

JAMES F. S. EPPRIGHT, K5RX
2701 Eppright Rd.
Little Elm, Texas 75068

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: NPRM 16-239

I oppose NPRM 16-239.

(All of my comments apply to HF communications, but not all should be taken to apply to VHF/UHF communications.)

Among other things, it undoubtedly will result in many persons, whether or not holding amateur radio licenses, using amateur radio frequencies for commercial and terrorist and other nefarious and illegal uses which would likely go undetected. The FCC relies heavily on self-monitoring by amateur radio operators which imposes no cost on the FCC. Radio amateurs' ability to monitor the sorts of communications which would result from adoption of this rule would be greatly hampered and rendered largely insignificant. It cannot be seriously contended people would not take advantage a poorly guarded resource. Therefore, under such circumstances, it would recklessly endanger our security for the FCC to not devote substantial new resources to monitoring transmissions in the amateur radio bands.

While in some instances emergency communications capabilities might be minimally enhanced, the likelihood of emergencies occurring would be increased by adoption of this rule, even with greatly increased resources being devoted by the FCC to monitoring of the amateur radio bands. Preventing an emergency is preferable to merely responding to one after the fact. A potential failure of the FCC to prevent an emergency is unsettling.

Although perhaps technically legal, using amateur radio for free email or as a private radio network is not in the spirit of amateur radio. There are commercial providers of these services.

I have read comments asserting if ARQ digital use were to be interrupted, or even come to temporary halt, it would have a devastating effect of the safety and well-being of US cruisers around the world. Any boater relying on amateur radio as his primary means of being safe is tragically misguided. If there are not other better-suited communications channels and services available to boaters (which, of course, there are), then the FCC should re-examine its maritime-related regulations.

Most amateur high frequency (HF) radio operators use narrow bandwidth modes. With

the very limited HF spectrum available to amateur radio operators, only narrow bandwidth modes should be allowed on HF. In any event, narrow bandwidth users must be protected and be able to readily identify the transmissions of other users. The proposed rule does not take into account these factors.

If non-narrow bandwidth transmission modes are to be allowed, then such modes should be restricted by frequency segments as well as bandwidth. When engaged in or attempting international communications, I have often experience interference from broadband transmissions. Fostering international goodwill being one of the traditional bases of amateur radio, this should not be taken lightly.

Construction and operation of an HF amateur radio station has become very difficult in for most radio amateurs due to a number of factors. Among them are, e.g., (1) private restrictive covenants applicable to nearly all new residential construction as well as many older housing developments, (2) municipal restrictions on antennas and (3) widespread sources of manmade interference such as consumer electronic and lighting devices. Increased HF frequency usage caused by the sort of communications allowed under the proposed rule would add to the difficulties.

That there might be a scintilla of benefit to emergency communications by adoption of the rule does not offset the detrimental results its adoption would entail.

Sincerely,

/s/James F. S. Eppright