

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RM-9259

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("timmins@penn.com")
Date: 8/3/98 10:55am
Subject: Fw: License restructuring (via ARRL Web site) -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded to the FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making#9259.

>>> "Timmins/Johnson" <timmins@penn.com> 07/24/98 06:46pm >>>
A copy of the message regarding restructuring of the Amateur radio service that I submitted to the ARRL. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Commission-in light of the streamlining of the Amateur service rules now under consideration, now is the time to secure the future of Amateur Radio for all time- Please act in the best interests of All Ham radio operators, not only the CW forever crowd. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

-----Original Message-----

From: William Timmins N3DDY <timmins@penn.com>
To: Atlantic Division <wt3p@arrl.org>
Cc: William Timmins N3DDY <timmins@penn.com>
Date: Friday, July 24, 1998 12:02 PM
Subject: License restructuring (via ARRL Web site)

RECEIVED
AUG - 3 1998
COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
300 N. BROAD ST.
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106

>From: William Timmins N3DDY timmins@penn.com
>Location: Warren, PA
>

>In light of the fact that the international requirement for morse code is 5
>wpm - would it not make sense to have the requirement for all four classes
>as 5 wpm?? Sure, differentiate between classes with more difficult levels
>of testing, maybe require on-the-air time before a person is qualified for
>a class A- but by continuing the requirements above the minimum required by
>the international regulations, you(the ARRL) are continuing the "I got
>mine, You need yours,too" mentality that has resulted in a very dangerous
>drop in the Amateur population in recent years. Face it , gentlemen- CW is
>on the way out... All the commercial/military services that have relied on
>it over the years have already, or will in the near future, phased out CW
>in favor of High speed data/satellite communications. There is a whole
>generation of potential hams out there who cut their teeth on the Internet
>and PC technology. To expect these people to devote themselves to learning
>an obviously obsolete technology is not logical. By perpetuating this old
>"I got mine" syndrome, the league may well be (inadvertently)condemning our
>beloved hobby to an uncertain future. It is time that the amateur service
>follows the rest of the world into the 21st century, and allows the growth
>that we so desperately need if we are to hang on to our bands well into the
>future.

> Please, gentlemen-
> think twice before you do this to us.
>
> Bill Timmins , N3DDY. Tech Plus since 1980
>

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RM-9259

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("mikel@urbancom.net")
Date: 8/3/98 11:30am
Subject: Oppose ARRL proposal submitted for Amateur Radio License
Restructure -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded to FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making #9259.

>>> Dinelli, Michael <mikel@urbancom.net> 07/25/98 05:43pm >>>
I oppose the changes outlined in the proposal for license restructuring presented to the FCC by the ARRL. This proposal is in my opinion contradictory to surveys conducted by the ARRL of it's members and non-member radio amateurs. My conversation with the Central division director of the ARRL suggests that this proposal was rushed by ARRL president Rod Stafford.

Morse code is an extremely viable means of communication. It requires only simple equipment, narrow bandwidth and low power to communicate great distances. A recent ABC news article states that NASA has a code key on the space shuttle, just in case. If all else fails, CW will get the job done. Radio amateurs when called upon in emergency/disaster situations must be competent in Morse for this very reason.

The ARRL also calls for the conversion of 100 kHz of CW/digital subband to phone use. As digital communication/experimentation continues to grow, more bandwidth should be allocated for these modes, not less. Digital modes also enjoy efficient, narrow bandwidths compared to voice modes.

Please do not accept the ARRL's proposal as the voice of all radio amateurs. Amateurs have a history of public service and self-policing. We administer our own license testing through volunteers. We are in constant training to become better operators. We tinker with our equipment and we hone our skills for fun, radio experimentation and for public service. Reducing the standards for radio amateurs will not serve the amateur community or those served by them.

On 31, December 1997, just hours before the British government ended Morse code monitoring of 500 kHz at shore stations, a freighter in the North Atlantic, the Bahamian M/V Oak, a 13,000 ton freighter carrying a cargo of wood sent an "SOS" using Morse code. "SOS SOS This is Oak. Position 53 16N 24 50W Stop Engine. We need assistance." The ship was in heavy seas, and the cargo had shifted. She also lost all power; and was sinking. The call was answered by a British shore station, and a Royal Air Force "Nimrod" was soon orbiting overhead. The crew abandoned the ship shortly thereafter, and was rescued.

If anything, please expect more from us, not less. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Dinelli
9423 Kolmar Ave.
Skokie, IL 60076-1321
ARS N9BOR
ARRL Life Member
FISTS # 4594

RECEIVED

AUG - 3 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

[Handwritten mark]

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RM-9259

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("whagen@NOREPLY.inreach.com")
Date: 8/3/98 11:36am
Subject: ARRL Proposal for Amateur Radio Licensing -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded to the FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making#9259.

>>> Bill <whagen@NOREPLY.inreach.com> 07/25/98 07:31pm >>>
I wish to state my desire for the FCC to adopt the Amateur Radio Licensing structure changes proposed by the ARRL.
Please adopt these proposals.

Thanks
William F. Hagen
447 Lilac Lane
Chico, CA 95926

whagen@inreach.com
kc6ufe

RECEIVED

AUG - 3 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20541

SEARCHED _____
SERIALIZED _____
INDEXED _____
FILED _____
AUG 3 1998
FBI - MEMPHIS
2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RM - 9259

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("kb4ezo@myself.com")
Date: 8/3/98 11:56am
Subject: RE: Restructuring of the Amateur Radio Service. -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded to the FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making#9259.

>>> Lee Johnson <kb4ezo@myself.com> 07/27/98 12:39am >>>
I would like to express my opposition to the proposed restructuring of the amateur radio service. I feel that this would absolutely destroy the amateur radio service. I have talked to several hams about this, including novices and tech+'s and they are even against the proposal. The ARRL does NOT represent my opinions. I also dont think that the ARRL represents the majority of the amateur community. I ask that you do not allow the ARRL's proposed restructuring to pass.

Thank you

Nathan L. Johnson

KB4EZO

RECEIVED

AUG - 3 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

9259

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("\Lyle / Penny TenPas\"@bytehead....
Date: 8/3/98 12:12pm
Subject: Fw: Regarding ARRL Amateur Licensing Proposal -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded to the FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making#9259.

>>> "Lyle / Penny TenPas" <tenpas@bytehead.com> 07/28/98 11:04am >>>

Dear Sir or Madame:

I am writing as both an American Radio Relay League (ARRL) member (#0008326614) and an Amateur Radio Operator (WE9R) to state my opposition to the ARRL's proposal to restructure the license classes for amateur radio license holders.

Several items of this proposal are particularly bothersome to me. The first is the restructuring of the existing bandplan with respect to the reduction of allocation for the CW subband. I do not feel this is in the best interest of the current and future needs of amateur radio. From the people that I deal with, I feel that the interest in CW operation is not reducing but may actually be increasing

Secondly the need for the 20 WPM CW requirement should not be reduced. 20 WPM is used as a standard for CW identification, so it makes sense that the highest class of license should be able to copy the CW Identifiers. I have other objections as well, but will keep my response brief.

I do not believe the ARRL is currently representing this on the behalf the majority of the amateur radio community or the for the good of spectrum allocation. Please note my exception to this proposal as a member of the ARRL.

RECEIVED

AUG - 3 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

9259

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("billroberts@wave.net")
Date: 8/3/98 12:16pm
Subject: Comments to the Chairman -Reply

Chairman Kennard requested that I acknowledge your comment and that it has been forwarded to the FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making#9259.

>>> Bill Roberts <billroberts@wave.net> 07/28/98 12:58am >>>
Bill Roberts (billroberts@wave.net) writes:

Dear ARRL:

The guy who thought up this simplified license structure must not be a real ham. If ARRL goes for this stupid idea, they can keep their life membership. If you think the way he thinks, we should eliminate all testing. I believe the first move is to eliminate the code, and once that is done, then eliminate the theory part. Think about it, most rigs are made in Japan and are all solid state. Who repairs their own equipment now days, and who still builds their own equipment, very few of the new amateurs would even consider the challenge. Most likely, it's a lot of the old timers who at onetime scrounged old TV sets for parts. (sound familiar guys) If we no longer need the electronics or theory anymore, just send your store bought rig back to the company for repair. Now that we don't need code or electronics, why bother with filling out the 610 form. Everyone has a social security number. Why not use the first two letters in our first name the first two letters in our last name and the last four numbers of our social security number. Walla, we are now licensed, no need to send any money to the FCC, no reason to be assigned a call, it's time to order our 1500 watt rig from the catalog. Was anyone around in the early 60's when this happened before? I recall it was a disaster called CB. Remember when there were a lot of CB rigs floating around we could buy cheap, and convert to 10 meters? Most of us had 10 meter mobiles back then.

I guess, I'm from the old school, everyone should be required to hold the novice for one year (non-renewable) to obtain their code proficiency and then be allowed to advance to the next class, after you build and have used your novice equipment for the year. (bread pans sound familiar guys) I guess I'm dreaming. I believe those who don't really want to become a ham the old fashion way, with hard work and study, should try the internet. You can buy your computer off the shelf, plug it in and your on the net. No test, no code, no theory, and no 610 to fill out. You want speed, buy a faster modem. You can email all over the world. Instant QSL cards.

Does anyone remember when the telephone company proposed the idea of doing away with ham radio so they could get our frequencies. Their plan was to place a telephone in all the radio operators homes. When you lifted the receiver it would ring any phone connected to the system at random. That was their solution for us amateurs. Makes you wonder where these guys come from. Now I'm starting to wonder who their working for.

Why would anyone want to take a great hobby, one we can be proud to a member, and turn it into something that has no tradition, no camaraderie, and no future. We took the challenge, learned the theory and mastered the code, built some of our own equipment, and passed the exams. How about those all night CW sessions

RECEIVED
AUG - 9 1998

○

running 75 watts as a novice.

I just knew the FCC would find out I was actually running 90 watts out of my Globe Chief. Why shouldn't the others do the same, what are their memories going to be?. What are they going to tell their kids, "I bought this radio thingy at a store and plugged it in." Gee Dad, your really a pro.

I believe this is nothing more than those seeking the all mighty dollar pushing for this change, it certainly has nothing to do with advancing the profession or skill of amateur radio.

73 Bill K7UF

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 204.214.126.79
Remote IP address: 204.214.126.79

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

9259

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("hrteach@swbell.net")
Date: 8/3/98 12:20pm
Subject: ARRL PROPOSAL TO CHANGE AMATEUR LICENCE STRUCTURE. -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded to the FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making#9259.

>>> HAROLD <hrteach@swbell.net> 07/28/98 02:37pm >>>
I ALONG WITH MANY OTHER OPPOSE THE CHANGES SUGGESTED BUY THE ARRL. THE CHANGES ARE JUST ANOTHER WAY THE ARRL IS TRYING TO DESTROY THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE MAJORITY OF THE AMATEUR OPERATORS AND THE FCC. THE LICENCE STRUCTURE SHOULD REMAIN AS IT IS.

THANK YOU HAROLD R. TEACHMAN JR.
RADIO OFFICER SEDGWICK
COUNTY, KS. R.A.C.E.S.

RECEIVED

AUG - 3 1998

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
AUG - 3 1993
9259

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("k4pb@mindspring.com")
Date: 8/3/98 12:26pm
Subject: Amateur Radio Licensing structure -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded to the FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making#9259.

>>> Alan Harp <k4pb@mindspring.com> 07/29/98 08:30pm >>>
My name is Alan Harp, I hold amateur radio license K4PB. I have been an amateur radio operator for about 39 years.

I am writing this as some thoughts and suggestions that changes to simplify the amateur radio licensing structure are being considered. It is reported that D'wana Terry has reported that the FCC would soon be issuing a Notice of Proposed Rule Making intended to streamline the service and eliminate unnecessary rules used in governing Amateur Radio.

The ARRL board of directors has submitted a suggested restructured service. I have read accounts of this proposal and although I am a lifetime member of the ARRL I wish to state that this proposal does not reflect my thinking on this subject.

While I realize that morse code has been deemed obsolete by our armed services and the coast guard, it is still widely used by amateur radio operators on the amateur bands. The ARRL proposal does nothing to preserve the opportunity to train novice CW operators and the high speed requirement for the EXTRA class license. The proposal appears as a step for the elimination of morse code activity altogether.

While there are those who hate the thought of learning morse code there are others who treasure it as a very useful art. It works very well between two operators who do not speak the same language. I enjoy this method of communication. Over 90% of my amateur radio activity involves the transmission of morse code. I believe that morse code ability should only be required for morse code privileges. Privileges for all other modes should be available with out passing a morse code test. This should be extended to all modes other than CW on all bands.

I believe that the current Extra and General class CW bands should be preserved for the exclusive use of those who do demonstrate morse ability at the levels that are required now.

The ARRL board of directors has submitted a suggested restructured service. I have read accounts of this proposal and although I am a lifetime member of the ARRL I wish to state that this proposal does not reflect my thinking on this subject.

While I realize that morse code has been deemed obsolete by our armed services and the coast guard, it is still widely used by amateur radio operators on the amateur bands. The ARRL proposal does nothing to preserve the opportunity to train novice CW operators and the high speed requirement for the EXTRA class license. The proposal appears as a step for the elimination of morse code activity altogether.

While there are those who hate the thought of learning morse code there are others who treasure it as a very useful art. It works very well between two operators who do not speak the same language. I enjoy this method of communication. Over 90% of my amateur radio activity involves the transmission of morse code. I believe that morse code ability should only be required for morse code privileges. Privileges for all other modes should be available with out passing a morse code test. This should be extended to all modes other

2

than CW on all bands.

I believe that the current Extra and General class CW bands should be preserved for the exclusive use of those who do demonstrate morse ability at the levels that are required now.

The ARRL proposal eliminates the novice CW sub bands. I don't agree with this. These bands are training bands for novice CW operators, It is a place for them to make mistakes, and learn. Seasoned CW operators go elsewhere to converse in higher speeds but may visit the band to train new hams at slow speeds. With out these bands it will be much more difficult for a new ham to learn CW skills. Newly licensed CW operators will be intimidated by the skilled operators operating around them and not even try to communicate if they are forced to share the band with more skilled operators.

In my view what has happened to the novice license in the past has been detrimental. When privileges such as the 10meter SSB band and packet radio were added, questions had to be added to the test making it more difficult to achieve.

I feel that the novice license should be restored as a CW only license with the simplest test of theory and rules & regulations possible. Because it would conflict with the "No Code license" I feel that the 5wpm code test could be omitted. The operator would be responsible for learning the code himself. There is a cliché "five words per minute is no code". Lets declare the 5wpm code test superficial and drop the test entirely.

The next level of written test could be for a license that would cover all privileges other than the higher speed CW. Many will argue that there should be several levels of expertise reflected in different licenses but I fear that is a luxury that may not be possible within the objectives of the FCC.

I do not want to stand in anyone's way who wants the telephony and modes from enjoying amateur radio with the exception of CW privileges. The CW requirement should only be applied to CW privileges. All other privileges should be available to no-code licensees.

I do feel that the present CW requirements should stand. CW privileges should be given by endorsements to the basic no-code amateur license. There should be two CW endorsements, 13wpm and 20wpm. The current extra CW bands should be reserved for the 20wpm endorsement.

I see this as four different licenses. Two written tests, two CW tests. The written tests would be for Novice and General. The General class licensee can receive the CW endorsements. This would give us Novice, No-code General, 13wpm General and 20wpm General. In all cases tests would be considered minimum requirements for license. The names of the license are not important. They could be Class A, Class B or some other pattern.

This would hopefully simplify the licensing structure and record keeping for the FCC. Higher technical endorsements could be offered by organizations such as the ARRL but would have no additional privilege value.

Thank you for reading this. I hope you find this helpful in considering decisions about the future of our hobby.

Alan Harp K4PB
8113 Belgium Dr

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED
156 - 3 1393
9259

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("mmusiel@kwmutl.com")
Date: 8/3/98 12:00pm
Subject: Regarding ARRL Licensing Proposal -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded to the FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making#9259.

>>> "Michael J. Musiel" <muth012@excel.net> 07/27/98 10:49am >>>
To whom It May Concern,

I wish to enter a comment regarding the simplified licensing proposal filed by the ARRL. I would like to be on record as being wholly opposed to this proposal as it stands. The ARRL did not go out of its way to tell members of this proposal, nor had it given much time for comment from its members before it filed this proposal with the FCC. They certainly do not represent me regarding this issue.

I understand that things must change to keep the license applications active, but handing over the Extra Class CW segments to hams who pass a test slower than the current General Class requirements is a slam to every ham who worked hard to pass their 20 wpm test. Please keep the testing requirements for the Extra Class, or Class A license (as the ARRL proposes) as is. The ARRL proposal will still open the HF bands to many who could not get on the HF bands in the past, but please respect those who did take the trouble and work through the entire incentive licensing program (that the ARRL fought so hard for in the first place).

Thank you for your time,

Michael J. Musiel K9SJ

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

9279

From: Mary Riddick
To: FCCMAIL.SMTPNLM("W4cz@aol.com")
Date: 8/3/98 12:41pm
Subject: Restructuring of Amateur Radio -Reply

Your comment has been forwarded to the FCC, Secretary's Office for association with Rule Making#9259.

>>> <W4cz@aol.com> 07/30/98 02:51pm >>>
Subj: Restructuring
Date: 98-07-30 14:42:20 EDT
From: W4cz
To: n4mm@arrl.org

Part 97.103
FCC - 8 1003

TO: John N4MM

from your comments you say:

<<Over the past several years, the FCC has received many requests from the Amateur Radio population in general to simplify and restructure the Amateur Radio licensing system. Many feel that the present system has outlived its usefulness, has been overtaken by events and in today's high tech world is too heavily biased on CW proficiency. >>

Like.....YEA man! Likelet's us be like CBers!

I don't buy "the FCC has received many 'requests' from the Amateur Radio population in general". These so called 'requests' are LARGELY and PROBABLY TOTALLY from those "waiver weenies" that are too darn LAZY to WORK and STUDY to upgrade! The ONLY replies I get, that are negative to the idea of leaving the licensing somewhat like it is, are from Techs and Tech+'s and some Generals, when you check their callsign for class of license! Is that some kind of a surprise? However, there are replies from some in these classes that say "leave it like it is!". The ONLY REAL way for the FCC to get an HONEST opinion is to mail out a question paper to all licensed operators and classify the answers by the class of amateur radio licenses! That is the ONLY way to tell the TRUE feelings!

It is totally preposterous to think that ideas coming from lower classes of amateur licenses COULD or WOULD influence what the FCC does.

That's like STUDENT pilots telling the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA),hey, these here Private, Commercial, and Air Transport Pilots qualifications are just too stiff! I CAN'T learn this stuff, all I want to do is fly a 747 !....so you need to lower your standards! BULL CRAP!

My original statement still stands: "Is the FAA also going to let "Student" pilots be "Flight Instructors" without FIRST "UPGRADING" to Private Pilot, and then on to the Commercial Pilot license with Instrument rating! Will the FAA then drop this MANDATORY UPGRADE system and let student pilots fly Boeing 747's without FIRST "UPGRADING" to Private Pilot, then to Commercial Pilot with Instrument rating and then on to Airline Transport Pilots license with aircraft type ratings!

Someone in the FCC and ARRL needs to get their heads screwed on straight! They are not living in the REAL WORLD....only Disneyland!

It looks like the FCC is the REAL villain on this issue, perhaps in the hidden effort to SELL off our frequencies. A massive effort towards CONGRESS and SENATE may be our only hope, ESPECIALLY if the ARRL does not know which end is UP!

William D. Price W4CZ

2

Life Member ARRL, QCWA, AMSAT, OOTC &
Volunteer Examiner