

Date: Thu, 5 Dec 1996 13:54:43 -0800
X-Sender: kjwolf@wheel.dcn.davis.ca.us (Unverified)
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
From: kjwolf@wheel.dcn.davis.ca.us (Kevin Wolf)
Subject: Media Docket No 87-268

Dear FCC,

Please record me as someone who is strongly in favor of ensuring that broadcasters commit to public interest obligations before they receive their digital licenses in the the nigh density tb allocations. I especially hope that they provide funds to a trust which is allocated to local television and internet communication public benefits and non-profits. They are getting to use the public air ways. They should pay handsomely for this privilege and property.

Thank you.

Kevin Wolf

Kevin Wolf
Kevin Wolf and Associates
724 N St
Davis, CA 95616
916-758-4211
fax 758-2338
kjwolf@dcn.davis.ca.us
www.dcn.davis.ca/~kjwolf

Consensus Facilitation
Internet Consulting
Water On-Line director
Strategic Planning
US Water News columnist

Date: Sun, 8 Dec 1996 00:58:22 -0800 (PST)
X-Sender: hpb@mail.well.com
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
From: hpb@well.com (Howard Perry Beckman)
Cc: benton@benton.org

Re: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268

The history of the early development of radio and television offers ample evidence that the public interest in the mass media, nominally guaranteed through licensing, cannot rest on vague promises of businesses that seek to profit from licenses.

The FCC must reverse the historic trend of relying on the opportunistic but nonbinding commitments of corporate news and entertainment media by defining the public interest obligations of broadcasters before they receive licenses for digital transmission of television signals.

The availability of digital transmission is the door to a new era in broadcasting, analogous to the opening of mass radio and TV broadcasting. The FCC should not repeat the mistakes made in the early development of these media.

* HOWARD PERRY BECKMAN
1261 via Dolorosa
San Lorenzo, California 94580 * Voice/Fax 510.533.6801

My Work on the Web

California Anti-SLAPP Project (<http://www.sirius.com/~casp>)
History 17th Miss. Inf. Regt. (<http://home.teclink.net/~moorergera/cw>)
Miss. Civil War Historical Sources (<http://home.teclink.net/~moorergera/cw>)

Date: Thu, 12 Dec 1996 08:36:02 -0700
X-Sender: pmccarty@utep.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: <dtvallotments@fcc.gov>
From: Phillip McCarty <pmccarty@utep.edu>
Subject: Digital TV
Cc: <benton@benton.org>

Regarding Mass media Docket No. 87-268:

I wish to pledge my support for defining broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive their digital licenses.

I come from a region (Southwestern US) that is largely poor. For many people of this region the idea of television, let alone digital tv, is a dream. There must be policy that takes into account that not everyone has the resources for digital tv. I am fortunate in that I do have resources and access (I work for a university) to such instruments for new communication. I ask the question, if not everyone can afford digital tv, how can the obvious impact digital tv will have on society and the ways we communicate be available to everyone? Via the schools and universities? Please do not disregard the need for everyone, in the least, to have access.

Phillip McCarty

From: Jim Wohlleb <Wohlleb@ahec.uams.edu>
To: "'FCC - digital TV'" <dtvallotments@fcc.gov>
Cc: "'Benton Foundation'" <benton@benton.org>
Subject: Mass Media Docket No.87-268
Date: Sat, 14 Dec 1996 17:39:54 -0600
Encoding: 4 TEXT

I support the Benton position. Purchasers of broadcasting rights ought to know and accept policies for the public good, including affordable access by non-profits and low-income groups, before the purchases take place.

Date: Tue, 17 Dec 1996 22:13:22 -0500 (EST)
From: General WWW Account <www@periplum.cdinet.com>
Reply-to: jwandrew@nyx.net (John W. Andrews)
Subject: Docket 87-268 Comments

jwandrew@nyx.net (John W. Andrews) sent the following:

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.

Self-Employed.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host:
Remote IP address: 198.189.25.72

Date: Mon, 23 Dec 1996 13:08:47 -0500 (EST)
From: General WWW Account <www@periplum.cdinet.com>
Reply-to: RASchutte@aol.com (Ron Schutte)
Subject: Docket 87-268 Comments

RASchutte@aol.com (Ron Schutte) sent the following:

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.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host:
Remote IP address: 152.163.237.73

Date: Tue, 7 Jan 1997 13:23:45 -0800 (PST)
From: Carol J Callen <cjc@sff.org>
To: dtvallotment@fcc.gov
cc: benton@benton.org
Subject: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268
MIME-Version: 1.0
Sender: cjc@sff.org

I would like to comment on Mass Media Docket No. 87-268: I fully support defining broadcasters' public interest obligations prior to their receiving digital licenses. It just makes good sense.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Carol J. Callen
6863 Cutting Blvd.
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Date: Tue, 07 Jan 1997 22:56:21 -0500
From: Prescott Eaton <prese@mindspring.com>
Reply-To: prese@mindspring.com
Organization: Retired
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
CC: benton@benton.org
Subject: Mass Media Docket # 87-628

I am commenting on Mass Media Docket No. 87-268. I support defining broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive their digital licenses.

From: NewOrbit@aol.com
Date: Wed, 8 Jan 1997 08:02:32 -0500 (EST)
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
cc: benton@benton.org
Subject: Digital TV Standards

RE: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268.

To the Honorable Reed Hundt and FCC Commissioners

I support careful definition by the FCC of the U.S. broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive their digital licenses. Of greatest concern to me-as a 20 year Communications professor who is active in the arena of educational telecommunications-is that the TV and radio broadcasters re-affirm in an active and engaging manner their obligations to provide programming content that is educational, informative and of "public interest, convenience and necessity."

This landmark phrase (which I require my media students to analyze) written in 1934 is ever the more significant today, as it relates to the universality of radio and TV receivers in American homes, the ease of access for all age groups, and the potential for broadcasting to go well beyond the "vast wasteland" of commercialism. As Edward R. Murrow reminded us: "TV can illuminate, can educate, and can inform us, but only as much as we can make of it; otherwise it is nothing more than wires and lights in a black box." (My students are also required to interpret Murrow's insightful comments.)

Increased channels via digital broadcasting means that we can offer a wealth of educational programming-such as telecourses, direct student instructional programming, higher and continuing education-into every American home. But the broadcasters and media conglomerates need to be held accountable that they are licensed to serve. Only through adherence to this vision can we guarantee our citizens' rights to high quality, informative, and interactive content. Perhaps then we can begin to transform the black box into a more dynamic media tool, one that we can all be proud of as part of the digital revolution.

Arlene Krebs
Author, The Distance Learning Funding Sourcebook
Professor of Communications
New York University and Marymount Manhattan College
39 Plaza Street
Brooklyn, NY 11217
NewOrbit@aol.com
<http://www.technogrants.com>

X-Sender: timgunn@nvr.org
Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Wed, 08 Jan 1997 12:19:42 -0500
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
From: "Timothy Gunn" <timgunn@nvr.org>
Subject: Mass Media document No. 87-268
Cc: benton@benton.org

I am writing in strong support of the need for a definition of broadcasters' public interest obligations before they are granted their digital licenses by the FCC. This is a comment on Mass Media Docket No. 87-268.

Sincerely,

Timothy Gunn

Tim Gunn, Executive Director
National Video Resources
73 Spring Street, Suite 606
New York, NY 10012
Phone: 212-274-8080
Fax: 212-274-8081
email: timgunn@nvr.org

Date: Wed, 8 Jan 1997 06:14:29 -0600 (CST)
X-Sender: strategc@bucky.win.bright.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
From: DJ Shrader-Smith <Strategc@win.bright.net>
Subject: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268
Cc: benton@benton.org

Please consider this my written notification of support to define a broadcaster's public interest obligations prior to receiving their digital license. Also, please consider this a request to notify us what standard these broadcasters will be asked to meet. If one is not set, I strongly suggest that there be a minimum level of involvement or public interest obligation defined.

This should be keyed to the core U.S. critical issues of education, crime prevention (especially drugs, domestic violence, etc.) In addition, there should be some element of motivation and incentive targeting teens 13-19 who may have no hope for a better future (This should include specific and detailed information on where these teens can go for help and how to acquire it-make it an appropriate and acceptable alternative for the teen-not something old guys in power parentally believe will or should work). And, make these resources and "help" accessible locally - no federal programs filled with bureaucracy, but real, caring and funded programs that have demonstrated they can bring realistic assistance to the child.

DJ

Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Wed, 8 Jan 1997 09:34:33 -0800
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
From: rlucas@mail.sdsu.edu (Robert Lucas)
Subject: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268
Cc: benton@benton.org

Sirs.

I am commenting on Mass Media Docket No. 87-268. I believe it is essential that the FCC, broadcast licenses and thoughtful, concerned citizens participate in defining, then quantifying broadcasters' public interest obligations before such broadcasters receive their licenses to do digital broadcasting.

As a broadcasting teacher, television professional and lifelong student of television, I ask that you conduct a proceeding which will help define the future of our media culture.

Thank you.

Bob Lucas

"Seriousness is the only refuge of the shallow." Oscar Wilde

Date: Wed, 8 Jan 1997 09:45:20 -0500 (EST)
X-Sender: Mawebber@eastnet.educ.ecu.edu
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
From: Mawebber@eastnet.educ.ecu.edu (Carroll Webber)
Subject: Obligations of dtv license recipients
Cc: benton@benton.org

I wish to comment on Mass Media Docket 87-268.

It seems to me that it will be important to fairly assess the public interest dimension of service to be rendered by licensees, who will be granted use of the PUBLIC airwaves. Therefore, before each petitioner receives their license, we should require them to explain how they will serve the general public, and how that service will be measured.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Carroll Webber
610 S. Elm St.
Greenville, NC 27858
919-758-4906

Date: Wed, 08 Jan 1997 09:35:57 -0500
From: "Mark P. Dessauer" <MPD@csis.org>
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
Cc: benton@benton.org
Subject: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268

I support defining broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive their digital licenses. I believe that access to our minds and culture should not be given directly to advertisers without any consideration or responsibility to the public. I look to the FCC as the one agency or referee in this coming Information Age that will defend the public's (not consumers) interest.

Thank you,

Mark Dessauer
Global Information

Comments filed at the FCC last year, the Benton Foundation called upon the Commission to conduct a proceeding to define and quantify broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive licenses to do digital broadcasting. In recent weeks, over twenty organizations and individuals have filed comments at the FCC in support of Benton's position. To add your support send an email to dtvallotments@fcc.gov. Say that you are commenting on Mass Media Docket No. 87-268. Let the FCC know you support defining broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive their digital licenses. (Please send a copy of your note to benton@benton.org as well).
The deadline for filing these comments is this Friday, January 10.

From: gaia@mtn.org
Date: Wed, 8 Jan 1997 08:27:39 -0600
X-Sender: gaia@mtn.org (Unverified)
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
Subject: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268
Cc: benton@benton.org

Dear Madame/Sir:

Please require a clear and fair definition of the "public interest" before issuing a license for digital broadcasting. This definition should include both quatity of time required as well as quality.

There is a natural conflict between the financial desires of the broadcasters and the public interest. The financial responsibilities of the management may cause public interest time to be limited and to be limited to undesirable times in deference to paid advertising unless some countervailing regulation is imposed.

The winners of licenses are using my airwaves for profit. it is not a tax on them to make these requirements. Rather, we ask that you give away only 90% of the public-right-of-way and reserve 10% of this national treasure for the public good.

Please call or write if you have questions or comments.

Sincerely,
Anthony T. Riddle

** Anthony T.Riddle, President **
** Interactive Networks, International **
** **
** Home: 718 252-1197 **
** Work: 718 855-7882 x 28 **
** **
** PO Box 40-1258 **
** Brooklyn, NY 11240-1258 **

X-Sender: nruggles@pop.tiac.net
Mime-Version: 1.0
Date: Thu, 9 Jan 1997 17:40:41 -0500
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
From: Neil Ruggles <nruggles@tiac.net>
Subject: Comment on Mass Media Docket No. 87-268
Cc: benton@benton.org, Bil Haley <hcdt@earthlink.net>

Dear Sir:

I have sent this email to urge the FCC to conduct a public hearing to define and quantify broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive licenses to do digital broadcasting. I am deeply concerned that the public share properly in the new opportunities and new bandwidth created by digital broadcasting.

Educational organizations, libraries, community groups and other not-for-profits must have a chance to explain their needs BEFORE broadcasters are granted licenses. Experience with other media shows that once digital broadcasting starts, and business procedures and business relationships are in place, it will very hard to properly provide for these public interests.

I am a management consultant with over fifteen years experience conceiving, planning, and managing interactive projects. Most recently I have specialized in using interactive media for marketing and public relations. I am also President and a former Event Planner for the New York Chapter of the International Interactive Communications Society.

Thank you for your attention to this important public interest matter.

Sincerely,

Neil Ruggles

===

IICS-NY President * iicsny@iicsny.org * www.iicsny.org

RUGGLES INTERACTIVE MEDIA

35-45 78 Street, Suite 52, Jackson Heights, NY 11372-4761
718.476.3692 * 718.426.3370 fax * nruggles@tiac.net

Strategic marketing and public relations
using phone/fax, CDROM, and the Internet

Date: Wed, 8 Jan 1997 22:46:19 -0800
X-Sender: brussell@mail.coos.or.us
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
From: "William P. [Bill] Russell" <brussell@mail.coos.or.us>
Subject: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268
Cc: benton@benton.org

This is a message to call upon the Commission to conduct a proceeding to define and quantify broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive licenses to do digital broadcasting. It seems only fair that there be a careful and measurable definition of the quid before the quo is made available.

For this reason, I endorse the Benton Foundation's comment on the DTV matter.

| William P. (Bill) Russell |
| P.O. Box 2029 |
| Bandon, OR 97411 |
| Phone: 541-347-3683 Fax: 541-347-6303 |
| brussell@mail.coos.or.us |
| www.coos.or.us/~brussell |
Where the Coquille River meets the Sea

Date: Thu, 09 Jan 1997 15:07:49 -0500
From: Kara Schiff <ctvmulti@access.digex.net>
Reply-To: ctvmulti@access.digex.net
Organization: The Multimedia Center at Comm. T.V. of Prince George's
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov
CC: sabyrne@access.digex.net, benton@benton.org
Subject: mass media docket no.87-268

This correspondence is in support of The Benton Foundation's position on Mass Media Docket No. 87-268. CTV supports defining broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive their digital licenses. This is a fair and just way to keep all interested parties informed.

Thank you,

--

Kara Schiff

~~~~~  
Multimedia Center, Project Manager  
The Multimedia Center at CTV  
<http://metro-gateway.org>  
(301) 386-8366

Date: Thu, 9 Jan 1997 16:38:37 -0500 (EST)  
From: uid no body <nobody@periplum.cdinet.com>  
Reply-to: jack@cryptnet.org (John T. Powers Jr.)  
Subject: Docket 87-268 Comments

jack@cryptnet.org (John T. Powers Jr.) sent the following:

-----  
Public interest obligations for broadcasters MUST be defined clearly  
before any licenses for digital broadcasting are awarded.

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

-----  
PowerComm Consulting

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: ppp26-son.sonnet.com  
Remote IP address: 207.212.101.46

X-Sender: carlp@mail.accessone.com  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Date: Thu, 09 Jan 1997 00:10:37 -0800  
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov  
From: "Carl B. Page" <carlp@cpsr.org>  
Subject: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268

With regard to  
    Mass Media Docket No. 87-268

I insist that defining broadcasters' public interest obligations  
before they receive their digital licenses.

These responsibilities should include free even handed political  
coverage before elections to end our policticians sickening  
dependence on large financial contributions.

Carl Page  
NORTHWESTERN DIRECTOR, COMPUTER PROFESSIONALS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILTY  
16255 NE 26 st  
BELLEVUE WA 98008

Date: Wed, 8 Jan 1997 22:46:19 -0800  
X-Sender: brussell@mail.coos.or.us  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov  
From: "William P. [Bill] Russell" <brussell@mail.coos.or.us>  
Subject: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268  
Cc: benton@benton.org

This is a message to call upon the Commission to conduct a proceeding to define and quantify broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive licenses to do digital broadcasting. It seems only fair that there be a careful and measurable definition of the quid before the quo is made available.

For this reason, I endorse the Benton Foundation's comment on the DTV matter.

-----  
| William P. (Bill) Russell |  
| P.O. Box 2029 |  
| Bandon, OR 97411 |  
| Phone: 541-347-3683 Fax: 541-347-6303 |  
| brussell@mail.coos.or.us |  
| www.coos.or.us/~brussell |  
| Where the Coquille River meets the Sea |  
-----

Date: Fri, 10 Jan 1997 11:42:12 -0500 (EST)  
From: Ruth Holder <holder@apt.org>  
Subject: Mass Media Docket No. 87-268  
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov  
cc: benton@benton.org  
MIME-Version: 1.0

In the Matter of Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact Upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service, MM Docket No. 87-268

The Alliance for Public Technology agrees with the thrust of the Comments of the Benton Foundation filed on November 22, 1996 in the above proceeding.

Enhanced public interest obligations should be required of broadcasters as a condition of allotting additional spectrum for high definition or digital television. If such public interest obligations are not defined before the spectrum is allocated, it is less likely that they can be required later.

The FCC should issue a notice for comments to take input from the public it serves as to how those public interest obligations should be defined. Requirements that are appropriate include additional hours of children's educational television programming, offering a space for public, educational and governmental programming like that provided by the nation's PEG channels on cable television systems, and providing technical assistance and training.

If this spectrum is auctioned instead of given to the broadcast industry, we urge that the public interest obligations be defined before that occurs so that potential purchasers understand the conditions of their spectrum purchase.

Sincerely,

Barbara O'Connor, Chair  
Mary Gardiner Jones, Public Policy Chair  
Henry Geller, Counsel

|                                      |  |                          |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Alliance for Public Technology (APT) |  | holder@apt.org (e-mail)  |
| 901 15th St. NW #230                 |  | 202/408-1403 (voice/TTY) |
| Washington, DC 20005                 |  | 202/408-1134 (fax)       |

For more online information about the Alliance for Public Technology:  
<http://apt.org/apt/>  
<gopher://apt.org>  
<ftp://apt.org/pub/.apt>

From: CLARKK@SERC.SI.EDU  
Date: Tue, 14 Jan 1997 10:45:54 -0500 (EST)  
To: dtvallotments@fcc.gov  
CC: benton@benton.org

I am commenting on Mass Media Docket No. 87-268. I support defining  
broadcasters' public interest obligations before they receive their digital  
licenses. It is in the public's interest to be clear about the public's interest.

Kelton L. Clark

Date: Tue, 14 Jan 1997 00:09:51 -0500 (EST)  
From: uid no body <nobody@periplum.cdinet.com>  
Reply-to: gristle@ix.netcom.com (James W. Freeze)  
Subject: Docket 87-268 Comments

gristle@ix.netcom.com (James W. Freeze) sent the following:

-----  
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.

-----  
Media Access Coalition of Central California

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: mhl-ca5-02.ix.netcom.com  
Remote IP address: 206.217.141.66

