
Subject: legal alternative route for lack of support
Posted by [Fred Bloggs](#) on Mon, 17 Oct 2005 15:23:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gt;
> Jimmy
>
>
>I can't believe this is still an issue.

<http://www.exetools.com/07-2001.htm>

Check out anti-pace universalYou leave tomorrow! ;-)

David.

DJ wrote:

>me too. I will be going down to Austin in the near future. I called
> Neve in Wimberley and talked to the manager (not Rupert) about a month ago.
> He told me I could come out there and see the place. I'm going to ask some
> questions. It's about an hour south of Austin.

>
>
>
> "Dave(EK Sound)" <audioguy_nospam_@shaw.ca> wrote in message
> news:43533a80\$1@linux...

>
>>Test tapes were recorded at low levels (185-200nWB) on low
>>print tape for this exact reason... to maintain frequency
>>response over time. Taking a roll of 250 or 456 to the edge
>>of its retentivity will produce significant print in just 1
>>day. The finer domains will easily realign to this higher
>>level changing the frequency response of the recorded
>>material... hence my suggestion to get it transfered as soon
>>as possible.

>>
>>Regarding the Portico... I still don't see how having a tape
>>head circuit in the audio path would emulate the tape
>>transfer characteristics of "actual tape". I would love to
>>sit down with Rupert and discuss how he gets it to do this! :-)

>>
>>David.

>>
>>gene lennon wrote:

>>
>>>"W. Mark Wilson" <wmarkwilson@verizon.net> wrote:
>>>

>>>
>>>>I've read numerous times that tape holds it's broadest freq and dynamics
>>>
>>>for
>>>
>>>
>>>>about 5 seconds a
