DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

~~93-48~~
87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 30 '96

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: Mark Brissenden <brissen@csn.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/29/96 9:09pm
Subject: Broadcast TV

I recently read that the FCC is considering giving new broadcast spectrum to the Broadcast TV industry for the purpose of introducing HDTV. In view of the fact that any other industry has to pay for its share of the spectrum, I feel that this would be patently unfair. If HDTV is profitable for the industry, then let them pay a fair market value for their resource, like any other industry has to. Especially at a time when everyone has to sacrifice in an effor to produce a balanced budget, it strikes me as pure power politics to make an exception for a powerful industry.

Mark Brissenden
Boulder, CO
brissen@csn.net

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 30 '96

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: FCCINFO
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("bstack@engrss2.unl.edu")
Subject: digital tv -Reply

Your comments will be associated with the HDTV proceedings.

>>> <bstack@engrss2.unl.edu> 01/22/96 05:54pm >>>
to whom it may concern, as an average everyday law abiding citizen, i am somewhat concerned about an article i saw in the san francisco examiner entitled "digital tv's costly future". to make my point brief, i do not agree with this overwelming desire to push analog tv out the door and replace it with a more costly transmission medium. i am sure there are a lot of people such as myself who see no problem in the quality of picture now being transmitted. i am not about to jump up and down at the mere idea of having to shell out over
1,000 dollars in order to receive a digital signal. what i'm receiving right now is just fine. please get the message out about this push for a higher tech transmission medium that could cost tv viewers big bucks. thanks. brian p. stack
bstack@engrs.unl.edu

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

87-268

RECEIVED

JAN 30 '96

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

From: <PJoyner105@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 12:28pm
Subject: Conversion to HDTV

Attn: Mr Reed Hunt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission

I have followed the development process for HDTV for years. I have two concerns about the implementation of digital television. First, the television companies should have to pay for this conversion since they have not kept the general public informed. They should pay for the additional bandwidth they are asking for because it is only fair considering the fact that cellular companies had to purchase theirs for converting to digital transmission. Second, television companies should not be allowed to put the consumer in a position which would force the consumer to buy a new television or converter box in order to receive the same programing they receive now.
Have you looked at the price of consumer electronics lately? An additional
$1,500.00 cost over the current $900-2-$2,000 would be to much for the average family. Television companies should be required to provide HYBIRD service for a number of years meaning the time it would take the average American family to save enough money to purchase an HDTV unit. Since the commissions purpose is to look out for the welfare of the general public, forcing the hybird issue would give the public that perception reguardless of how you issue bandwidth.

Thankyou
MSG Paul S.

Joyner

Digital

Transmission Systems Manager

U.S. Army

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED 87-268

From: Edmund J FitzGerald <FITZPATRH@sunbelt.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCinfo)
Date: 1/23/96 9:57am
Subject: Digital vs Analog

RECEIVED
JAN 30 '96
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Mr. Hundt I am opposed to the proposal that broadcasters use a second set of channels FREE during the shift to digital T.V. transmission technology. Certainly if it is necessary for network broadcasters to utilize a second set of channels the channels should be sold at auction with the proceeds used to reduce the national debt.

It is also questioable as to whether broadcasters are living up to their agreements per the communications act relative to public service obligations.

May I have your support on this issue?

Sincerely, Edmund J. FitzGerald

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

87-268

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
JAN 30 '96
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: Patruno Nicholas <npatruno@brynmawr.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/28/95 12:14pm
Subject: digital tv

Message for Mr. Reed E. Hunt:

I am concerned and disturbed by today's article in the Philadelphia Inquirer on digital TV. It appears that, one more time, government agencies are playing "tootsies" with big companies, this time big broadcasters, and shafting the general public. If there is one iota of truth that in the near future the TV sets we have today will become non-functional unless we resort to converters (or purchase new expensive sets), I resent it. This imposition by a group of burocrats who tend to favor the financial fattening of the purses of the few at the expense of the taxpayers is unacceptable, not to mention "unethical" (a term Washington has difficulty in understanding).
I would like to receive more information on the facts concerning this issue.

My name and address are:

Nicholas Patruno
1114 County Line Road
Rosemont, PA 19010

Thank you.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

87-268

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED
JAN 30 '96
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: MRS INGRID M STEINWASCHER <ingrid@prodigy.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/27/95 2:48pm
Subject: Digital TV

Dear Sir or Madam,

I read this morning's paper with some concern as to TV broadcaster's plan to change to digital broadcasting. I am truly concerned about the t.v. industry's request to have a second channel free while the cellular telephone and pager industry have had to pay more than $8 billion for new channels at government auctions. I understand the Senate has given the FCC instructions to reconsider having the t.v. industry pay for this second channel at a government auction.

I would like to become more informed on the subject, particularly the role the FCC will play in the process. Please e- mail me any information you have on the above subject or send it to me at

Ingrid Steinwascher
306 Kuukuma Street
Kailua, HI 96734

Thank you.

Ingrid Steinwascher

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

87-268

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 30 '96

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

From: Karen H. Spake <net27@conrad.appstate.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/21/96 7:23pm
Subject: Change in systems

3774 Harmon Road
Lincolnton, NC 28092
January 21, 1996

To Whom It May Concern:

Before you begin phasing out your current transmission system to replace it with what you describe as a more efficient, computer-style digital system, let me remind you of a few things:

1. The number of people over 65 years of age and living on a fixed income is growing daily. This is one group who would not be able to purchase the needed equipment.
2. Remember, too, there would be many homes without the space for a 35 inch T.V.

I feel it would be more helpful to most customers if those who decide what programs are put on the air would spend some of that money to improve the type of programs they present. There is way too much violence sex and profanity now. We need more family oriented programs as well as programs (such as good game shows) that help the viewer improve his/her mind in an enjoyable way.

Sincerely,
Clarabel K. Heavner

****

K. Spake (Message e-mailed by Mrs. Heavner's daughter, Karen H. Spake)
Net27@appstate.edu

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

87-268

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 30 '96

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

From: <Satina1234@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/19/96 6:05pm
Subject: HDTV

To Whom It May Concern

It concerns the American public. Please let the evolution take place.The Broadcasters should broadcast in HDTV. The public wants it and should be given the opportunity to get it. The greed of the Government should not dictate what we have been waiting years for. HDTV is for the people.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

87-268

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
JAN 30 '96
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: <HIVISION@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/19/96 6:01pm
Subject: High Definition Television

Please let HDTV be broadcast free to the public.
We don't need more TV but at least let it look better.
I have been waiting a long time for it.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

87-268

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 30 '96

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

From: Michael Fay <MikeFay@gnn.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/20/96 9:15pm
Subject: TV's Future--Big-Digit Television--article by Frank Greve, HOUSTON CHRONICLE, 1/7/96

Reed Hundt, Chairman:

I am an end user of various telecommunications products including analog television. I am not a "neo-luddite" in the sense that I oppose the deployment of new technology. The problem that I perceived with private industry being given free or low cost opportunity to purchase or bid for the new channel spectrum while broadcasting on current analog channels: Is where will the Public Television operators, including the small state University broadcasters, find the funds to re-tool for the digital technology? Television is a passive form of communications. It does not actively encourage the viewer to participate. I view that digital communications as an educational tool will have little value for a large part of the American Public. Personal computer technology is growing but as a digital tool it has not been embraced by the total community in the Home or many places of work. The question is why should current broadcasters be given a "free lunch" when the Nation's general good and welfare standard will not receive an overall benefit measured as meeting of goals of educational literacy and or the development of a town meeting on line democracy?

The current mood in Congress is not sympathetic to the above listed argument. The intent of the majority of Congress is to permit selected private industries to reap the benefits of new technologies at the expense of others. Television broadcasters are riding on the research, development, and initial investments of other tele-communications providers. It is not correct to accept that the broadcaster has free right for dual broadcasting license because the holder has a pre-existing purchased right to run a television station facility. The FCC must insist that it supports fair competition in the granting of either dual or new licenses for digital television broadcasting. The FCC must insist on balancing the interests of the American Nation and the not the election chances of Congressmen, Senators, President, or the indirect political appointees. Mr. Hundt this may be the last chance that a regulatory agency like the FCC will have a chance to prevent a near monopoly power of one communication industry from taking full control of a nation's minds and welfare. Television as a passive form of communications is a dangerous tool of expression that in the wrong hands will destroy the tradition of the American Republic. Television broadcasting is a property right held in public trust. The public trust is the assurance that public good is protected in the broadcast's content. The government through its regulatory agencies is the landlord's collector of compensation from all broadcast holders [private]. The private broadcaster right holder is expected to pay equitable rent as he would when paying compensation for real estate that houses his business headquarters. The ultimate measure of public trust is what serves the general public the best. The FCC can not permit the broadcast rent holder to dictate what is the national American public welfare and benefits.

Sincerely Yours,

Michael L. Fay
6000 Hollister, Apt. #3113,
Houston, Texas 77040
HOME TELEPHONE: (713)939-9826
WORK TELEPHONE: (713)690-3720
Intenet Address: MikeFay@gnn.com/

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

87-268

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

JAN 30 '96

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: Randall Paris Dark <rpdark@hdvision.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/19/96 8:16pm
Subject: HDTV

I have invested 7 years of my life and millions of dollars in the development of High Definition programs. This was based on the committment the FCC gave to the Broadcasters. To change policy at this point is unfair. Let the public have their HDTV.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED 87-268

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
JAN 30 '96
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

From: wilhite <wilhite@hudnet.com>
To: FCCINFO <FCCINFO@fcc.gov>
Date: 1/19/96 7:18pm
Subject: Re: Broadcasters want HDTV at our expense! -Reply

>Your comments have been associated with the HDTV proceedings.
>
>>>> Dean Wilhite <wilhite@hudnet.com> 01/01/96 01:24pm >>>
>I was alarmed to read press accounts of the broadcasters' desire to
>render obsolete millions of television sets in our country, via the adoption
>of
>HDTV as a "new" broadcast standard. My sentiments are closely
>aligned with those of Mr. Reed Hundt, as I do not wish to "subsidize" the
>broadcasters in their endeavor to build market share and hog "public
>airwave space" for their personal gain.
> I am a Television Production/Video/Photography teacher in the public
>school system in my town in southeast Kansas. My students and I often
>discuss the lousy state of affairs with the quality of American network
>and syndicated programming. And these are the same people who
>pretend to know what's good for us? Are these not the same people
>who are under political, social and economic pressure to stop glorifying
>weird sex, dysfunctional families and crime in their quest for "market
>share [a.k.a. profits]?"
> I remember reading of the historical accounts when Britain switched
>from the old 409-line scan system in the 1940s and 1950s and went to
>their present system, and even THEY had a "grace" period (lasting into
>the 1960s if historical accounts are correct) when some "outdated" TVs
>were usable due to the regulation that broadcasters transmit TV signals
>in dual formats for a time. I believe the history books in the offices of our
>network presidents, and even the government, will bear this out (I found
>the information in magazines like Multimedia Producer and Videography).
> Please mark my sentiments in this battle. What the industry leaders
>are proposing to do, with all undue speed and without public input, is no
>less than a scheme to spur the sale of TV sets, freeze out spectrum
>competition, and serve their own interests.
> Please let me know what I can do to add my voice to this battle. I
>may not have the profits of NBC, Turner or Thomson but I'm also aware
>how enough angry people can create viable dialog!!
>
>Dean Wilhite
>Parsons High School
>Parsons, Kansas wilhite@hudnet.com
>
>
>
>
>What does "associated" with the proceedings mean?

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE