

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED
98-143

From: "Chris Terkla" <cterkla@together.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(FCCINFO)
Date: Fri, Oct 30, 1998 3:57 AM
Subject: For the WTB - Amateur Licensing...

Dear Sirs/Ms,

I am writing to express my displeasure. Recently I was able to upgrade to Extra Class on my Amateur Radio License. Because of this upgrade I applied for a Vanity Callsign through your program. Well as it happened the call I wished to put in for was available, which was W1AU. I was eligible to put in for the call which became available on 9/21 on 9/29. Good odds I thought.

Well the callsign was issued yesterday. I was very disappointed as the call sign was not issued to a person from Zone 1. It was not even issued to an individual but rather to a club. I believe this to be poor policy and unfair. A club in Merced, California, clearly Zone 6, whose trustee's callsign was W7WN, whose Club name has nothing to do with the callsign they have taken, has deprived an eligible fellow ham from obtaining the callsign he desires. Had I lost to a fellow region 1 individual, or even a region 1 club, it is understandable, and perhaps even expected. It is not expected that a region 6 club would, or even should, be applying for and granted a Zone 1 callsign. This to me is wrong. And because it is a club, it is reasonable to assume that they will most likely forever deprive a Zone 1 licensee from ever obtaining that call.

I am in zone 1, and can not for the life of me figure any reason why I, or anyone, would want to have an out of zone call. To DX operators, it sort of misrepresents your location. The call I wanted has been given away. I have applied for another, but that will not have the same meaning to me. Your policy leaves me wondering why we even have zones, if they have no true restriction on the callsign usage. If I were portably operating from a remote zone I would have to identify N1XYS/6 (assuming I were in zone 6), it should follow that a licensee using an out of zone call should identify (in this case) W1AU/6. This defeats the purpose of having the short vanity callsign does it not.

Well I suspect there is nothing that can happen that will make the call I truly wanted available to me now, or perhaps ever. It is a sad situation, seemingly unfair, and in my opinion it borders on being just wrong.

This is no my opinion alone, I suspect that if you were to poll the amateur community you would find that a majority of the people feel that out of zone callsigns are not proper. Why, there is even a person who lives in Rhode Island a significant portion of each year, if not full time, with a callsign KH6xx (KH6HZ I think). What a commotion he causes when he checks in on a local 2 meter repeater.

Respectfully,
Christoher H. Terkla N1XYS
Amateur Extra

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE

98-143

From: "Jeff Hamlin" <hamlin@lct.org>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(FCCINFO)
Date: Tue, Dec 29, 1998 12:38 PM
Subject: Amateur Radio License Proposal

Dear Sirs:

I am a General class amateur radio operator, and I am writing to express my hope that the FCC will study and adopt the thoughtful and well considered proposals that CQ Magazine has made regarding the restructuring of Amateur Radio licenses.

I believe these proposals are made in the best interests of ham radio operators and will aid in making amateur radio a healthy and vibrant activity for many others in the next century.

Yours (73),
Jeff Hamlin
N2KOF

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE

#98-143

From: <NHMVIS@reninet.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(FCCINFO)
Date: Wed, Nov 4, 1998 1:23 AM
Subject: Amateur Radio proposal WT98-143

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Commissioners Neil Morse
Federal Communications Commission 1121 Vista Drive
Office of Plans and Policy Eureka, CA 95503

NHMVIS@reninet.com

Re: FCC WT98-143

Sirs,

I have been a radio amateur with a general class license for over thirty years. I strongly disagree with the ARRL's proposal on the restructuring of the license classes, especially the general class license. I was proud to have been able to complete the requirements and pass the necessary tests to acquire my general class radio amateur license, and believe that to lower the standards of this license would be an affront to the many amateurs who hold the general class license and worked so hard to earn it. The knowledge of electronic theory and Morse code should be primary facets of Amateur Radio. I suggest combining the lower technical and novice licenses with a 5 to 8 word per minute code requirement, and combining the advanced and extra licenses with a 15 to 20 wpm code requirement, and requiring the higher of the technical knowledge requirements for each respective new class. For power limitations - 100 to 150 watts should be appropriate for the technical/novice, with a maximum input power of 1200 watts for the higher license classes. If you feel the general license must be changed, I would rather have it upgraded to the position now held by the advanced license then to be down-graded to a lesser license-status than I have earned and held in the last thirty years.

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Sincerely,

Neil Morse
W6FCO

Neil Morse
NHMVIS@reninet.com

No. of Copies rec'd 0 + 1
List ABCDE

#98-143

From: Nancy Robitsch <nancy@ims-1.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(FCCINFO)
Date: Sun, Nov 22, 1998 6:05 PM
Subject: AMATEUR RADIO LICENSING CHANGES

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Dear Sir,

I hold an Advanced Class Amateur Radio License and would like to express my support for the American Radio Relay League's (ARRL) proposal concerning Amateur Radio license restructuring.

I fully support the modifications that would allow for four (4) license classes and dropping the Morse code requirements to five (5) and 12 words per minute in accordance with the respective license.

Thank you.

Todd L. Robitsch
KG0PN

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE

#98-143

From: "L Pereira" <k6lsp@hotmail.com>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(FCCINFO)
Date: Mon, Nov 9, 1998 3:17 AM
Subject: Amateur Licensing Restructuring

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Hi there...I'll try to keep my comments short and to the point...I have no objections in making any changes. The following are some suggestions:

Classes:

A=EXTRA 150 questions;
B=ADVANCED 100 questions;
C=GENERAL 60 questions
D=Technician 50 questions...

The idea of A - B - C - D CLASSES will match and make possible for an INTERNATIONAL LICENSE AGREEMENT, much similar to USA/Canada, where we have no need to apply for permission to transmit on each other's territories or even throughout the world.

My comments on all aspects of Morse code testing in particular, I would like to see it reduced to a one level of 5 WPM, required speed. Most new Hams would prefer to trade a reduction in Morse code requirements for additional written elements on newer digital technologies which, in my opinion, are replacing the Morse code. Further the Commission should consider specifying Morse code examination methods, such as fill-in-the-blank or one minute of solid copy, instead of allowing VEs to determine the testing method.

Charge a fee as follows for the new comers:
\$5 for D CLASS 10 years;
\$10 for C CLASS 10 years;
\$15 for B CLASS 10 years &
\$20 for A CLASS LIFE.

Please do not forget to implement an enforcement again against gammers; pirates even HAMS whom interfere with communications which could save lives...

Well I am running out of inspiration...73s...K6LSP

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

0+1

98-143

From: The Warnocks <warnock@michweb.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(FCCINFO)
Date: Sun, Nov 29, 1998 10:51 AM
Subject: Amateur Radio Restructuring

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Gentlemen: We are the Warnocks, Tom WB8WIV and Carol KA8LHI, from Michigan and would like to comment on your proposed Amateur Licensing Restructuring.

1.) We agree with the FCC and ARRL that the Novice license should be terminated. The Novice was never intended to be a renewable license. Most Novices upgrade or lose interest and let the license laps. Stop issuing the license immediately. For those who have them - non-renewable; they receive credit of completion when license expires.

A.) Follow the ARRL plan for 75, 40, and 15 meters. Give existing Novices General CW privileges on 80 and 15; remove Novices from 40 meters. (Tech +) would have these same privileges.

B.) Novice/Tech+ retain 10 meter privileges until licenses expire.

C.) Novice needs to take current Tech and General written tests to get General.

2. Technician + license - stop issuing immediately. Current Tech+ would be non-renewable. When renewed = Technician with credit for 5 wpm (certificate of completion) but with 50 Mhz on up privileges only. Can operate Novice HF 10 meters, 80, and 15 meters until renewal.

A.) Tech+ only needs to take current General written test to upgrade to General. Certainly, most Tech + will do this! Grandfather all Tech + with original licenses before 1986 to General (Techs and Generals took the same written test until Novice Enhancement) ; Tech + from 1987 to present would have to take General written test to get the General.

3. Follow ARRL's CW requirement request. 5 wpm. CW for General, 13 for Advanced. No CW test for Extra.

4. Keep (Code-Free) Technician as it is, but only 1 written test is needed. Use UHF/VHF questions from Novice test- rework - and put in this test plus the Technician test. Keep it simple! A bank of about 350 questions should be sufficient.

Good Luck and Thanks! The FCC is on the right track.

73, Tom WB8WIV and Carol KA8LHI Warnock, Cadillac, Mich.

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

0+1

78-143

From: Mike Gilbertsen <mgilbert@isd.net>
To: K1DOM.K1PO1(FCCINFO)
Date: Wed, Nov 4, 1998 11:48 PM
Subject: ARRL Amateur Radio Restructuring Recommendations

Dear Sir/Madam:

I tried to sort through your site looking for something on the proposed Amateur Radio Restructuring, but was unable to find anything. Tried repeatedly to enter a comment on this, but your comment input screens are next to impossible to understand! You appear to ask for all kinds of information the inquiring person most likely doesn't have. Oh, well.

Anyway, I wanted to state my strong support for the ARRL's proposal on restructuring the licensing of Amateur Radio. It's about time we (the USA) "woke up & smelled the coffee" regarding the antiquated code requirements. My only suggested improvement would be to drop one more class, and combine "Advance" and "Extra". At the same time, add additional questions regarding proper useage of the ham bands.

It's really past the time for these changes! Let's move ahead at once!

Sincerely,

Mike Gilbertsen
W0CYS
15526 Old Brick Yard Road
Shakopee, MN 55379
(612) 496-9077
email: mgilbert@isd.net
11-04-98

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

JAN 27 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1
List ABCDE