

From: Joseph D. Straubhaar <JDSTRAUB@BYUGATE.byu.edu>
To: J4.J4(dtvallotments)
Date: 3 Dec 1996 11:42a
Subject: Digital TV Standards -Reply

RECEIVED

DEC 3 1996

Dear FCC,

I wish to comment on Mass Media Docket No. 87-268.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I urge you to not give digital spectrum away free to broadcasters. Broadcasters have already benefited sufficiently in the past and currently from this public resource that they ought to pay for access to it. If this is a year to cut back on corporate welfare, this is a very good place to start. I would most support auctioning off the spectrum, but if it is to be allocated then a fair price for access should be set--perhaps with proceeds helping to pay for the subsidy required in the new universal service proposals for schools and libraries.

For whoever receives the spectrum allocation, I also urge you to define broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive their digital licenses. I would urge standards that require more children's programming and more news programming. Perhaps a more rigorous sort of trial allocation could be given, conditional on broadcasters meeting such standards in good faith.

Thank you,

Joseph Straubhaar
Professor of Communications
Brigham Young University

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

DEC 3 1996

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20541

From: Mary Emery <memery@lcsc.edu>
To: J4.J4(dtvallotments)
Date: 2 Dec 1996 7:20p
Subject: mass media docket 87-268

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear folks:

I support the benton foundation's proposal to define broadcasters' public interest obligations in the digital age before digital licenses are issued. This issue will have great impact on educational access and use of telecommunications. I am particularly concerned about affordable universal access.

mary emery lewis-clark state college lewiston, ID 83501
208/799-2460

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("benton@benton.org")

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

From: General WWW Account <www@periplum.cdinet.com>
Date: 3 Dec 1996 2:52p
Subject: Docket 87-268 Comments

RECEIVED
DEC 3 1996

clohr@loop.com (charles m. lohr) sent the following:

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I am writing to express my support for defining broadcasters' public interest obligations before being granted digital television licenses.

I support the Benton initiative to define broadcasters' public interest obligations in the digital age. ----- world television

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: charles.loop.com
Remote IP address: 206.138.119.22

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

RECEIVED

DEC 3 1996

From: <swalker@ithpost.axiohm.com>
Date: 3 Dec 1996 11:57a

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

>From swalker Tue Dec 03 11:53:00 EST 1996 remote from ithpost.axiohm.com
Received: from ithpost.axiohm.com by ithlm1.axiohm.COM; Tue, 3 Dec 1996 11:58 EST
Received: by pcgate.axiohm.com with Microsoft Mail
id <32A45C64@pcgate.axiohm.com>; Tue, 03 Dec 96 11:59:16 EST
From: Scott Walker <swalker@ithpost.axiohm.com>
To: "dtvallotments@fcc.gov" <dtvallotments@fcc.gov>
Cc: "'benton@benton.org'" <benton@benton.org>
Subject: Mass Media Docket No.87-268.
Date: Tue, 03 Dec 96 11:53:00 EST
Message-ID: <32A45C64@pcgate.axiohm.com>
Encoding: 11 TEXT
X-Mailer: Microsoft Mail V3.0
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 469

I am writing to comment on Mass Media Docket No.87-268, which concerns standards for the new digital bandwidth. I would like to request that broadcasters' public interest programming obligations be strictly defined by the FCC before allotting them digital bandwidth. I would also request that, since the digital bandwidth is public property, that it not be given to broadcasters for free, but auctioned.

Thank you,
Scott Walker
660 Stewart Ave.
Ithaca, NY 14850

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

2

From: Harry P. Lee <hplee@fishnet.net>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 12/2/96 9:46pm
Subject: Movie Industry's Complaint of the DTV Agreement

87-268
RECEIVED
DEC 3 1996
DEM
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Office of Secretary

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear FCC,

I believe the movie industry's complaint about 16:9 vs. 2:1 aspect ration is not that big of a deal. A 16:9 aspect ratio can easily accommodate a 2:1. In fact, it may be preferred anyway. Just make the picture in the upper 16:8 area, and make the lower 16:1 area for "closed captions." This way, the closed captions will not block out a portion of the picture like what we see today.

Please do not delay your approval of the DTV Standard any longer. Let's get it done!

Respectfully yours,

Harry P. Lee

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE