MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Megan C. Wheeler <102425.3064@compuserve.com>
To: Mr. Hundt, Chairman, FCC <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 12/30/95 12:00am
Subject: Digital TV and HDTV

Subject: Digital TV and HDTV

Chairman Hundt,

I recently read a Knight-Ridder newspaper article regarding changes beingproposed by the owners of the major broadcast networks in the area of digital TV and HDTV. This article stated that the changes proposed by the networks would force TV owners to purchase either a new TV set to receive the broadcast, or an adapter which would change the broadcast back to analog so their current TV set could handle it. The article also stated that the networks are requesting free access to channels for the digital broadcasts for 15 years.

First of all, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. Of course there may be those out there who want this type of technology and can afford to pay for it, but they are the minority. The vast majority of us out here in techno-shock land are still adjusting to 100 or 150 cable channels and the fact that we are paying for "pay" channels who also subject us to commercials, for which they get more money.

Secondly, the request for free access to channels by the networks makes it sound like they are providing a public service, when in reality they are forcing me to go out and spend more money to see the evening news. Maybe if they were a more responsible group who was willing to accept the onus of their effect on the public in general (i.e. dodging the violence in TV issue and other areas of public irresponsibility) I would be more willing to see their efforts to drag us into the next generation of TV more kindly. But the gall of these requests can only be explained, in my mind, by their assumption that the general public would not be aware of it.

Anyway, I would request that you would consider my views before making any decisions in this matter. I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes as they stand at this time. I am not against progress, but let's not do in on the backs of the average citizen who cannot afford to have his TV made obsolete by the stroke of a pen. Let's do this gradually and let's have those who will benefit by it (i.e. those pushing for it) pay for it.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Megan Wheeler
Phillipsburg, NJ

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Grant Delphey <74217.2442@compuserve.com>
To: FCC <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 12/29/95 5:28pm
Subject: HDTV spectrum giveaway

Dear Mr. Hundt--

I've been following this recent story about the TV
Broadcaster's getting essentially a 15-year free ride for extra spectrum to be used for HDTV--or whatever.

A recent article by Frank Greve or Knight-Ridder has prompted me to finally write a quick note of concern about this egregious form of corporate welfare.

My feeling is that the extra spectrum should be auctioned off to the highest bidder--yearly. The broadcast industry would be free to do anything they want with this spectrum. If they want to do HDTV, fine. If they want to do cellar telephone, fine.

Please, please do not give this valuable resource away for nothing!! Let them have it, just make them pay!!

Regards--
Grant Delphey
328 Lochside Drive
Cary, NC 27511
74217.2442@compuserve.com

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 07-268

JAN 19 1996
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Roger Petersen <roger@redline.sr.hp.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/29/95 5:17pm
Subject: HDTV comments

Hello FCC,

My comments on HDTV:

Demand:

1. I want it. Now.

2. You should take a survey, to determine what US citizens want.
   (You should have some facts to back up your decisions.)

3. It MUST be compatible with Computers! NO INTERLACED SCANNING!
   (Please DON'T make HDTV out-dated at its introduction.)

Handling the conversion:

4. Most people buy new TV sets every 5-15 years.
   (You should have statistics on this! What are they?)

5. Asking citizens to pay $200 (min) to $1000 in the next 5-15 years
   shouldn't be too harsh.

6. How much could it possibly cost to keep 4 old analog channels
   around for 10-20 years, for those with old TVs?
   Provide only ABC, CBS, NBC, Fox on these old channels.

Sincerely,

Roger Petersen
Santa Rosa, CA

CC: Roger Petersen <roger@redline.sr.hp.com>

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: <ZGoldie@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/29/95 3:37pm
Subject: Channels

JAN 19 1996
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Date: Fri, Dec 29, 1995 1:30 PM PDT
From: ZGoldie
Subj: Digital T.V.
To: fccinfo@fvv.gov

To whom it may concern,

At this time I do not think that you should phase out the current transmission system and replace it with a digital system. It is a waste of time and energy as one only sees a difference with a T.V. screen of 35 inches or bigger.

Thank you,

Cynthia Goldman
San Rafael, CA

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: <ZGoldie@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/29/95 3:34pm
Subject: Channels

To Whom it May Concern,

I do not think broadcast stations should get a use of a second channel free if the transmission system is changed to digital. Sell the airwaves and the government can use the money for social programs.

Thank you,

Cynthia Goldman
San Rafael, CA

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Dolores Leister <DLEISTE@CO.PIERCE.WA.US>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/29/95 1:12pm
Subject: Broadcast TV comments

I read in my local paper yesterday that the TV broadcast industry is going to make every TV set and VCR I own obsolete within the next 7 years. And they want the taxpayers to foot the bill for the cross-over both by having to replace all current home equipment AND with an incredible tax break of free use of channels during the cross-over time.

I read that your chairman Reed Hundt is the only voice speaking up against this move. I would like you to know that both my husband and I agree with Mr. Hundt. I do not want to be forced to switch. I do not want my tax dollars paying for something I don't want to be forced to do.

Let the broadcast stations buy the duplicate channels they need. And push for a much slower forced cut-over.

Sincerely,
David R. Leister and Dolores J. Leister
715 S. Lawrence St.
Tacoma, WA 98405-2210
206-759-9920

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: <MCFARNSW@suadmin.syr.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/29/95 10:35am
Subject: digital t.v.

I recently read about the proposal that TV broadcasters want to start changing over from analog to digital transmissions. I am not afraid of change nor am I afraid of progress and agree that this is probably the way to go. However, if the change really doesn't make a great deal of difference in picture quality except in very large screen TV's then I wonder if it is worth the expense.
The majority of American homes do not have TV sets that are larger than 35" that seems to be more popular in public gathering spots such as the local
"pub". If a change over does need and I underline that word "need" to take place then it should make enough of a difference to the average TV owner to justify the expense. What I see is the average cable viewer having to pay higher cable prices fora service that is really not that beneficial and of course the charge to add an adapter to a current TV to convert digital to analog would of course be shouldered the the average TV owner. I think that the FCC is out of touch with the average person and there should be some attempt made to see what the general public feels about this. I am shocked and surprised to see that discussions have gone on this long before hitting our local newspapers. Isn't our gov't supposed to be for the "people" not the
"industry" alone. However I don't think that favoritism should be given to major broadcasters and if they want a second channel they should have to pay for it or continue to let it stay public and make the major broadcasters be accountable to the "public" in regards to educational programming. Who is doing the reviewing and who is being the "watch" dog?

There are many questions that need to be answered and it angers me that my input has not been sought. I laugh at the idea that people living below the poverty line would be an eager buyer for a new digital Tv as Bruce Allan , vice president of Thomson Consumer Electronics seems to think. GET REAL MR.
ALLAN!

The technology is really not new and I wonder why manufacturers haven't been adding the digital possibility into new sets and made TVs that could receive either signal? The other question I have is - how long before technology changes again and digital is no longer the way to go - how soon before we are able to transmit hologram images over the airwaves and create a whole new way of being entertained in our homes?

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

JAN 19 1996
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Diane Galiardi <dianeg@netdex.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/29/95 3:25am
Subject: TV's future

As a parent and human being, I am extremely concerned with the amount and severity of violence shown on TV. Except for the public broadcast channels, every station shows a huge amount of brutality.
I am afraid to let my children watch anything except public television.
Even with the so-called family shows on the regular channels, there are often commercials for the violent shows to be watched later that day or week. So much violence in everyone's living room can only be bad for society. Isn't there any way to cut way back on this sort of programming?

As for digital TV, no broadcasting company should be given free air time. That is ridiculous.

Diane Galiardi

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <usbond@Interpath.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/28/95 11:22pm
Subject: HDTV

JAN 19 1996

Mr. Hundt,

In a recent issue of my local newspaper, I read about some of the complexities involved with High Definition TV. From that article, I came to the conclusion that you should auction off the available bandwidth to the highest bidder. We cannot continue giving handouts to big business. I realize that paying for bandwidth will undermine the broadcasters' attention to public service issues, but we certainly have enough broadcasting outlets today that we can afford to let market forces rule.

Please don't give the bandwidth away. Make big business pay for it.

Thanks,
John Teague
9906 Leslie Drive
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996

From: <AGURUS@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 12/28/95 10:28pm
Subject: TELEVISION

FCC

Recently I read an article in the local paper regarding the up comming era of new TV??

Number 1 Mr Clinton's idea to sell new spectrum to commercial entities??
GARBAGE
Only an novice, as he is with regard to proper government practice, would concoct such an methodolgy to manage spectrum. Spectrum for public use should be given away to corporations in the broadcast business with the understanding that it is a public utility -- not a bought and owned asset.
The public thru government should regulate the use of spectrum as a public utility.

Number 2 With the advent of color TV the owners of BW TV's could still watch color programs, and owners of color TV sets could watch BW programs with no additional expense in hardware contraptions. The article indicated 35 inch
TV's are a requirement to allow users to get the advantage of HDTV. That old sets could not receive HDTV programs without a $200 gadget. The FCC should be not the proponent of expensive outlays by the public to use new broadcast capabilities, but as in the BW to COLOR evolution minimized the impact.
Perhaps an FCC rule should be that no TV programs can be exclusively broadcast using HDTV technology thereby permitting NTSC receivers to have the same/equal access to HDTV broadcasts. That broadcast companies will provide
NTSC broadcast based on public need without any exclusions until FCC/Public notice eliminates the need. Cheers
Andrew Gourley

Number 3 The FCC should be managing the digitization of all TV broadcast.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Robert V. Scheide Sr. <bscheide@pacific.pacific.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/28/95 9:51pm
Subject: HDTV

I presently have a C-Band sattelite system and a Primestar digital system, I can not see any benefit to be gained by rural citiens from HDTV. The quality of both of the systems I use are as good as I need them to be. The information I have seen of HDTV says that upgrading to it would only be beneficial if you purschased a new Tv with at least a 35 inch screen at a cost $1500 dollars more than an analog system.

When you here our leadership in Congress mounting attacks on what is on the tube now, why should we give them the go ahead to do it with a better picture. They should demonstrate that they can produce something of value first. If they wanted to do something good for the country they could concentrate on gettin everyone affordable access to the internet.

Respectfully ,
Robert V. Scheide Sr.
Robert V. Scheide Sr.
3008 Wolf Creek Road
Clearlake Oaks, Ca 95423
707-998-1883
NON ILLEGITIMI CARBORUNDUM EST

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: MR H PAT M EHLE <SUEH55A@prodigy.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/28/95 9:21pm
Subject: RE: Digital TV

JAN 19 1996
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

{\rtf1\ansi \deff0{\fonttbl
{\f0\froman Times New Roman;}{\f1\fswiss EngraversGothic BT;
}}{\colortbl
\red0\green0\blue0;}
{\stylesheet{\fs20 \snext0 Normal;}
}{\info{\title Letter - Traditional Letterhead}}
\margl1440\margr1440\margt1080\widowctrl\ftnbj\ftnrestart \pard \sl0

{\plain \fs22 }\sectd \sbknone\headery1080\vertalc\endnhere {\header \pard \qc\sl0 {\plain \scaps\fs22 \par }{\plain \scaps\f1\fs20 150 Sun Harbor Drive\par }{\plain \scaps\f1\fs20 Liverpool, NY 13088 - 4357\par }{\plain \scaps\f1\fs20 315 457-5227}{\plain \f1\fs20 \par }}

{\plain \fs22 December 28, 1995\par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 Reed E. Hundt, Chairman\par
}{\plain \fs22 Federal Communications Commission\par
}{\plain \fs22 1919 M St. NW\par
}{\plain \fs22 Washington, DC 20554-0001\par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 Dear Sir:\par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 In today\'92s Syracuse Herald-Journal I read an article by Frank Greve of Knight-Ridder News Service. His article detailed plans for digital TV. It did not state a time table for this or what the effect will be on people who are on cable for TV now! It does state that the change will not be noticeable except on TV of approx. 35" size costing $1,500. 00 today. I for one feel we Americans are to plugged in and that this will not be good for Society as a whole. With the minimal effect on TV to allow broadcasters and manufactures to push a $187 billion dollar change on the public I think is money foolishly spent.\par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 I hope the Commission acts with the interests of all people at heart and not the just the monied few.\par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 Sincerely,\par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 \par
}{\plain \fs22 H. Pat Ehle\par
}

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: michael keeney <R2MJK@VM1.CC.UAKRON.EDU>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 1:06pm
Subject: HDTV

If what I read today in the Akron Beacon Journal is true ("TV upgrade would cost big bucks," page 1, Dec 27, 1995) I would like you to understand that I consider your agency's handling of the HDTV conversion to be an outrageous betrayal of the public trust.

I am perfectly satisfied with my current TV picture, and do not desire either to pay $200 to receive the identical picture through a converter box or to have a $1500, 35-inch television in my living room. If your agency is truly interested in improving American television, I suggest you begin by having CBS,

NBC, and ABC actually provide the educational and public service programs for which they received free broadcast licences. I object to station owners receiving additional designated signal channels for free. In an era in which budget cuts and federal deficits are cutting benefits and increasing user fees for all Americans, it is time for government agencies to stop secretly giving away the store to special interest groups.

A change that will cost Americans an estimated $200 Billion, and which will produce only the most minimal benefits, should not be made solely by a few bureaucrats and the special interests they allegedly oversee. I therefore urge you to do the following: (1) Require television broadcasters to inform the

American public about the HDTV plans and their costs, (2) Require television broadcasters to absorb conversion costs for people who do not want to take advantage of this new technology, and (3) ask the American people whether they desire this new system.

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: <Parker.Steve@esc.state.nc.us>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 1:21pm
Subject: HDTV

Hi,

I just read about HDTV in my local paper.

It sounds great, and I don't mind having to buy a new TV.

But I think the licenses for additional band width should be sold. For years, TV stations and networks have been making money on resources that should be owned by the public.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: <ACrutcherj@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 1:23pm
Subject: Digital TV

This memo is directed to Mr Reed Hundt::::::::

The whole change in tranmission technology must take place as we can not impede technology just because all current TV will be outdated and reguire a
$200 converter to allow the old tvs to function on the new signal.

However there are ways to mitigate the problem of not hurting those who financially could not afford the new technology or the converter at the time that a broadcaster makes the change. There are obvious problems for cable service providers also. I strongly reccomend that a nationwide sympossium be held which would bring together all industries effected by the change to determine as concisely and as completely all of the problems.

I would then determine which industries would save the most in operating costs as a result of the change and if there were a significant reduction in current and future costs I would place some of the burden on those that will experience the reductions.
One scenario would be to reguire the broadcasters to provide the converters at no cost to the public who does not want or can not immediately buy a new set. I would require that a excise tax be placed on every digital tv sold in the amount of the cost of a converter. At the time of a purchase of a new digital TV the tax would be collected from the consumer and destroyed. The distributor of the converter would be reimbursed a fixed amount for each converter that was returned sand destroyed and which was a converter tracked by a serial number or somesuch system.

The result would be that the consumer would evevtually pay for the new technology as the consumer should but the consumer would not be forced to change until they wanted to and would not be forced to spend money they could not afford and a large inrease in consumer debt would not affect other areas of the economy adversely.

My last comment is that the adminisration any such program be done by the private sector as a government agency would only add to the cost to the consumer and history tells you that I am correct.

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Sincerely, Anson Crutcher
2331 Guerneville Rd.
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: Ron Vehlow <ronv@sonic.net>
To: Federal Communications Commission <fccinfo@fcc.gov...
Date: 12/27/95 1:25pm
Subject: HDTV

I am outraged over the plan to require all television sets to switch to digital broadcasting in the future, at great and unnecessary expense to the customer viewer, and to the requirement that makes it necesary to spend $200.00 to purcase a converter box if the viewer does not, or cannot, afford the cost of a new digital TV set.

There is little worthwhile on the "Boob Tube" now, and the picture quality is just fine, so why force a change.

It is decisions like this that help bring on the next American Revolution.

Sincerely,

Ron Vehlow

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <BLCramer@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 1:37pm
Subject: HDTV Proposal

Dear Sirs:
In these times of Gov. reduced spending and Governmental search for dollars,
I do not agree with giving brodcasters free access to additional channel space. If the governmet must sell the PMA's in an effort to raise money,how can you justify giving this space away? I realize that this technology is new and the market will be very low at first for its use, but is this any different that any other emerging industry? Let them bid for the space via auction and let the market determine the sales price. If broadcasters do not feel confident in the future of this technology, the price may be low, but if this is the case, should Government be the one that supports a lackluster industry with free channel space that could be auctioned for considerable gain to the federal treasury? I wupport the new technology, but let industry take the gamble that it will be saleable to the general public!

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: <kd4zka@bbs.k4ry.ampr.org>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/28/95 12:17am
Subject: H.D.T.V.

dear sir,
i am sending you this meessage in regards to high definition television or HDTV. i am strongly opposed to this measure as this is just another plot for "BIG BUSINESS" to make money. we already have enough problems with these cable television companys overcharging the public just to watch television. if they make the switch to hdtv then that means we, the taxpayers, will either have to buy $200 converters or buy new televisions that are overpriced anyway! just to see the quality of hdtv we would all have to buy at least a 35 inch television to notice the differance! please doon't let these money hungry and greedy networks get this senseless trash passed. if they do, heaven only knows what they'll charge us then! please consider what i am saying. thank you for reading this. sincerely
Joshua Ainsworth

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <Mbtrex@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 11:49pm
Subject: channel gifts to broadcasters

There should be no channel gifts to broadcasters to start digital TV.
Starting HDTV or anyother form of digital TV is going to cost all Americans much money to change TV sets, etc. That's just to get the reception over the air. Where we live in Hawaii, we don't have free TV. We have to have cable because of the mountains. Ours monthly rates just went up from 22.00 dollars a month to 25.00 dollars a month. If you give away frequencies to broadcasters, I am sure cable companies will then say what great new TV features they're giving us and raise our rates again and to top it off we'll have to buy a new TV to receive their signals. Make them buy the frequencies. No not buy. Lease the frequencies.

Aloha,

Mark Trexler
67-346 Waialua
Beach Rd
Waialua, Hi 96791 mbtrex@aol.com

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: MR SAMUEL VEGA <CSSH21A@prodigy.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 9:45pm
Subject: HDTV

-- [From: Sammy Vega * EMC.Ver #2.10P] --

I read in a newspaper article that TV broadcasting companies want to change the TV signal from analog to digital. This would be a good idea but for a few unanswered questions. Who is going to pay for all this?? Me again?? No way!! The broadcasting companies want to go digital at the consumers expense, the TV companies should pay for the signal change. No doubt that cable rates will increase to " cover the upgrade " no one wanted. Also the TV companies are looking for a 15 year free ride on the signal. Why not just give them the whole country?? This is a better deal than the state legislators give themselves!! Our government needs CASH to stay in business, charge the TV companies all you can and then some. They have no choice but to pay up, just like the average joe when cable rates increase. No more freebies to anyone!! The FCC and federal government are not the salvation army, make the TV companies pay up!!

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <HalL101451@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 9:36pm
Subject: Digital TV

After reading an article in "The State" from Columbia, SC, I am dismayed to learn that the Government once more wants to invade my personal choices and dictate what I can and cannot do. To convert to digital TV with no thought to those who depend on television as their primary source of information and entertainment is to negate the value of the individual voter. Congress needs to provide a means for average citizens to speak their minds on this issue. From the article that I read, the decision will be made solely by those few legislators that understand the issue and the CEOs of the companies that will benefit. Joe Public will find that his TV no longer works without an adapter and he must ante up $1500 if he wishes to use television as his medium for information. Not all of us can afford computers and digital units. Does the
FCC really want to be party to creating an electorate that slips beneath the lowest common denominator, soundbites? I urge you to avoid forcing every citizen to purchase digital TV in order to be informed.
If you require further information from me, my home phone is 803-332-1276.

Sincerely,

Hal Lewis

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: <PbmG@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 8:59pm
Subject: broadcast tv's future

I am deeply concerned that our government is even considering allowing free access to broadcasters again to enable them to completely revolutionize signals sets etc to gain an unfair advantage to the consumer. This is concerning HDT tv and/or digital transmission vs. analog. Let me simply ask how many more times is the average taxpayer going to finance another pet project of the congress and their contributors. This is the Broadcasters Business and they need to pay and process their future as thye see fit. The
Government and/or the taxpayer need to be concerned with, 1. Reducing the
Deficit, 2. Reducing the tax rate, 3. Reducing the size of government, and 4. making business pay for public use of our airwaves. This will end as another nail in the coffin if congress doesn't wake up and auction off those airwaves without waivers accordingly.

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: David Spencer <DLSpencer@gnn.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 8:17pm
Subject: HDTV

Mr. Hundt:

Please keep the public in mind when the difficult decisions are made about the change from analog to digital broadcasts.

There really is nothing the masses can do when technology changes.

The controversy in who gets what spectrum and if it's fair that existing TV broadcasters are asking for "free" spectrum during the transition are way above most people. People with a lot of money are the ones who get the spectrum.

Just try to keep the "little guy" in mind and try to keep the cost to the consumer as low as possible.

Jean Spencer

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: <BDR11@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/28/95 9:20pm
Subject: HDTV

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I recently read an article in my local newspaper in regard to digital television that nearly knocked my socks off! It said that current television sets will soon become obsolete due to the introduction of digital t.v. (HDTV). It will force Americans to purchase new equipment in order to meet the requirements for this new form of television. I find it thoroughly ridiculous for the American public to spend billions of dollars (involuntarily) just because the FCC cannot figure out a way to make things work under the existing conditions in regard to television. I can confidently say that, we, the American public, are perfectly happy with the current quality of television. There is no reason I can see that we need to cross over into digital television, except for the fact that we are too lazy to figure out how to make it work under the existing conditions. This is why our country's debt is so outrageous,... because we refuse to find a more economical means of accomplishing smaller "little picture" tasks that in the end have a "bigger picture" impact. If I am speaking nonsense, I would like to know why. Feel free to e-mail me back at this address.

Sincerely Concerned,

Doug Rigg
Age 30
Honolulu, Hawaii

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: LEROY BELL <102667.2315@compuserve.com>
To: INTERNET <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 12/28/95 8:56pm
Subject: HDTV

JAN 19 1996
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: LEROY BELL, 102667,2315
TO: INTERNET, INTERNET:fccinfo@fcc.gov.
DATE: 12/28/95 12:38 PM

RE: : HDTV

12/28/95

Mr. Reed E. Hunt, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St. NW
Washington DC 20554-0001

Dear Mr. Hunt:

I read, with great interest [*], the coming of Digital TV. I spent some 30 years in News & Documentary filming & later taping; I grew up with the industry and first hand saw the monies generated and techniques improved ie: the crude ,by comparision, of early Black & White sets thru the birth of Color reception!..

I owned the first type of VCR, a RCA unit that recorded ONE pre-timed Channel/Remote Control unheard of;. today we have 8 Channel selections, built in VCR+, Remote everything!

To my way of thinking-the industry (+), in whole, should supply Converters at no charge ; the retailers of TV's then should have displays of conventional sets using the Converters along-side HDTV sets. John Q. Public must see, firsthand, the vast difference in reception.

Over a period of a couple of years the public will save up their money to buy HDTV because the Digital system will sell itself.

Your reply will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Leroy Bell
2405 Alan rd.
Norristown PA 19401

610/279-4981

[*]Phila. Inquirer 12/27/95 from their Washington Bureau

(+) TV Manufacturers/Networks/Local Affiliates

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE