EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Late filed comments
WT Docket No. 95-102

RECEIVED
NOV - 8 1996
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

From: <bobcat@webtv.net>
To: A7.A7(jwise)
Date: 11/1/96 6:24pm
Subject: According to Ness Comments

Todd D. Dugdale (bobcat@webtv.net) writes:

I am a GMRS licensee, and i have comments regarding the FRS. The FRS offers absolutely nothing to the public that they can't get on a Gmrs radio, and he difference in cost is negligible. In fact, if there was this HUGE demand for this kind of service, as the industry alleges, then it would already have been fulfilled by the GMRS market. There is no reason whatsoever to offer 14(!) channels, unless it is to undermine the present gmrs service. Do you REALLY think that there will be SO MANY people in a short-range service area, using CTCSS, all talking AT THE SAME TIME? This kind of thing could have been handled a number of ways using already existing services, such as the 49 Mhz band or 900 Mhz band. As a camper, hiker, hunter, biker, etc. I can assure you I have always found CB(27Mhz) radios to do nicely, especially since you are likely to be out of urban areas. By flooding GMRS frequencies with these Ill-conceived squawk boxes you are depriving clubs of the repeaters they need to carry crowd control, logistics, and establish locations to meet. I hear the kind of people that you purport to be serving every day on GMRS, and by allowing these devices to coverup repeaters you will make large areas forced to hear otherwise mundane and private conversations, while denying licensed users the chance to use the repeater time they PAY for. The only people who will happy with this is the people who sell these FRS units, and only until people bring them back for a refund. If you are going to speak directly from the pocket of the industry, then at least look out for their interests.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: proxy-3.isp.alma.webtv.net
Remote IP address: 205.180.153.23

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE