

"In the matter of 1998 biennial Regulatory Review - Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Amateur Service Rules, FCC WT Docket 98-14" **RECEIVED**

OCT 6 1998

FCC MAIL ROOM

To whom it may concern:

I think you are way off base with your proposal to change the rules concerning amateur radio. I agree there is an overlap of privileges of the Novice, tech., and tech. plus. classes of licenses but to drop the 5 wpm level and go to a beginning CW test of 10-13 wpm is an even greater discouragement to someone thinking of becoming a ham. Also you say that there will be no new Novice, tech., and tech. Plus licenses, what will happen to the ones that are already licensed at these levels? Will they lose that portion of the HF bands that they are authorized to use now?

I think a much better idea would be to go ~~to~~ to the ARL plan which ~~to~~ takes these things into account. It narrows the amateur classes down to few but it doesn't cause anyone to lose privileges. It also leaves it more attractive to the prospective ham to get their license.

In Summary, I would just like to say that I think the FCC plan would cause the demise of amateur radio over a period of years; whereas, I think the ARL plan, although not perfect is a definite step in the right direction, I would like for you to take a long hard look at the ARL plan to see if you don't think it would work better.

Thank you
William H. Jolly
NØRTI

William H. Jolly, DDS. NØRTI
1415 South Morris
Mexico, Mo. 65265
Ph. 573-581-0511

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF
COMMISSIONER
SUSAN NESS

RECEIVED

OCT 5 1998

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

WT Docket 98-143

2 Oct. 1998

FCC MAIL ROOM

FCC SECRETARY, Magalie Roman Salas
Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission
1919 "M" Street N.W., Room 222,
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the matter of 1998 biennial Regulatory Review -- Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Amateur Service Rules, FCC WT Docket 98-143:

RECEIVED
OCT 10 1998

It's simple, have two classes that operators can be licensed in. Have a General class, and an Advanced class, both based on a difficult theory test. The theory test I had to take could have been passed by a smart six-year old child. People who have a General class license, in my plan, should know an awesome amount about what goes on behind their control panel. People who hold an advanced class should know even more, and prove it on a test AFTER holding a General class three years. Some will not pass a difficult radio-theory test the first time, and maybe not the second time, but it will keep Amateur Radio from becoming CB radio.

Oct As for Code, many smart people don't have the time to learn a new language. At one time in Amateur history it was necessary, now it should be just an option -- at whatever speed.

As for enforcement policies, each operator should have 'easy-mail' cards supplied by the ARRL. If an offender can be identified, and three or more cards come in to the FCC concerning said offender, official inquiry should then be made. The complaint must include the complainant's call-letters.

Thank you for your time
and consideration,

Joe Gambino
N2UYY
Joe Gambino

808 11th Street,

West Babylon, LI, NY,

11704

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

18 Nottingham Dr.
Athens, OH 45701
(740) 592-2371
September 29, 1998

RECEIVED
OCT 6 1998
FCC

Magalie Roman Salas, Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street N. W.
Room 222,
Washington, DC 20554

Re: in the matter of 1998 biennial regulatory review--AMENDMENT OF PART 97 OF
THE COMMISSION'S AMATEUR SERVICE RULES, FCC WT DOCKET 98-143.

Gentlemen and Ladies:

I have read the FCC proposal for the restructuring of the amateur radio bands. First, I believe that a Morse Code requirement is needed for access to the HF bands, and the General Class License. Second, proficiency in receiving Morse Code to attain a General Class License need only be five words per minute. Third, greater proficiency in receiving Morse Code would be necessary for the Advanced Class License, and this should be 12 words per minute, and this should be the highest level of Morse Code proficiency needed. These levels of Morse Code proficiency are similar to those of other developed nations.

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF
COMMISSIONER
SUSAN WESS
9/29/98

With regard to the number and classes of licenses, four is certainly a good number. However, I believe the proposal offered by the American Radio Relay League (ARRL) to be much more equitable in that no licensee loses any privileges. Under that proposal Extra Class licensees become Class A; Advanced Class licensees become Class B; Novice, Technician Plus, and General licensees become Class C, and are granted extensive HF privileges, and Technician licensees become Class D. All in all, I must say that the ARRL proposal for restructuring is well thought out, leaves few questions unanswered, and no one with a loss of privileges. I recommend adopting this proposal because it addresses the concerns that I have mentioned above, e.g., Morse Code requirement, Morse Code proficiency levels, and maintaining/improving current radio operating privileges.

Sincerely,

John W. McCutcheon
John W. McCutcheon
N8XWO

0

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RECEIVED

OCT 8 1998

FCC MAIL ROOM

**Laird Wilcox
KB0RDL
PO Box 2047
Olathe, KS 66051**

30 September 1998

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF
COMMISSIONER
SUSAN HESS

**9
8
Secretary
Magalic Roman Salas
Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St., NW, Room 222
Washington, DC 20554**

Oct
Dear Sir/Madam:

In the matter of 1998 biennial Regulatory Review - Amendment of Part 97 of the Commissions Amateur Service Rules, FCC WT Docket 98-143, I would like to offer the following comments:

I think that Morse Code proficiency is an antiquated and outdated require-ment for the licensing of amateur radio operators of any class. It is no longer objectively necessary for any purpose. It's only function is to keep people out of amateur radio.

I also think the test requirements for the licensing of amateurs in the technician and general class are too strict. Amateur radio operators should be tested on what is actually necessary to know, such as the FCC rules, good operating practices, and so on. The present testing practices were initiated when many amateurs actually built their own radios and almost nobody does that anymore. Electronics expertise of the level in the present tests is not necessary. It's only function is to keep people out of amateur radio.

I hope the Commission will consider these views and bring the Amateur Radio service into the 21st Century.

Sincerely,

Laird Wilcox