

ORIGINAL
FILE

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

FCC MAIL SECTION

DEC 23 2 39 PM '91

RECEIVED BY

RM-7869

RECEIVED

DEC 24 1991

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

In the Matter of: >
Amendment of Part 97 of the >
Commission's Rules Governing >
Amateur Radio Services >
Regarding Repeater and >
Auxiliary Operation in the >
1.25 Meter Band >

To: The Commission

IN SUPPORT OF RULE MAKING

I, David G. Gutierrez, WA6PMX, hereby respectfully submit my request to the Federal Communications Commission to take action on the Petition For Rule Making, RM-7869, as submitted by the American Radio Relay League.

I have been an active user of the 1.25 Meter Band for many years and I was very saddened when we lost 40% of our band. It is my strong opinion that this loss should be fairly distributed among all user groups using the band; no one user group should lose everything and no one user group should lose nothing.

The new national 1.25 band plan has 150 kHz for weak signal operations. This segment is less than half the size of the weak signal segments on our other VHF bands and it is a reduction of 350 kHz from what we had before we lost 40% of our band.

075

In southern California, a new local band plan was adopted after we lost 40% of our band. This new local band plan allocated only 10 kHz for weak signal operation and placed the allocation right next to ~~the 10 kHz weak signal~~ repeater allocation completely ignoring

many people and I keep hearing the phrase "The needs of the many
outweigh the needs of the few." But they seem to forget that the

users, like me, with equally expensive radio equipment that will have no where to operate. Since the weak signal allocation has decrease 350 kHz, it is reasonable to request the repeater allocation to decrease 150 kHz.

In a related, but local issue, it does not seem reasonable to request that repeaters that just happen to be allocated in the new weak signal allocation ~~should lose their allocation and all the other repeaters in the 1.25 Meter Band not be affected.~~ The local frequency coordinator should devise a method of fairly and impartially distributing the loss of repeater pairs among all the repeaters. Hopefully, this will be done by the local frequency coordinator since it is a local issue.

I am now convinced that only through the force of law will we be able to have a weak signal allocation in southern California. It seems clear that the local frequency coordinator is not going to decrease the repeater allocation voluntarily or accommodate the weak signal community. I feel that RM-7869 is equitable and I support it because it is needed here, in southern California, more than anywhere else.

Respectfully Submitted,
20 December 1991


David G. Gutierrez, WA6PMX
5221 Del Norte Circle
La Palma, CA. 90623-2206
(714) 220-1777