

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: TOM BLACKWELL <radio@airmail.net>
To: B7.B7(BCROSS)
Date: 4/14/98 3:00pm
Subject: Opposition to Imlay's "Request for Declaratory Ruling" dated 4-3-98

Dear Mr. Cross,

Thank you for returning my telephone call.

There is opposition to the "Request for Declaratory Ruling" filed by attorney Christopher Imlay for the ARRL. His filing was dated April 3, 1998.

I am requesting that the FCC invite comments on this from the public, so that we will have at least one month to prepare and submit the comments. I would like to be advised of the date the comments are due.

Thank you for your attention.

RM-9259
RECEIVED
THIS DATE
CANCELLED
7 1998
FCC
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the SECRETARY

RECEIVED
Apr. 1 WTC
MAY 14 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
THIS DATE
CANCELED
F.C.C.
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
RM-9234

From: "David Coursey" <david@coursey.com>
To: B7.B7(BCROSS)
Date: 4/14/98 5:23pm
Subject: Request for Declaratory Ruling

The ARRL does not represent amateur interests nearly as well as it claims to do. I strongly support comment periods on ARRL proposals.

David Coursey
N5FDL

RECEIVED
April 14 1998
MAY 14 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

W7C
RECEIVED
THIS DATE
CANCELLED
MAY 7 1998
F.C.C.
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary
RM-9259

From: "wayne zehner" <wzehner@skynet.net>
To: "Bill Cross" <bcross@fcc.gov>
Date: 4/14/98 5:24pm
Subject: ARRL request for declaratory ruling

Hi Bill,

This Email is a request for you to allow a comment period on the ARRL " Request for Declaratory Ruling" . This was filed with you on April 3, 1998. We feel that this ruling needs to come out in the light of day so all hams, not just the ARRL can comment on it. We feel that the ARRL is trying to " SPIN " this for the benefit of the league and the NFCC, NOT for the good of amateur radio in general.

73

Wayne Zehner, WA9INM
PG-18-28282

6386 Hwy 17
Plymouth, Indiana. 46563-9464

wzehner@skynet.net

RECEIVED
Apr 14 1998
MAY 14 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: alan rutz <arutz@shfmicro.com>
To: B7.B7(BCROSS)
Date: 4/14/98 5:27pm
Subject: declaratory ruling request

W7L
RECEIVED
MAY 14 1998
CANCELLED
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary
R/M 4/25/98
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I am asking that the FCC allow a comment period on a "request for declaratory ruling" concerning "good amateur practice" the FCC recently received.

As Citizens, we depend upon the FCC to allow reasonable input when rules and regulations could be changed, and it would be fair to allow for some honest input into this ruling request.

Alan Rutz, WA9GKA

RECEIVED
April 16 1998
MAY 14 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E
=

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
CANCELLED
MAY 26 1998
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

W7C

PRM-9259

From: "Harold L. Deitz" <hdeitz@ms.rose.cc.ok.us>
To: B7.B7(BCROSS)
Date: 4/24/98 11:14am
Subject: ARRL PRM

Bill,

For the past few weeks, the National Frequency Coordination Council (NFCC) members have been trying to come up with a new band plan for the Amateur six-meter band or at least part of it. They have not requested input from non-NFCC members (and there are many). Some of the NFCC membership have suggested doing away with certain radio control frequencies. Others have suggested a national APRS frequency 20 Khz. below the 50 Mhz radio control portion of six-meters. This would allow high power operation on a nation-wide basis of APRS that would probably cause unwanted interference to radio control of model aircraft. One member stated that the radio control people should incorporate a data link in thier equipment that would cause the engine to shut down and a parachute to deploy if the datalink were lost. Would this be their solution to causing such interference by their own actions?

RECEIVED
April 26
MAY 14 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

If the FCC acts favorably toward the ARRL's request, it would allow the NFCC to dictate to non-mebers (which they have refused membership because of dissenting views) what the non-member band plans would be. The NFCC claims membership of 95% of the nations coordinators and this simply is not true. The NFCC has stated goals that preclude the use of certain modes on our VHF/UHF bands (modes allowed by the FCC) and is basically an FM repeater organization regardless of what they may say.

The ARRL is working closely with the NFCC leadership to further its goals through the NFCC and vice-versa. This is not a healthy union for Amateur Radio. As such, I oppose any changes in the present status of band plans at this time. The FCC should reject the ARRL's porposal.

These statements have been my own and my not reflect the ideas or position of the Oklahoma Repeater Society, Inc. as a whole. However, they are from a frequency coordinators point of view.

Harold L. Deitz - WB9VMY
Frequency Coordinator,
Oklahoma Repeater Society, Inc.

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("board@orsi.org")

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List A B C D E