

9682

From: Your Real Name <username@exis.net>
To: B7.B7(smagnott)
Date: 5/10/96 11:06am
Subject: VHF Licensing

To whom it may concern

I think that the past fee of \$75.00 is too steep. You can buy a VHF radio for a few dollars more. This has caused the already overburdened Coast Guard to be responsible for enforcement, and increased danger because the Coast Guard was loath to rescue non-licensed VHF operators.

As to whether you charge a smaller amount or no amount at all, I would prefer you not charge any amount. In the past I have paid for CB licenses, for a model plane radio license and currently hold a HAM license.

Paul F. Wilson
KD4CXF pwilson@exis.net

MAY 10 '96

RECEIVED

No. of copies rec'd
List A B C D E

1



BOAT/U.S.

Boat Owners Association of The United States

RECEIVED

Washington National Headquarters
880 South Pickett Street, Alexandria, VA 22304

May 9, 1996

MAY 10 1996 823-9550

Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20554

FCC MAIL ROOM
RE: Federal Register Notice
WY Docket No. 96-82

As an organization of more than 500,000 recreational boat owners, we would like to comment upon the Commission's Proposed Rule pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to amend the Commission's rules regarding ship radio stations and to remove the individual radio licensing requirements and to authorize by rule the operation of radio equipment on recreational vessels.

We strongly support the Commission's proposed rule. We have supported de-licensing of recreational boats since it was first proposed in Congress last year as a means of eliminating the \$115, and later \$75, "user fee" for owners of VHF marine radios aboard recreational boats. The reasons we support the proposed rule and the elimination of the user fees for recreational boats are as follows:

- We believe the license fee has had an adverse impact on boating safety by actively discouraging many boaters of modest means to simply do without a radio because of the added cost. The \$115 fee actually doubled the cost of having a radio, which can be purchased for \$120 or less.
- Without a two-way radio on board a boat, a skipper cannot call for help in an emergency, listen to weather forecasts such as severe storm warnings, or hear another vessel's call for help.
- Since the fees went into effect, we have been deluged with calls and letters from boaters who have indicated they will simply do without a radio rather than pay the fee or will simply not license the radio, but keep one on board for emergency use only.
- Fewer radios on the water will increase costs for search and rescue operations for the U.S. Coast Guard and state marine police. The largest percentage of Coast Guard SAR cases involve recreational boats.
- The time, expense and staffing required of the Commission for processing licensing paperwork for voluntarily equipped recreational boats could be better directed towards enforcement of proper use of the VHF frequency and to other more critical activities.

For the above reasons, we believe the Commission has taken the proper course in seeking to eliminate the burden both upon its own resources and upon the boating public. While we wholly support the elimination to individual licenses, we ask that the Commission bolster its commitment to police the airwaves, through its own field offices and/or through an agreement with the Coast Guard to maintain the proper use of the VHF marine frequencies for distress, safety, weather and other necessary communications. We believe its extremely important to the safety of 12 million recreational vessels that the marine band not deteriorate into a citizens band because of lack of licensing and diminished enforcement.

Thank you for the speedy work on this rulemaking and for considering our comments.

Sincerely yours,

Elaine Dickinson

Elaine Dickinson
Government Affairs

FCC MAIL ROOM
L101 ABC DE 0