVING THEM SUPPLY SOME METHOD OF ALLOWING THE CURRENT TV'S TO REMAIN USEFUL.

SINCERELY,

WILLIS T. BIRD
502 PEACHTREE ST.
HEADLAND, AL. 3634

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: David Hawkins <hawkins@auscsmp.sps.mot.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 3:31pm
Subject: Charge TV broadcasters for icreased bandwidth

I encourage the FCC to charge TV broadcasting companies for the channels they are requesting to incorporate high-definition TV. As a tax-paying citizen, I do not want to see our public resources given away to a bunch of big-money lobbyists.

David J. Hawkins email:hawkins@auscsmp.sps.mot.com Motorola Inc. VOICE: (512)
934-3412 MOS Digital Analog IC Division FAX: (512) 934-6225 Custom and Special Design
=====

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: CHUCK G@xband.com <U_729127255_19_B@xband.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/27/95 3:05pm
Subject: HDTV IS GREAT

XBAND From: 'CHUCK G' (U_729127255_19_B@xband.com)
XBAND To : "FCCINFO@fcc.gov"
XBAND Subj: "HDTV IS GREAT"
XBAND Date: 1995 12 27 12:05AM PST

Message: Thumbs up to you guys! It about time HDTV became a reality.

-- Sent from the XBAND Video Game Network --*-- info@xband.com

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Franklin Gibson <Sandy_Gibson@msn.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 1:53pm
Subject: \$200 Billion Costs To Consumers: HDTV

I am categorically opposed to what television industry executives are up to with passing on such costs to us consumers. The TV industry does not own the air waves, congressional action and regulation is certainly in order.

I want you to know that this planned effort without investigation, public hearings and congressional oversight smacks of a veiled, greedy attempt by the "Networks" to line their pockets at my expense. I will not support such action, and will bring this to Senator Strom Thurmonds attention.

Signed A Very Concerned Tax Payer and Voter.

Sandy Gibson

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECURITY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: <LBonin8839@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/27/95 1:40pm
Subject: Networks changing to digital

I find that this well hidden approach by the networks to change over to digital and invalidate all televisions is just another approach to fleece the American public.

I would hope that you would investigate this and see that the public has a say in whether they are even interested in this offering, rather than having it rammed down their throats. It seems another way that they networks will try to get the consumer to pay of watching their stations while they continue to collect advertisement dollars. If they think the consumer is going to pay to watch commercialized TV, they better be prepared for a BIG LET DOWN. I will be listening to radio before I pay for a new TV set and then pay to watch commercials. .

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: Simmons <tsimmons@nando.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 1:39pm
Subject: hdtv/digital

To whom it may concern: I have read in newspapers and heard on the radio, news reports re: HDTV and digital television communication signals. My understanding is this: Without a converter costing about \$200 my current TV is pretty much useless. A TV that would take full advantage of the technology would cost \$1,500 or more and need to be 35 inches -- 35 inches?? The broadcasters in return get much more bandwidth and free access to something that cellular phone companies and pager companies must pay for. If this is true, I don't understand where the public is served. I pay more for the same quality picture through a converter or I pay a lot more for a better quality picture that promises no better content. (Does anyone debate content anymore or is that a lost cause?) In the meantime, the gov't passes up the chance to collect millions from broadcasters who obviously benefit from the new technology. What am I missing here?

Sincerely,
Tim Simmons tsimmons@nando.net

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Roberta Piper <robpiper@siu.edu>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/27/95 8:39am
Subject: Digital TV

As someone who resisted having a TV for many years, and then went from rabbit ears to an aerial on the roof and finally to cable, I want to tell you that I think the new move toward better reception is an absolute crock! The reception now is far far better than the quality of the programs. The money which consumers would have to spend (in order to enrich the producers) is incredible! When you think how many people go hungry, it is surely wasteful to put this kind of money into developing and producing a high-end picture. Perhaps it should be done, but very very gradually, with stations required to provide the old kind of reception for many years. Rob Piper 126 Pump House Road, Murphysboro, IL 62966

Roberta Piper

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <Lchornack@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 9:23am
Subject: analog vs digital

I was appalled when I read in todays Bradenton Hearld, that you people were going to give TV stations a 100 billion dollar gift, whereas you auctioned the channels to the pager industry. Were is it written that some pay and some don't? I for one resent your blatant dis-regard for the welfare of the general public. Why should we hand the TV industry this gift, when we are asked to pay more for our Medicare, Medicaid, forgo the progress made in protecting the enviroment, etc. This 100 billion could go along way in balancing the budget.

Also, I resent, for the sake of the industries desire to enhance our TV picture, (ours is next to perfect), having to spend approx. \$1,500 per set to 'up-grade' our picture, or \$200.00 for a little box that will let us continue to view on a analog basis. I not sure that one would not have to purchase one of these boxes per set?

In short, if the (TV industry) wants the change, let them pay for it, including buying me 4 new sets!!!

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <CWCW1@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 9:37am
Subject: digital tv's

Please advise me as to what someone with 9 tv's would have to do with the proposed digitalized tv's. Would I have to go out and buy 9 new tv's? Will there be some type of rebate program from broadcasters or manufacturers for the old tv's? What about large screen tv's that cost thousands of dollars- What do we do with them? Please advise. Thank you.
Craig Weiner

Address : CWCW1@aol.com

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: Eugene Preston <egp@mail.utexas.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 9:57am
Subject: HDTV

A letter to the FCC:

The Austin American Statesman presented HDTV on the front page of it's Dec. 27 paper in a negative tone, talking mostly about cost and implying corporate greed as the driving force. They failed to grasp the simple idea that our existing technology is obsolete and a new technology is now ready for implementation.

The FCC has acted in a very professional manner in the way it has conducted the business of deciding the best HDTV format. I have been following this development for years, mostly in the IEEE Spectrum magazine.

I have a technical concern I need to discuss with you. There is a possibility that HDTV will be much more susceptible to magnetic fields from power lines than conventional tv set designs. There are three reasons for this concern.

- 1) If the vacuum tube screens are made large the electron beam will be deflected more than a smaller tube.
- 2) If the sweep frequency is not exactly 60 Hz the screen will 'wiggle'.
The best monitors use a higher frequency than 60 Hz to get less flicker, so HDTV based on digital circuitry will most certainly want to use a higher refresh rate than 60 Hz, although I understand that the initial designs will be 60 Hz. I am certain that the TV viewers will want higher than 60 Hz refresh rates once they see the difference.
- 3) The very fact that the resolution is higher will allow viewers to see smaller imperfections. I think viewers will 'see' the low level magnetic fields in the 1 to 10 milligauss range and will be upset when their new \$5000 TV doesn't work properly because they have a power line magnetic field.

Our group at the City of Austin Electric Utility performs magnetic field measurements for the public and for businesses. We have encountered numerous instances of EMI in which computer monitors have experienced all the above things described above. Has the FCC given thought to this problem. If so, where is the discussion documented? We could be of assistance to the FCC in testing products if you are interested.

Sincerely,
Gene Preston, Manager System Analysis
City of Austin Electric Utility Department
Preston@electric.austin.tx.us egp@mail.utexas.edu

"He who gives up liberty for security ends up with neither."
...Benjamin Franklin

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECURITY

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("Hough@electric.austin.tx.us","Clarkj...)

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: MR JACK B HANKS <NWKX77A@prodigy.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 10:02am
Subject: Hi-def TV

I can't believe that the FCC might allow the pressure from the networks to push them into offering High Definition TV in a way that would obsolete millions of TV sets currently owned by viewers. The practical benefit of HD TV is so limited that only the networks would benefit in their fight to preserve exposure. Analog broadcast is certainly acceptable and it certainly preserves the right of the viewer to access without tremendous additional costs!

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <HDAUSTX@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 10:53am
Subject: HDTV

Mr. Hundt:

I read of the networks' proposal to switch to HDTV in the newspaper today and was appalled. In answering your rhetorical question, "Does the audience want to go on this journey?", I would say, "Absolutely not!" I have no aversion to progress, but I do object to the way the networks propose to jam it down our throats. Should they succeed with this shameful plan, I and my family will discontinue our relationship with network television and find other more rewarding pursuits. I would encourage you to do whatever you can to prevent this scandalous conspiracy from coming to fruition. Thank you.

Harry Downing
5910 Blanco River Pass
Austin, Tx. 78749

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE