

MM 87-268

**From:** BROCK SLABACH <slarock@mci.newscorp.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/27/95 11:47am  
**Subject:** HDTV and Public Policy

First, let me state that I view kindly the advancement of technology and look favorably upon the rapid proliferation of such into the broad market of American consumers. However, I am equally concerned over the power of network Broadcasters and their ability to manipulate the system to obtain unfair advantages in the advent of HDTV.

I could afford to obtain an expensive HDTV set, yet how would millions of Americans acquire this technology without undue hardship? It would be appropriate for networks and their local affiliates to provide the analog converter sets (approximately \$200.00) to low and fixed-income consumers at no cost in exchange for "free" use of the airwave that carries the HDTV signal.

I am VERY concerned about allowing the networks 15 years of "free" use of the HDTV airwaves. This seems odd in that cellular vendors have to pay high sums of money through an auction to obtain the "rights" to their associated air space. It seems that some compromise (such as what I mentioned in the previous paragraph) would be a good solution.

Whatever happens, please do not remain captive to the special interests of the network Broadcasters. Obtain a balanced approach that takes into account testimony from multiple sources, including consumers that will have to ultimately pay for this advance of technology.

Thank you for this opportunity to share my comments regarding this important topic.  
Brock Slabach

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM87-268

**From:** Ross, Mike <mross@msoil.mason.k12.ky.us>  
**To:** FCC <FCCINFO@FCC.GOV>  
**Date:** 12/27/95 11:51am  
**Subject:** Digital Television

Dear Mr. Hundt:

I just finished reading an article concerning the broadcast industry's desire to switch to analog transmission for their personal gain. I think this is a terrible insult to the the public. This is not a question of need or money. It is a question of making more money for an industry on the backs of common people.

I urge you and the FCC to reject this proposed switch

Michael H. Ross

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_ /  
List ABCDE

---

MM 87-268

**From:** <GJones3248@aol.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/27/95 12:02pm  
**Subject:** digital tv

Who is representing the average citizen? Going to this new system is a license to steal.  
SHAME ON YOU!

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

---

RECEIVED

MW 87-268

**From:** <GBodwell@aol.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/27/95 12:43pm  
**Subject:** HDTV channel allocation

JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Chairman Hundt:

I read with concern an article in the local news stating that the networks are asking for free allocation of spectrum space for their introduction of HDTV. How can a valuable, publicly owned resource be just given to a commercial enterprise in these days of tight federal budgets? With all of the talk of balanced budgets and reduction of services across the board, how can a governmental agency even consider giving away a resource that other commercial enterprises pay for? I think that if the networks want to experiment with a new standard for broadcast they should support the venture with their own resources completely especially since this will also require that all of us consumers will have to reinvest in new equipment to even view their new broadcasts. The quality of programming is not high enough in my opinion to warrant the expense of new receivers. The viewership of network television is going to suffer. Low income families will be excluded from the new standard at least initially until the prices come down.

Families that have several TV sets will face replacement of several sets and possibly VCRs.

Schools that have a large investment in technology based instructional materials will be faced with the decision of maintaining compatibility with current broadcast standards. The television screen is small enough that the improvement in picture quality provided with

HDTV has marginal value. Please reconsider allocating channel space to the commercial networks at no cost. This experiment should not be provided for free when other potential users of the space are willing to pay for it.

Thank you for considering this opinion.  
Grant Bodwell, Teacher  
Sonoma Valley Unified School District  
Sonoma, California

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

**From:** Peter C. Reilly <preilly@skn.net>  
**To:** 'FCC' <fccinfo@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 12/27/95 1:04pm  
**Subject:** Digital or HDTV

I read with interest this morning in the Lexington Herald-Leader regarding the FCC's proposal for digital TV.=20

I think that digital TV is the wave of the future. However I am concerned about the transition. As an owner of an analog TV I like the idea of providing parallel channels to Broadcasters so people would have a reasonable transition. However, it doesn't seem right that the Broadcasters could reap benefits from broadcasting on the parallel channel when they are not broadcasting digitally.

As a taxpayer, I would prefer that the Broadcasters either provide better public service or pay a fee to the government for the second channel when they are getting to use it for additional service.

This is a complicated issue and I would appreciate knowing your opinions on this matter.

Sincerely,

Peter Reilly

318 Jackson Street  
Berea, KY 40403-1720

Voice: (606) 986-9773 or 9840  
Fax: (606) 986-9722

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE  
\_\_\_\_\_

MM 87-268

**From:** Crookshanks, W Scot <crookshw@TWB68OG.Eglin.AF.Mil>  
**To:** 'FCC' <fccinfo@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 12/28/95 7:52am  
**Subject:** HDTV changes

Sirs,

I am completely content with the quality of the current TV system. I am not interested in paying for additional quality, or having to purchase a \$200 box to convert the new signals back to analog so my 2 existing TVs can use them, or buy new TVs.

The networks are mistaken if they think the reason we are not watching their shows is because of the quality of the signal. They are lacking in the quality of their shows!

Please watch out for the consumers and DON'T allow HDTV to be the only method of receiving TV broadcasting.

W. Scot Crookshanks

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

1

MM 87-268

**From:** <scremf@ptialaska.net>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 3:15am  
**Subject:** Proposed digital transmission systems for television

Chairman Hundt,

I for one am alarmed at the thought of taxpayers footing the bill for the proposed change from analog to digital television broadcasts. I certainly don't feel the people of America will benefit in any way from this move. A move to digital television, at this time would make virtually every television set in America obsolete! Even if new TV channels were auctioned off, the revenues to the US treasury, would be less than half of what the consumers cost would be for upgrading their present television systems. Let ABC, NBC, and CBS, pay for their own upgrades if they desire them, not the American public.

Regards,  
Frank Gwin  
2090 Glacier Hwy.  
Juneau AK 99801  
E-Mail scremf@ptialaska.net

RECEIVED  
JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
OFFICE OF SECURITY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

**From:** MR EDWIN L EASLEY <FDGA07A@prodigy.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 2:42am  
**Subject:** proposal on HDTV

I was reading a article on the proposals by the broadcast networks on HDTV. I find I'm opposed to what they want if the article is correct about making current sets non compatible. I feel that if as the article states if the difference is not noticeable on small than 35" screen whats the point. If theres to be HDTV it should be either on its own separate band like AM/FM are or wait till it can be made compatible like when color TV was introduced. Making millions of TV sets obsolete at the cost of billions of dollars is totally wrong. It doesn't even cover the non-broadcast issues of videotapes, video games and other uses that are run thru TV sets. If it is inevitable to have HDTV and so as not to condemn existing equipment. Requirements like were imposed in the 50's by the all-channel act to require all sets to be able to receive both VHF and UHF a new act requiring new sets after such and such a date be able to receive both HDTV and analog. In the past the FCC thru consumer friendly rules like this kept both UHF and FM radio from extinction, being accessible only to the richer population, or being dumped as non profitable requiring wholesale change of peoples habits.

Sincerely

Larry Easley

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 87-268

**From:** MR EDWIN L EASLEY <FDGA07A@prodigy.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 2:41am  
**Subject:** proposal on HDTV

I was reading a article on the proposals by the broadcast networks on HDTV. I find I'm opposed to what they want if the article is correct about making current sets non compatible. I feel that if as the article states if the difference is not noticeable on small than 35" screen whats the point. If theres to be HDTV it should be either on its own separate band like AM/FM are or wait till it can be made compatible like when color TV was introduced. Making millions of TV sets obsolete at the cost of billions of dollars is totally wrong. It doesn't even cover the non-broadcast issues of videotapes, video games and other uses that are run thru TV sets. If it is inevitable to have HDTV and so as not to condemn existing equipment. Requirements like were imposed in the 50's by the all-channel act to require all sets to be able to receive both VHF and UHF a new act requiring new sets after such and such a date be able to receive both HDTV and analog. In the past the FCC thru consumer friendly rules like this kept both UHF and FM radio from extinction, being accessible only to the richer population, or being dumped as non profitable requiring wholesale change of peoples habits.

Sincerely

Larry Easley

RECEIVED  
JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

**From:** MR RICHARD D MCSWEENEY <GHFP93A@prodigy.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 1:40am  
**Subject:** TV Rape of US citizens

I saw an article in the local news that really upset me. Seems like the analog TV is out and the digital in and the consumer has to pay the bill. Well nuts to that - who's making a profit on the new system. Who elected the officials that represent "supposedly them". I rest my case. If the congress decides to vote for the TV special interests - every dipstick that votes for the special interests will be out there on the Internet as a traitor to his constituents. You can bank on it. If it's a commercial enterprise - and others have to buy a license or time on the airwaves then all should be treated the same way. There is no alternative. Thanks for your interest. Dick

RECEIVED  
JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 87-268

**From:** Frank DiMauro <fadim@med.unc.edu>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 12:00pm  
**Subject:** Brodacst legislation

To: Reed E. Hundt

Just read an article about the propsed legislation which would grant broadcast license holders the right to free access of broadcast wavelengths. This is not right. To exempt TV station owners from auctions just exacerbates the greatest gov't resource giveaway of the century, and the airwaves are a resource which belong to all of us taxpayers. To broadcast is a privilege which these corporations exploit mostly for the interest of their owners and shareholders and less and less for the public interest.

As for HDTV, the FCC should worry more about the quality of the LINES OF DIALOGUE than the number of LINES OF RESOLUTION. As long as the content of most programming devolves to the lowest common denominator of viewership intelligence, the improvement in reception quality will not further the public interest. In fact we all know who will benefit most from this technology upgrade... high-tech corporations intent on capitalizing on a massive scale the shift to a totally digital electronic environment.

Meanwhile, where will most of this technology come from? Certainly not the US of A. Offshore electronic firms are already gearing up for this anticipated gold rush in digital upgrades. Not everybody operates a computer but by golly, everybody in America knows how to turn on a TV set. The potential windfall is mind-boggling. If this can create employment here, maybe it's not a bad idea. But let's face it, we all know the off-shore companies are more prepared to handle these orders than we are, so as far as employment is concerned, the best we can hope for is increased retail sales, increased service employment in areas of cabling and transmission requirements. Manufacturing output will increase only insignificantly. Please consider all of this when meeting with legislators.

Thanks for hearing me out.  
Signed a concerned media watcher/voter frank DiMauro  
Chapel Hill NC

RECEIVED  
JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

**From:** Jo Dolan <74264.2633@compuserve.com>  
**To:** FCC <fccinfo@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 12/28/95 10:30am  
**Subject:** Digital TV

Dear Sir: I am very opposed to the FCC's plan to convert from analog TV to digital TV. As a member of the general public, I will gain nothing from this change. Since I use a regular size TV, my picture will not be improved. This change will force me and millions of other Americans to buy new Japanese TVs further damangeing the trade balance and taking money from my buget that I could spend here in the US. It will also cost the US government billions in lost revenue from the sale of airwaves. This money could go for deficit reduction. If you have the best interest of the American people at heart, you will do what you can to stop this waste of money. Sincerely, Jo Dolan

RECEIVED  
JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 87-268

**From:** <ACCORD2@aol.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 10:15am  
**Subject:** digital tv conversion

if the press is accurate in their descriptions of the effects of digital transmission, i.e., most tv sets will be unable to pick up the signal, i say lets consider some type of gradual conversion to this innovation. it is an outrage to imagine that the fat-cats can foist this on a very unsuspecting public, and with the gov'ts. blessing? no way man. and people wonder why their is distrust of both government and industry. what a classical example of top-level arrogance. i will be contacting my reps in washington to voice my opinion on this. thank you.

RECEIVED  
JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

---

MM 87-268

**From:** Bob Huddleston <74632.772@compuserve.com>  
**To:** Mr. Reed Hundt <fccinfo@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 12/28/95 10:02am  
**Subject:** The Proposed HDTV Television System

Mr. Reed Hundt  
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission

The Wichita Eagle (Wichita, Kansas) on December 27, 1995, contained an article concerning the future of television broadcasting in the United States. While this article did cover some advantages of digital broadcasting, mainly the ability to transmit HDTV, there appears to be some disadvantages to the new digital system as it is being proposed.

First, there is the fact that unless the television, itself, is 35 inches or larger there will be no improvement in the picture quality over the present system. Wow, a 35-inch television. In my home, I only have two televisions and neither one even comes close to 35 inches. I guess I could purchase one but in reality I have no desire to purchase either a big tube or big screen television.

I believe that are many other households in the U.S. that have the same problem that I have (no desire for large televisions in my home).

And yet, knowing tha many homes have televisions smaller than 35 inches, broadcaster are willing to make all current televisions obsolete. Obsolete does not seem to be the correct word here because "obsolete" implies that while the television is old it is still usable and in the case all current televisions would be unusable unless the sets are modified.

Next we have the taxpayers footing the bill. Not directly of course, but in a round-about-way so that most people will not even realize what is happening.

Not only does everyone have to purchase new televisions, but they must all allow the broadcasters use the airways free of charge. How come the cellular phone companies are expected to pay for their use of the airways while the television broadcasters think their channels should be free?

Why does everything about the this new television system seem to be skewed in favor of the broadcasters? It would seem that the broadcasting industry has sole control over the future (or at least that is what they appear to want and are getting). They even have control over the information concerning the new system so that they can ensure that negatives are not discussed on their news programs.

I realize that our present television system is old and outdated. I also realize that that it will require the consumer to pay a price to get the system updated. However, the price should not be determined solely by the broadcasting industry. And the broadcasting industry should pay its share of the cost without the taxpayers picking up additional cost either directly or indirectly.

Robert E. Huddleston  
130 S. Greenwich #146  
Wichita, KS 67207

RECEIVED  
JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 87-268

**From:** Daniel J. Borgos <Daniel.J.Borgos-1@tc.umn.edu>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 8:17pm  
**Subject:** Television networks and free spectrum

Dear Mr. Hundt:

The major television networks have repeatedly betrayed their public trust by such things as putting nothing but filth on the air during prime time, running ads on R $\ddot{1}$  rated films during sports events watched by children, and generally offering up programming that glorifies violence and dysfunctional families.

Now they want free use of more of the frequency spectrum, and with it the freedom to obsolete our television hardware and force us to buy into HDTV.

Well most of us do not want digital television, and especially not at the prices being discussed. And we do not think the network bandits and violence peddlers should get more spectrum for free. They should pay dearly for it, as others have recently.

The networks are not looking out for the public interest, but only their already obscene profits. I urge you to insure they do not benefit at the expense of the public. Make them pay for their spectrum, and also reconsider this HDTV fiasco they are about to force on all of us.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Borgos  
425 Dudley Avenue  
St Paul MN 55126-2305 email: borg0061@maroon.tc.umn.edu

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

**From:** <Charlotte\_Harris@shsl.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 4:19pm  
**Subject:** Keep Analog

I am against switching to digital televisions. It is not fair to force the consumer to make television buys when we won't see a difference in quality unless we buy a really expensive t.v.

The only good thing that could come out of switching to digital televisions would be that people would give up watching t.v.

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM87-268

**From:** Dick McCandless <70077.2631@compuserve.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 3:32pm  
**Subject:** High definition TV

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the request of the TV broadcasters to receive free channels in order to provide TV quality which will cost consumers a good deal of money. Generally speaking, I suggest that, since every other player in telecommunications has to pay, so should they. Broadcasters certainly have not been so devoted to the public welfare that they deserve a "free ride." In addition, I am a TV user who will be a senior citizen by the time HDTV is implemented and I'm sure our family income will prohibit a very costly new TV. At best, we'll buy an attachment which will allow us to see what we have now; we'll have to pay just to keep what we currently have, and that is unacceptable to begin with. So, if public comment is helpful, mine is to make the broadcasters pay; they certainly don't deserve special consideration. Thank you. R. W. McCandless, PO Box 753, Parsons, KS 67357 (700077.2631@CompuServe.com)

RECEIVED  
JAN 19 1996  
RECEIVED  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 87-268

**From:** <EJR@bsys.jeane-thorne.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(FCCINFO)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 3:26pm  
**Subject:** DIGITAL TELEVISION AND THE AUCTION OF FREQUENCIES

TO: Reed Hunt, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission  
From: Joe Radaich, 5625 Xerxes Ave So, #112, Minneapolis, MN 55410  
(612)925-8699

Mr. Hunt:

I think it is unfair that major television broadcasters are trying to get free access to new broadcast frequencies when somany other businesses have to pay top dollar in federal auctions when they want broadcast frequencies.

This is a "business welfare" at its worst.

Also, it promises to place an unfair burden on consumers when they are forced to upgrade their current tv sets. These new frequencies should be auctioned publicly. This will stop every broadcaster from rushing to the new "free" channels which they must do or be left behind.

If a "paying" system is implemented, it will cause many broadcasters to stay with their analog equipment, thereby creating a dual analog/digital system which will allow consumers to choose which system they want, much as tv viewers can choose between broadcast, cable, and sattelite direct tv today.

Above all, it would be unfair to give away new broadcast frequencies to businesses.

Thank you for your time.

Joe Radaich

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
OFFICE OF SECURITY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

**From:** R.J Thomas <richard\_thomas@ncsu.edu>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 2:26pm  
**Subject:** HDTV

Gentlemen:

If the information presented by Frank Greve of Knight-Ridder News Service is correct, I am greatly disturbed by the National Association of Broadcasters recent actions advocating HDTV. To promote a system of broadcasting that would not only render obsolete the 220 or so millions of televisions currently in use, but require a purchase of a TV 35 inches or larger does not do the consumer any favor. Try placing a 35 inch TV in a 12 X 14 foot or smaller room. Also consider the price of \$1500, or more, for a TV capable of receiving digital signals. The alternative, the purchase of a \$200 converter that would permit analog TV's to receive HDTV with no better picture quality than currently available is a consumer ripoff.

If the TV industry wishes to pursue HDTV, then they must do it on their own and without the Government granting them, an additional 6 megahertz of additional channel space free of charge for 15 or more years. Let them compete with the other users of air space and pay a fair price and broadcast in both systems. If this method means HDTV will not reach the marketplace, then the consumer has spoken and indicated that the improved picture and sound quality are not worth the price. I suspect that without the free channels, the TV broadcasters will not proceed as they will consider the risk to great, given the high expenditures required of the consumer. A government subsidy to bring about HDTV is not in the best interest of the public.

Richard J. Thomas  
913 Warren Avenue  
Cary, NC 27511

Telephone 919/467-6693  
E-Mail - richard\_thomas@ncsu.edu

**JAN 19 1996**  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
OFFICE OF SECURITY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <Brogmus@aol.com>  
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)  
Date: 12/28/95 1:58pm  
Subject: HDTV

RECEIVED  
JAN 19 1996  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

--PART.BOUNDARY.0.6572.emout04.mail.aol.com.820177118  
Content-ID: <0\_6572\_820177118@emout04.mail.aol.com.29954>  
Content-type: text/plain

Comments on Allocations to Commercial Broadcasters for HDTV Implimentation

As you consider regulatory issues affecting commercial television's transition to HDTV, I urge you to consider the following points:

--PART.BOUNDARY.0.6572.emout04.mail.aol.com.820177118  
Content-ID: <0\_6572\_820177118@emout04.mail.aol.com.29955>  
Content-type: text/plain;  
name="FCC1.TXT"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

1. Frequency allocations in the VHF and UHF regions of the spectrum clearly have significant monetary value. I believe it is contrary to the public interest to allow established commercial interests, i.e. television broadcasters, to use this resource free, simply to enhance or upgrade their technology. It is obvious from its content that broadcast television is, above all else, entertainment presented for profit. I believe it is totally inappropriate for the FCC, as trustee of the public interest, to subsidize this industry. Indeed, other industries competing for spectrum, e.g. cellular telephone services, clearly have a much more direct impact on the health and safety of the American people than do television broadcasters.

=0D

2. HDTV does not enable television broadcasters to provide any programming that they do not already offer. It represents a change that is strictly cosmetic.

=0D

3. I believe HDTV may have potential benefit to the public interest, in that digital broadcast technologies may pave the way for future methods of reducing bandwidth of broadcast signals, or perhaps for multiplexing such signals on common channels. The FCC has the ability to create incentives for developing such technology, by requiring payment of the spectrum's "fair market value" from all commercial users.

=0D

4. Above all else, please do not confuse the desires of the industry with either the desires or the best interests of the American people. Industry certainly sees vast profit in rendering every television set in America obsolete, and in being able to do that as cheaply as possible. I believe this only underscores the need for broadcasters and manufacturers to enter this arena on their own, without preferential treatment by government, and without special financial considerations.

=0D

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

=0D

James A. Brogmus  
West St. Paul, Minnesota

=0D

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

--PART.BOUNDARY.0.6572.emout04.mail.aol.com.820177118--

MM 87-268

**From:** <ROKOSZ@WSUHUB.UC.TWSU.EDU>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 1:18pm  
**Subject:** HDTV

Mr. Hundt,

If what I am reading about the consumer cost for HDTV reception is true, I am dead set against it. Who can afford such a thing? I have four TVs hooked up to cable in my house. We would go bankrupt just to get, in essence, the same thing we already get. The picture quality we get now is fine. Kill this whole idea if you can.

Frank Rokosz  
4200 Charron Ln.  
Wichita, KS 67220  
316-686-8310

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

**From:** <Whitehawk3@aol.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 1:01pm  
**Subject:** HDTV

I just wanted to express my opinion regarding HDTV. The idea to change things so that all Americans will have to but new t.v. sets to receive the new form of transmission will not fly in the face of the American people.

There are thousands who will not be able to afford the new sets. Are some sitting so high on their thrones that they have forgot those who live at the bottom? Thanks for reading my opinion.

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE

MM87-268

**From:** Larry J. Frederick <larryjfr@innovation.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/28/95 12:48pm  
**Subject:** Digital TV's costly future

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Mr. Reed E. Hundt, Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission

Mr. Reed,

I guess I do not understand how the "return on investment" is beneficial to the individual consumer like myself. From everything I've read on this debate, from the network pressure to the free channels to the joint solution and to the competitors seeing red... it's seems to me that this is a one way street... all in favor of the broadcasters.

Don't get me wrong... I am in favor of progress and I am in favor of better communications, yet I'm always curious of the economic advertising communications powerhouses crying about needing free channels when they haven't lived up to their end of the bargain in the first place. And why 15 years of free channels?

Why should each American pay an average of \$383.00 of our pockets to fund this changeover to digital, plus an average of \$1500 for a new digital TV?  
Plus have the broadcasters additionally charge us monthly rates to get their digital programs... which translates into nothing for free to the American consumer!

The broadcasters have yet to live up to their promise of providing educational programming and positive family style entertainment for American families. What makes you think they will start now to do it? Without regulation and enforcement from the FCC, programming will continue on as it has in the past.

If what you're saying is true... then broadcasters want me to buy a new digital TV for \$1500.00 and they want use of a second channel for 15 years for free. Is this really true? Let me get this right... they want use of the potential \$100 billion value of the second channel for free? And on top of that they want me the American consumer, to change from analog to digital TV, pay more money to them before, during, and after the transition takes place. Mr. Reed... what's wrong with this picture?

One of the major problems I have with this entire scenario is this: I have been involved with fundraising for several years now and it takes an act of Congress to get any of the networks to even look at what we are doing... you need to have an "insider's guide to the publicity game players" and then nothing happens unless you have an inside track with someone in the broadcasters inner circle. In all fairness, one local network who is affiliated with NBC has been very supportive.

Mr. Reed, what is now and always has been America's most important national treasure?

I think it is the American people and the American consumer and it seems to me that this could be just another example of a well-connected industry trying to exploit public domain in the name of progress and new business opportunities at the expense of the individual American consumer.

Or... it also could be another example of American entrepreneurship at it's finest. Therefore it is up to elected government officials to help the American consumer find a happy middle ground between encouraging American business and protecting the American consumer who ultimately will pay the total price of progress.

Thank you for allowing me to respond, and I hope to meet you in Washington D.C. next July 30, 1996.

Larry Frederick  
2147 Alejandro Drive  
Santa Rosa, Calif.95405  
707-579-3555

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

1

MM 87-268  
RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

**From:** Michael A. Peterson <mpeter@win.bright.net>  
**To:** Reed Hundt <fccinfo@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 12/28/95 12:05pm  
**Subject:** digital airwave space

A recent news article regarding giving free digital airwave space to TV broadcasters prompted this letter. My opinion is that it is not fair to those in the cellular industry, and others, who have paid billions of dollars for such access. Preferential treatment of this nature by the government is not fair in any industry. The playing field should be as level as possible. Please see to it that this does not occur. Thank you.

My mailing address is: Michael A. Peterson  
PO Box 94  
Frederic, WI 54837  
Michael A. Peterson

No. of Copies rec'd 1  
List ABCDE \_\_\_\_\_

MM 87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

**From:** <Mimsically@aol.com>  
**To:** A4.A4(fccinfo)  
**Date:** 12/30/95 12:00am  
**Subject:** Digital TV

As a consumer that already feels pushed to the technological edge in "trying to keep up," I voice my opposition to broadcasters being allowed to change to digital TV broadcasting. It is unjust to consumers to force us to purchase new TV's for an improvement that, at best, would be seen only on digital units 35" or larger screens. Our home TV recently went out and we bought a new one. We purchased one for our son for Christmas. To force these, along with the ones owned by millions of others, to be immediately obsolete is not only unfair, it cannot be healthy for our economy to add so much debt to the populous.

I am also opposed to giving broadcasters extra and free privileges that other communication entities must pay for. Please do not put undue burdens on us brought on by money-hungry tyrants.

Sincerely,

Herbert E. Mims  
2709 Fierro  
El Paso, TX 79935-1903

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List ABCDE