

at Docket No. 98-143

FCC MAIL ROOM

OCT 23 1998
RECEIVED

RECEIVED
OCT 26 5 13 PM '98
PRIVATE MAILERS

19 October 1998

George Hall F6FIE
426 Greenwood Beach
Tiburon CA 94920

Office of The FCC
1919 M St NW 222
Washington DC 20554



Commissioners:

I have held a General Class amateur license since 1957, and I am strongly opposed to various proposals that would do away with this classification. At one time this was the primary amateur classification; the other classes have been added one at a time since the early 50s. The best plan, if a reduction in classifications is called for, would be a rollback to a three-license structure: Extra Class with a 20-word-per-minute code requirement; General Class with 13 words; and Technician Class with five words and restricted bands.

Downgrading the 100,000-plus General Class holders would be foolish and unwarranted. Please note my strong opposition to this ridiculous and unnecessary idea.

Thank you,

George Hall W6FIE

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

RECEIVED

wt Docket No 98-143

William C. Houlihan **OCT 23 1998**
(619) 295-4990

1847 Alta Mira Place
San Diego, CA 92103

FCC MAIL ROOM

October 19, 1998

Federal Communications Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 "M" Street N.W.
Washington D.C. 20554

Re: Contemplated changes to Ham Radio Licensing

I believe that the requirement for demonstrated code proficiency should be eliminated, at best, or severely reduced. In particular there should be no code requirement for marine use.

Thank you for taking time to solicit input from the Ham radio community.

Sincerely,



William C. Houlihan
KD6SPI

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____ *0*

RECEIVED

at Docket No. 98-143

OCT 23 1998

October 15, 1998

To **FCC MAIL ROOM**

The Federal Communications Commission
1919 M ST. NW.
Washington, D.C.

I may have a possible solution to the problem of License Restructuring for Amateur Radio. I would leave license classifications and band assignments for General and above as they are presently assigned. The only possible change I would consider is a possible reduction in Morse Code to 10-12 wpm for General and 17-18 wpm for Extra Class.

The major changes I would make are as follows.

- 1) Eliminate the Novice, Technician and Technician Plus Licenses.
- 2) Grandfather the three licenses into a new Technician License.
- 3) Retain the current HF privileges for the Novice License but lower the power level to 100 watts. The current codeless Technicians would have to learn the code or remain of VHF. Its their choice.
- 4) For the new Technician License a 5 wpm code test would be required. This would do two things. 1) It would reduce the number of "CB" types now proliferating the VHF bands. 2) It would reduce or eliminate a lot of the applicants for disability waivers. Thus, they would have to work to earn the privilege and would not apply. No one should be exempt from this requirement.
- 5) For those who wish to obtain higher privileges they would then fall into the current licensing requirements. The 5 wpm code would make it easier to attain higher license if they so desire. Either way they would have to learn the code.

Referencing the disability waiver.

I would eliminate the waiver completely. DO NOT get the doctors involved. **THEY ARE THE PROBLEM.** They have no knowledge of what it takes to learn the code. VEs can do the same with a deeper insight into the problem.

In place of the waiver, I propose a team of 3 VEs. The team would have the following authority.

- 1) Grant or deny waivers requests.
- 2) Be allowed to use alternate means of adaptive testing.
- 3) Require each applicant to take a code test at the required code speed. This would eliminate the "lazy" individuals wanting to take the easy route.

Most handicapped people do not want or expect any favors. Given the opportunity using adaptive methods most handicapped people would not hesitate to take the test and would pass. Where an individual is truly handicapped it will be obvious to the VE team that a waiver may be needed.

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Given this authority, VEs would not knowingly grant waivers and jeopardize their licenses due to misconduct. Each team member would act as a check and balance on the others. Any waivers would require a short explanation on why the waiver was granted or denied. This may require a little time and effort on the part of the VEs. It would go a long ways toward solving the problem. I do not think many VEs would object.

An excellent article on adaptive code testing may be found in World Radio Magazine, October 1998 issue, Handiham Column.

Sincerely:



Roger R. Schroeder WB7DIW

P.S. My comments are being filed on paper only without a diskette, since it is not feasible for me to include a diskette. I do not own a computer.