

ORIGINAL

99-325

From: "Roger Moore" <rmoore@teleport.com>  
To: <mcopps@fcc.gov>  
Date: 4/11/02 2:08PM  
Subject: IBOC

Mr. Copps,

I am sending you this email to let you know that I do not support the efforts to implement IBOC radio regulations. I don't believe this would be the best for the American people.

Do not pass the regulations that would restrict the broadcasting of AM and FM stations.

Thank you for reading this email.

Roger Moore

RECEIVED

APR 26 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

ORIGINAL

99-325

**From:** "Ted Trujillo" <nedcarla@spinn.net>  
**To:** <mcopps@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 4/12/02 8:53PM  
**Subject:** IBOC

DEAR MR. COPPS,

NO IBOC.

THANK YOU  
TED TRUJILLO

**RECEIVED**

APR 26 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
ORIGINAL

99-325

**From:** "Lisa Brunner" <l.brunner@verizon.net>  
**To:** <mcopps@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 4/12/02 9:28PM  
**Subject:** IBOC Proposal

Mr. Copps,

Please don't support the implementation of current proposals for IBOC digital radio. I don't believe it is in the best interest of the radio listening American public. The value of what comes into a person's world through radio can only be measured it's TRUTH. Having better technical reception of twisted truth and lies is no benefit.

Thank you.  
Respectfully,

Lisa Brunner  
Kenewick, WA 99337

**RECEIVED**

APR 26 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd  
List ABCDE

2

**From:** Glenn Martin <ghmsm94110@yahoo.com>  
**To:** <mcopps@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 3/21/02 2:09PM  
**Subject:** Docket MM 99-325 (IBOC Digitalization)

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

99-325

ORIGINAL

To: The Federal Communications Commission

From: Glenn H. Martin

RE: Docket MM 99-325 (IBOC Digitalization)

Dear Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

I am an avid listener of small stations KPOO and KUSF in San Francisco. I have been through a struggle to save KPFA and the Pacifica Foundation. I ask the FCC not to force the market, let us decide if digital radio is worth the sacrifice in money, station ownership and programming values! No forced prohibition of analog FM, please!

I am filing these Reply Comments in support of THE VIRGINIA CENTER FOR THE PUBLIC PRESS. Like them, and others, I am opposed to implementation of In Band On Channel (IBOC) Digitalization. IBOC could displace both aspiring stations, such as listed above, and established stations as well.

I urge the Commission to proceed with the Eureka-147 alternative Digitalization technology, which would avoid the displacement problem. Even then, of course, the Eureka-147 technology should first be tested and evaluated as thoroughly as the IBOC technology has been.

In no event should IBOC Digitalization be adopted without full and complete testing and evaluation of the less disruptive Eureka-147 Digitalization technology.

Sincerely,

Glenn H. Martin  
3035 23rd Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110

Do You Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Movies - coverage of the 74th Academy Awards.  
<http://movies.yahoo.com/>

RECEIVED

APR 26 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

99-325

**From:** "Jan Harris" <thankfuljan@hotmail.com>  
**To:** <mcopps@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 4/12/02 3:10PM  
**Subject:** IBOC

ORIGINAL

PLEASE - JUST SAY "NO" TO IBOC!!!!

tHANK YOU,  
JL Harris

---

Join the world's largest e-mail service with MSN Hotmail.  
<http://www.hotmail.com>

RECEIVED

APR 26 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE

---

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED  
ORIGINAL

99-325

**From:** John Chidester <chiptester@cybermesa.com>  
**To:** <mcopps@fcc.gov>  
**Date:** 4/10/02 10:20PM  
**Subject:** IBOC

I am writing this e mail in reference to the proposed IBOC standard.

I feel that the system being proposed may not be in the best interests of the United States, The Broadcast Industry or the 'consumer'. Here's my thinking.

First of all, Since communications is one of the main defenses of our (or any) country, to switch to IBOC would mean, if I understand correctly, I would no longer be able to throw together a few parts (or make a few parts, then throw them together) and make a receiver which I would be able to listen to. Instead, I'd have to purchase PROPRIETARY Circuits, get current technical information, have the equipment available to connect the circuit (surface mount soldering/reworking station). All of which may or would be unavailable in the event of an emergency or attack. Currently, I could make most of the required parts with 'junk' and minerals in abundance to be able to 'tune in' to a radio station.. Although this is not a primary concern, it is a possibility... I like the idea of someone being able to build something if they need to.

I also mentioned that I didn't think it would be good for the broadcast industry... The licensing fees for the use of this technology could amount to substantial financial outlays for all broadcasters which at least in small markets (not owned by the mega groups for the most part) could eliminate profitability or at the least hurt stations financially. Additionally, as I understand it, Ibiquity Corporation would own all the rights to this technology. Doesn't that amount to a monopoly? If the FCC approves the proposal, wouldn't that be a federally mandated monopoly? (Anyone owning a radio station would be required to go the IBOC standard whose soul licensing company is Ibiquity). I honestly don't know... I'd appreciate understanding this better.

What's going to happen to the spectrum after everyone goes IBOC?  
There's going to be some unused space - whose is it?

I can't see how the consumer is going to benefit either, yes I know the audio quality is supposed to improve and coverage is supposedly better. I have been in the radio industry for 20+ yrs and have seen 'improvements' made here create problems there. Some things improve this aspect or that, but for the most part it's a trade off - a little better of this for a little less of that... etc. I suggest that we haven't found the tradeoffs yet, but I'm certain they are there.

Thanks for taking the time for my e mail & being there doing a tough job with excellence.

John Chidester

**RECEIVED**

APR 26 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARYNo. of Copies rec'd 2  
List ABCDE