

MM 87268
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: Paul Mullane <m4801m@sonic.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/30/95 7:03pm
Subject: Digital TV

Digital television may be fine for sports bars with big screens that may benefit, but the general public should not be made a pawn in the network ploy to get free airwave space and then make a profit by selling part to rivals. The public will pay for replacement TV sets and big business will once again feed from the public trough. Make them pay for the broadcast frequencies to help reduce the deficit and throw in some restrictions on what sort of trash they can broadcast along with more enforceable public service requirements.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <dlhansel@mailbox.syr.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/30/95 10:01am
Subject: Digital TV Channels

To: FCC Chairman Reed Hundt

This E-mail message is to urge you to put the U.S. Citizen and consumer interests ahead of the telecommunications industry in allocating the new digital channels. Certainly these resources should be auctioned and not given away. I understand that by your own estimates, the U.S. Government might realize \$100 billion if auctioned. We must not give to special interests what is rightly owned by all the citizens of this country.

Thank you for considering my concern.
Dr. David L. Hanselman
4772 Edgeworth Drive
Manlius, NY 13104

JAN 19 1996
RECEIVED
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Frank Scott <frank@marin.cc.ca.us>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/30/95 10:23pm
Subject: marketing the airwaves

Dear Chairman Hundt: I am concerned that the public airwaves, already corporatized, will be further commodified with little public input. All of the exciting possibilities brought about by electronic advances threaten to become simply private profit makers, at public expense. What is the FCC doing to protect us, and what can we do to either support the FCC in its efforts, or fight against a lack of effort?

We cannot allow the internet, HDTV, receiving disks and other hopeful signs of possible information democracy simply become marketing tools used to advance a minority at the expense of the majority.

Frank Scott
225 Laurel Place
San Rafael CA 94901

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM87-268

From: Ken Castleman <castlman@phoenix.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 1:32am
Subject: HDTV

JAN 19 1996

Dear Mr. Hundt:

I think digital HDTV will be a good thing, even though the transition will be expensive.

The changeover should be done in such a way as to maximize benefit to the US economy. Yes, consumers will pay for it, but it can be done so as to create jobs in the USA.

For the transition period, what about converters that receive the new-type signal and generate a signal that ordinary receivers can use? Maybe if these were mass-produced they wouldn't be too expensive. Cheap components could produce standard quality audio and video.

I think stations should be required to transmit video and audio that is up to the communication channel. I hate hearing the crummy sound some stations transmit when I play my TV through my stereo system.

I would hate to routinely see 320-line NTSC quality video on a 1000-line system.

Good luck with this.

Kenneth R. Castleman, Ph.D.
(Electrical engineer)

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <MojoBill@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 12:23am
Subject: HDTV

Let the market decide on HDTV. Cable is the obvious testing place and birthplace of HDTV. I think that broadcast television will follow by some years the adoption of HDTV and digital broadcasting by cable networks. HBO, Showtime, Cinemax and the Disney channel will probably be the first to market and cable will be the medium because of the large bandwidth and much easier implementation. As prices come down and more and more people buy digital sets or computers with digital capability. There must be a critical mass of digital sets before any stations broadcast over the air. I do think that when the broadcasters decide to switch they should pay for additional bandwidth they require.

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

1

MM 87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

From: William Knight <wmknight@ix.netcom.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 12:12am
Subject: HDTV

Dear Sirs,

I feel that the American public does not have the need for High Definition TV. The quality of the cable system I use (Prime Cable of Houston) is excellent to me. If there were an inexpensive way of being able to use our current TV's with the new system, I would be all for it.

According to an article written by Frank Greve of Knight-Ridder, it will cost \$200 per convertor box, to allow regular TV's to receive the new signal. I have three TV's in my home, and do not want to spend \$600 for convertor boxes.

The article also mentions that there will be a ten year conversion period for the change over. I own a TV that is ten years old and still works like new. I also feel the Television broadcasters should pay for the use of the public airways.

In conclusion, if the television manufactors, instead of the American Taxpayer, would cover the estimated \$187 billion bill for this conversion, I would be all for it. If it were required that a majority of the convertor boxes, and televisions were made here in America, not just assembled here, I would be for it.

Thank-you for your time.
William L. Knight Jr.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Robert Cruikshank <rcruikshank@dtus.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 10:12pm
Subject: Big-digit television

JAN 19 1996

Mr. Reed Hundt, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20554-0001

Dear Commissioner Hundt,

Thank you for your invitation to respond to the plans that seem to be forthcoming for digital TV. Although I feel like I am in the poverty level, I do not qualify by governmental standards. With this in mind, I was amazed to read the quotations and statements by Bruce Allan, vice president of Thomson Consumer Electronics that families below the poverty level would be eager buyers of this most expensive new addition to the communications adventure that corporate America is pushing on the citizens of this good country. He has not talked to the same folks as I. They are not interested in paying a fortune for TV that seems to fit their needs. This grandiose venture that will bring into our homes, if we can convert to 35 inch screens and to pay heaven knows how much to keep these vultures in business, this tremendous amount of money to see something we already see, begs upon the mental capacity of the consumer, and I hope those in power to make the final decisions about this important decision.

Many of us will have to reconstruct our homes that were custom built to accommodate a TV smaller than a 35 inch screen.

Frankly, most of this is beyond the point. America was not built and established to cause its citizens to be forced to make these expensive changes just to increase quality that is already acceptable. The monopoly given to Warner in our area is already bad enough.

I appeal to you not to let the broadcasting industry place the American Constituency into a position of having or not having TV. As I see it, that is what is before us.

Thank you,,Robert J. Cruikshank

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

From: <RWLAFON@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 10:09pm
Subject: re:HDTV, 1/7/96 Houston Chron, pp1d;3d

Attn: Reed Hundt

I am not in favor of giving "free" channels to Broadcasters. If they wish to rent/lease space available for 7-15 yrs during transition - OK.

My understanding is that the picture quality is unaffected for TV less than 35in. I have no statistics but I bet that the an overwhelming number of TV sets are less than 35 inches.

I purchased a new TV set last month. No way would I pay the cost of a 35 inch TV. The trade off appears to be more channels for the broadcast companies vs \$ for new equipment with little to gain for the vast majority of viewers.

It is difficult to draw fair conclusions from one article and general knowledge. However, if the technology makes economic sense without "gimmies" then the companies should stand the cost. If it doesn't make economic sense then why do it. Interestingly enough I didn't see anything in this article about changeover cost for cable TV or other video inputs to the TV screen.

Has that been considered??

Robert W. LaFon
826 Halewood Dr
Houston, Tx 77062

rwlafon@aol.com

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <nathan_hanks@cmail.rustei.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/11/96 8:30am
Subject: Attn: Reed Hundt

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. Hundt,

My name is Nathan Hanks and I live in Houston, Texas. This past weekend I was reading a Houston Chronicle article about High Definition Television (HDTV). When HDTV is available I want the chance to buy one and I want the broadcasters to maximize the potential of this awesome technology. I do not think the government should decide what the broadcasters can bring to market. If the technology and broadcasts are available and the people don't like it, then they won't buy into the technology. At this point the television manufacturers and broadcasters will stop supporting it. Let the market dictate what technology is available to the public. It is not your job to take away my right to choose as I wish. If you do not agree, then give a good reason why my thinking is wrong, the newspaper sure didn't. I can be reached via e-mail at:
nathan_hanks@cmail.rustei.com

Thank You,
Nathan Hanks

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996

From: Blake Wilfong <blake@phoenix.phoenix.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/10/96 8:34pm
Subject: Please support HDTV

I recently saw an article on HDTV from Knight-Ridder Tribune News. It said to send comments to this e-mail address.

I have no connection with any electronics or broadcasting firm. (I'm currently trying to break into the writing business.) But as a longtime computer user, I recognize the importance of HDTV to this country--not as a medium for entertainment but also as a crucial invention that will greatly accelerate our technology and computer literacy.

HDTV will make broadcasts of vast quantities of computer data possible. It will create a definitive standard for digital video in the computer industry, thus accelerating the development of multimedia products. The mass production of HDTV CRTs will finally make large, high-resolution computer displays feasible. These in turn will vastly increase the usability of home computers, transforming them from mere toys into valuable tools.

The FCC's decisions about HDTV will have an enormous impact on the computer industry and thus on the technological advancement of this country. Please let the broadcasters have the free temporary loan of TV channels they have requested. To do otherwise will slow the acceptance of HDTV by many years.

Let's show the world what our government and commercial industry can accomplish when they work together. Thanks for considering my opinion.

Blake Wilfong blake@phoenix.net Houston, TX

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Ron Vehlow <ronv@sonic.net>
To: Federal Communications Commission <fccinfo@fcc.gov...>
Date: 1/10/96 1:51pm
Subject: [Fwd: HDTV]

Message-ID: <30E18F8E.7201@sonic.net>
Date: Wed, 27 Dec 1995 10:25:18 -0800
From: Ron Vehlow <ronv@sonic.net>
Organization: Sonoma Interconnect
X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.0b3 (Win95; I)
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Federal Communications Commission <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Subject: HDTV
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

JAN 19 1996

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 necessary to spend \$200.00 to purchase 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

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: Ayres, Tom CPT <ayrest@benning-dbbi.army.mil>
To: FCC <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 1/9/96 9:22pm
Subject: Television, obsolete???

JAN 19 1996

Mr. Hundt,

I recently read an article in my local newspaper stating that the network television industry wants a greater part (larger band-width) of the electromagnetic spectrum for free so that they can go to digital TV transmissions. This means that every family in the country will eventually have to buy an upgraded TV system or converter to receive the new signals.

Now I certainly understand that technology must move forward; but, I do not believe that the public should have to foot the entire bill. If the public must buy the hardware then the TV industry must rent the entire portion of the spectrum that they will use.

Why?

1) The TV networks provide no public service which does not entitle them to 'free' use of a public resource. Most public service announcements are provided by local stations (affiliates and independents) which absorb the costs. For the networks to take credit for that is tantamount to me taking credit for your work just because I pay taxes which in turn pays your paycheck.

Also, it can be said that many cellular phone companies provide a public service when they offer free calls to people who report traffic accidents, crimes, etc... It typically works like this... You're driving in traffic and the traffic is backed-up because someone has broken down on the side of the road. You pick up your phone and dial *116 for example and report it. Police, wreckers, etc. are dispatched to the scene to get traffic flowing again. Also it gets reported to radio stations and their traffic reports get updated. The San Francisco Bay area does something along those lines. My point is, cellular companies rent the spectrum and provide a better public service than the Network TV industry does. Make Network TV pay!

2) All of this boils down to \$\$\$\$. The TV networks and TV manufacturing industry stand to make a huge profits from this venture. Those profits come out of the public's pocket. In the article it stated that even those below the poverty level will probably buy the new equipment. If the networks have their way all of the money will be flowing in one direction, out of the working man's pocket and into the network TV industry. The public has a right to reap some benefit from this. Auction the airwave channels and put the money to work for the public. As this stands now this is a one-way deal. If we let this go as is without reaping some benefit (other than better picture quality) we've shafted ourselves and we'll have no one to blame but ourselves. No one-way deals! Make them pay!

=====

The bottom line to all of this: As a consumer, if I've got to pay so that a company can make some profit off of me using my resources (public lands, waters, airwaves) with little benefit to me, then that company must pay for the use of my resources!

=====

How do I define what little benefit is? Take a look at what we get now.
That is little benefit!

I guarantee you that this is how the public feels!

Thomas R. Ayres

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <BMHMorgan@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/9/96 8:50pm
Subject: hctv

JAN 19 1996

STOP the move to implement HDTV. Do we not have enough government and citizen expense already for user commodities?

This would be a travesty to the American way and democracy. PLEASE LEAVE IT ALONE!

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Martin Ulrich <martin@wolfenet.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 8:55pm
Subject: broadcasters

JAN 19 1996

To Whom It May Concern:

My personal opinion is that the BROADCASTERS ought to purchase air space. Should one telecommunication organization purchase air space, all organizations ought to be required to purchase air space.

Changing from analog to digital is acceptable, as technological advances do not wait. To force the public to pay an additional fee to keep their analog tv's is not acceptable, especially at the cost stated. As stated, "a costly no-gainer is the \$200 digital to analog convertor with no change in picture or sound quality"; "even promoters say it'll take a big digital set, 35 inches or larger and costing about \$1500 more than current analog models, to see the difference in picture quality".

Hopefully the public will be made aware of the probability of the change in the tv's from analog to digital, indicating the advantages and disadvantages and potential future costs.

As a person below poverty level, that will be a costly upgrade for family entertainment and/or education.

Martin Ulrich
Selah, Wa.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996

From: <DGarcia877@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 5:22pm
Subject: Digital TV

I oppose the granting of additional free frequencies to existing TV stations for the purpose of transitioning to digital TV.
Donald J. Garcia
19 Feather Branch Ct.
The Woodlands, TX 77381

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-248

From: ronnie fojtasek <Ronnie=Fojtasek%Dist=Sys%Ops=Hou@bangate.compaq.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 2:34pm
Subject: Digital TV

JAN 19 1996

Dear Mr. Hundt:

I am responding to a recent article in the Houston Chronicle regarding the change to digital TV. While I am for progress in this area, I am against the proposed method. This method, as explained in the paper, will require people to switch over by buying new televisions. Since the average cost for the most basic tv is now around \$200, that can be a significant expense. Despite the claim of Representative Fields I believe the average person will find this expense onerous.

I believe that the market, free of government control, should determine the system to be utilized. Everyone should be free to choose the speed with which they convert. There are always people who have to have the latest technology and can afford to indulge their whim. Most people will change gradually as they replace their old televisions. Some may never change if given a choice.

I would also prefer that the stations be forced to purchase the digital channels. They can simulcast on both digital and analog frequencies if it is profitable. If not, let them choose which way is most lucrative. This way the consumer and the provider set the pace and demand for such a change.

R. J. Fojtasek

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-468

From: <jwelch@firstnethou.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/8/96 2:25pm
Subject: HDTV

FCC,

Its my opinion that although HDTV broadcast will produce a better quality picture, the cost to us, the consumer, to purchase new TV sets is NOT WORTH IT!!! If you continue with your plan to auction air-waves to stations for digital broadcast, please allow them to simulcast in both digital & analog for a long period of time...say fifteen years or so. This is the only feasible way to justify the cost to the consumer.

Thank You!

Jon Welch
Houston

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <Scdahlgren@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/18/96 2:21pm
Subject: digital tv and selling airband

Reed Hundt,

I have a suggestion for you. Sell most all of the bandwidths, take the money from the sale and buy every household in the United States a fiber optic/internet/cyberschool connection. airwaves are best left for mobile needs. The value that could be found in having all households connected far outweighs that mobile convenience. put what is left in the national debt.

Scott Dahlgren
1298 East 580 South
Provo, Utah 84606

JAN 19 1996

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Tom Smith <tesmith@phoenix.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 2:31pm
Subject: I support switch to digital TV

I just wanted to voice my support for digital TV. I read that you were seeking public opinion on the matter.

Onward and upward!
Tom Smith

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

From: Greg Williams <gwilliams@ghgcorp.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 12:54pm
Subject: HDTV

Mr. Hundt,

The conversion to HDTV will have wider impact to the public than is currently being discussed. Comparing this transition to the evolution of hi-fidelity recording is not valid. Many people sill choose to use reel-to-reel tape recording and phonograph records for their listening pleasure and will never have to buy hi-tech, high dollar audio equipment.

However, they will be forced to purchase some sort of HDTV hardware or be faced with being cut-off from what has become a necessity in today world, broadcast television.

The cost of VCR replacement will also be passed onto the consumer. Many homes have a VCR with each TV set. The HDTV signal will not work on the VCR tuner. I also assume the VCR recording format will have to change to keep up with increased number of lines in HDTV picture. What will this do to existing consumer-owned movies and to the movie rental businesses?

What about the existing signal services, like cable. What hardware changes will they be making? Will they not attempt to pass these cost to the consumer? The delivery quality of cable companies in my area is quite poor. A lot of people I know have returned big screen TV because the consistently poor cable signals look worse when enlarged. This is from induced cable company noise. How will this be different?

Thank you for this comment opportunity.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

1

MM87-268

FCC by February 28, 2001 with no compensation for its return.
They do not share in the proceeds of the auction of the
resulting spectrum.

I realize that is MUCH more aggressive than anything that has been reported from the news media concerning the
hearings that have been going on recently. You can't move on this too aggressively to suit me. I bought an
expensive 55 inch television receiver in December 1994, and this Digital Television
/ HDTV specification would make it obsolete. I am not interested in the converter box that has been discussed. I will
replace this receiver long before the end of its useful life in search of a higher quality image.

Note that my employment does not give me any involvement in this industry, other than what Texas Instruments
hopes to derive from its Digital Light Processing products. I am not in the Digital
Light Processing group, but so far as I know, there is little or nothing in the Digital Television and HDTV
specifications that would make the Digital Light Processing products based on the deformable micro mirror
incompatible.

Very Truly Yours
Robert Gammon
12435 Truesdell
Houston, TX 77071-2829
713-274-3299 rgammon@ibm.net (home) rgammon@micro.ti.com (work)

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM87-268
RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996

From: Robert Gammon <rgammon@ibm.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 12:13pm
Subject: Digital Television and HDTV

In an article that appeared in the Sunday January 7 edition of the Houston Chronicle, writer Frank Greve of the Knight-Ridder Tribune News suggested that the FCC was interested in hearing from consumers on the proposed adoption of the Digital Television and HDTV specifications that are presently under consideration by the FCC.

I have been very disturbed by some of the reported presentations to the FCC on this topic. Two that have attracted most of my attention were the comments by the computer companies led by Microsoft that opposed the adoption because the new signals would not be compatible with the merger of the computer and entertainment electronics industries that they see coming in the near future, and the desire of the local broadcasters to get the spectrum for the new signals 'free'.

The computer companies are NOT offering a valid reason to slow down or halt the adoption of the Digital Television and HDTV specifications, in my opinion. They can and will readily adapt to whatever changes occur in the marketplace as a result of the adoption of this specification.

The auction of spectrum has been a very positive step towards efficient useage of our radio spectrum. There is little need to break with this newly established pattern just to favor the local broadcasters. They should have to compete for access to this spectrum with all comers. New entrants to broadcast television should be welcomed to improve the diversity of product offerings, and to furthur enhance to opportunity to provide local interest offerings.

I do not consider myself to be an early adopter. I don't own a camcorder, I don't have a surround system on my entertainment center, and I didn't own a TV larger than 25 inches until December 1994. Yet, I will be eagerly awaiting the arrival of digital television receivers that are compatible with the Digital Television and HDTV specifications. When local broadcasters start broadcasting HDTV signals, and when the Hughes DSS system starts broadcasting HDTV signals, I will switch over nearly immediately. I have little interest in the converter box that permits reception of the Digital Television signal on my exiting analog receiver.

I want higher quality. I am impatient for Digital Television and especially impatient for HDTV to arrive. I had an opportunity to view a high definition television system at the Sarnoff Labs in the middle 1980s. The screen was about 20 wide and displayed no artifacts that I could see at distances as close as 2 feet. It felt like I could step through the screen onto the set that the camera was focused on. No, this was not the system whose specification you are considering, I realize that there are very important differences between that system and the one that you are considering. I have also seen what the existing television signals look like when displayed on a monitor inside a local broadcaster's studio. Both are vastly different than what I can get through an antenna or through cable (although Warner's local system has gotten much better in recent months, it still does not compare favorably to the images that I see on the Hughes DSS ssystem). I have upgraded to a laser disk and a DSS receiver in search of a better quality image than what local broadcasters and cable operators provide. I have gotten some of the quality improvement that I am seeking, but it is still not good enough.

I am in favor of a proposal that would include the following features:

- Local broadcasters required to begin broadcasting Digital Television signals, AND HDTV signals by January 1, 1998.
- Network broadcasters required to provide a minimum of 6 hours daily HDTV signals by January 1, 1998
- Local broadcasters must compete for licenses to the new spectrum allocations for Digital Television.
- Local broadcasters must cease broadcast of their existing analog signals by January 31, 2001.
- Local broadcasters must return their analog spectrum to the

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <B4h4h@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 11:42am
Subject: Giveaway of TV channels

I feel the give away of TV airwave channels is a waste of a natural resource.
These channels should be sold to the highest bidder like all other channels.
When we are trying to find ways to balance the federal budget it is stupid to overlook such revenues.
I hope you will consider this. Thanks , Ben Johnston, Columbia, MO

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <WayneVos@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 11:42am
Subject: High-Definition Television

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION

The Knight-Ridder Tribune News suggests that opinions on High-Definition Television can be sent to this address. I would suggest consideration of the following:

1. I would support moving in this direction over a several year period as recommended by the FCC. I believe in staying abreast of technology.
2. If a change is to occur, I suggest we consider going to a TV Screen with a width to height ratio the same as movie films. In this way, movies viewed on TV will not have invisible portions of the screen on the left and right as they do today.

Regards,
Wayne Voskamp

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Dan McKay <danmckay@ix.netcom.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 11:39am
Subject: broadcast TV

As a consumer and viewer of some of television programming, I would like to urge you to speed the way for digital signal transmission.

Switching to High Definition TV (HDTV) is ultimately in our nation's interest. I understand that the cost of new HDTV sets will be high for the first couple of years, but this should not deter a solid federal policy of support for the commercial introduction of new technology from which citizens across the country will benefit.

Television broadcasters need the flexibility of having an additional 6 megahertz for eight years in order to broadcast both digital and analog signals so that all Americans can receive programming whether they have bought a new HDTV set yet or not.

Also, FCC needs to support the transition to HDTV by requiring broadcasters to air several hours of HDTV programming on a daily basis. Otherwise, consumers who shell out the big bucks early to be the first on their block with the fancy new gear will feel jilted and could spread negative comments to friends and neighbors about the value of HDTV. This, in turn, could slow sales of HDTV sets in the early going -- at precisely the time that such sales need to accelerate in order for the price of new HDTV sets need to drop in order for prices to fall within the budget of the common man.

I am not alone in fervently wishing that my next television set be an HDTV set on which I can watch truly digital programming. Please work on my behalf and that of other fellow Americans to bring a digital tomorrow to us at the earliest possible juncture.

Sincerely,
Daniel J. McKay
2421 Westcreek Lane, Apt. 7-H
Houston, Texas 77027
(713) 871-8127

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE _____