An early lesson I learned, back in the mid 1970's, about CB radio was that "when the skip rolls in, you can forget about trying to simply talk across town". CB was my first exposure to the broader radio hobby, and at that time the rules were more stringent than they have been in recent times. Nowdays, the [missing text] " would say, "deregulated".

As a prime example, it appears that there is no longer a prohibition against "chit-chat" and/or "hobby type operation". While time constraints remain (Rule 16, AKA 95.416) the rules on CONTENT (Rule 12, AKA 95.412) clearly indicate that such a prohibition as mentioned above no longer exists.

That considered, it seems likely that a CB communication might then occasionaly resemble that of an Amateur Radio Station if for no other reason than there is no prohibition against it based purely on the CONTENT of such a two-way communication.

When I got a little tired of the rather limiting rules of CB back in the mid-70's, I went after an Amateur License and in 1974 was issued my Novice ticket as WN9OMC. I have been licensed ever since and with the callsign of WB9OMC I have progressed over 25+ years through the Technician (C), General, Advanced and more recently the Amateur Extra Class licenses.

During the years of operating as a licensed Amateur and without the prohibitions placed upon CB operators I learned a considerable amount of practical knowledge on the subject of Radio Propagation. Particularly on the subject of the Amateur 10 meter band, where I spent and continue to spend a considerable amount of my operating time. And one of the great truths of the Amateur 10 meter band is that during optimal periods in the sunspot cycles, or sometimes due to other natural phenomena, a very low powered signal can be transmitted to the other side of the planet - NOT ONLY to the other side of town. In fact, when the 10 meter band is "open", it is nearly impossible to talk to the other side of town because the number and strength of signals from VERY distant locations is so great that local signals are difficult if not impossible to hear.
But then, we Amateurs are fortunate enough to have VHF/UHF bands like 2 meters and the 440 MHz band where we can operate our repeaters with only rare interference due to propagation effects.

CB does NOT have the luxury of bandswitching to avoid interference. These radio users often are left with no choice but to simply turn their radios OFF and walk away. Why? Because

CB rule number 13[a][9], AKA 95.413 prohibits them from conducting communications with any of those distant stations.

It is often said, "If you can't beeat 'em, join 'em!" Without a doubt, one of the main lures of virtually ALL radio hobbyists is that "catch" of a DX (station a great distance from one's own station) signal and perhaps even more luring, the opportunity to ANSWER that signal. While certainly those radio hobbyists who are content to simply *listen* to distant stations can perhaps imagine it (and study for a ham license, maybe?), those hobbyists with a microphone can do more than imagine - they can respond.

Except our fellow radio hobbyists, the CBer. On 11 meters, much as on 10 meters, even a legal 4 watt AM signal or a legal 12 watt SSB signal (95.410) can be propagated many hundreds of miles under optimal conditions. IT MUST BE MADE PERFECTLY CLEAR THAT SUCH PROPAGATION DOES NOT REQUIRE THE USE OF AN ILLEGAL AMPLIFIER OR AN ILLEGALLY HIGH ANTENNA (95.408) TO OCCUR. In this respect, the 11 meter Citizens Band very closely resembles the Amateur 10 meter band.

I have personally used a Uniden HR2510 Amateur radio on the 10 meter band to conduct international communications with a number of nations on several continents. This unmodified HR2510 gave me an USB output of perhaps 15 to 20 watts - NOT much more than the FCC-allowed 12 watts for legal CB SSB use. Nor was the antenna particularly large or high off the ground and certainly, as a simple wire dipole, there was little or no "gain" to give me a larger "Effective Radiated Power".

There should be NO argument that these similarities between propagation effects on the 10 and 11 meter bands exist and they are real. There should also be NO argument that similar power outputs may have similar effects where those two bands have similar propagation characteristics.

I have established that the FCC does not disallow ordinary, "Amateur style" conversation CONTENT on Citizens Band. I have established what is a physical FACT, that propagation effects can carry a signal OF LEGAL POWER LEVELS considerable distances.

Why then, should the 250 KM distance limit of 95.413 remain, other than to attempt to satisfy the ORIGINAL intent of the FCC for CB, which was to provide short distance, personal communication? It is plainly obvious that such a service should NOT be placed in

a band that has such long-distance propagation potential. The FCC have obviously recognized this as evidenced by the creation of both GMRS and FRS. By placing them in a UHF portion of the spectrum, the FCC has created a truly useful short distance, personal communication service that is clear and very much more free from interference than CB on 11 meters has EVER been. I submit that by the very ACT of creating these two services, the FCC has made a statement (if perhaps unintentionally) that 11 meter CB is NOT that service and is not capable of BEING that service.

What then is left for 11 meter CB? If hobby type communications are now allowed even WITH the prescribed time limits and low power levels, then what is left is, in effect, a PARALLEL RADIO HOBBY SERVICE TO THE AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE. Granted, a much more limited one but unless licensing and written testing were to be instated for legal CB operation, it should be limited.

I submit that what should NOT be limited is the distance that a CB operator is allowed to communicate. If CB is no longer anything but a "hobby" band with long-distance propagation effects, then LET the operators take advantage of those effects. RESCIND THE RULE THAT PROHIBITS COMMUNICATIONS OF MORE THAN 250 KM.

I further submit that such a rule no longer serves any more of a valid regulatory purpose than the 13 and 20 Word Per Minute Morse Code tests did prior to the recent report and order that ended those tests for Amateur Operator testing. While it may continue to make sense to prohibit making contacts with 11 meter band users in other countries (except Canada, as per 95.413[a][11]) it does NOT, in my opinion, make sense to prohibit an east coast operator from making contact with a west coast operator. Nor does it make sense to prohibit ANY CB operator who is operating a legal station from making contacts with the locations listed in 95.405 [3] through [16] simply because they may be more than 250 KM from the transmitter site of said operator IF the conditions of propagation are favorable for such a contact.

In further consideration of support for Mr. Dixon's petition, I would like to address comments made by two organizations - the American Radio Relay League and the National Association of Broadcasters. Both of these organizations have presented comments opposing the petition.

ARRL - The ARRL asserts that by making such comments, it is representing not only its own membership but also "...the

more than 650,000 amateur licensees in the United States,.....". While I realize that this is a "boilerplate" comment that the League simply "tacks onto" any comment, request or petition that it submits, I wish to state for the record that I am NOT a member of the ARRL; therefore they do NOT represent the opinion of THIS Extra Class operator on THAT score. I resent the implication that they also feel that they can automatically represent me before the Commission simply by claiming so in that "boilerplate". I believe that if those ".....more than 650,000....licensees...." wished to be represented by ARRL, they would join. Looking at the league's membership numbers it is obvious that several hundred thousand US licensed Amateurs must agree with me as they are NOT league members.

Having disposed of the notion that ARRL represents my opinion in ANY matter in which I do not specifically wish to be so represented, I must say that I am surprised that the League would even bother to comment on such a matter. Where was the ARRL when fellow radio hobbyists were being assaulted in Congress by the passage of the ECPA? I was told by a representative of ARRL (who shall remain un-named) that they were not interested in the issue because "It is not an Amateur Radio issue." I therefore find it hypocritical that the League comments on a Citizens Band issue which is ALSO NOT an Amateur Radio issue. I therefore suggest that the Commission consider what motives the ARRL has in opposing a petition that by their own past examples *does not concern them*.

Such motivations can be clearly seen if their comments on RM-9807 are examined closely.

"This proposal strikes at a core distinction between the Citizens Band (CB) Radio Service and the Amateur Radio Service (ARS)."

Indeed it does. Or perhaps, DID, past tense. By the commissions own action of deregulating CB to the extent that it has, the distinctions between types of communications allowed in the two services has become blurred and suggests an increased willingness to allow "hobby type communications". The ARRL, in arguing against the Dixon Petition, attempts to use FCC responses that are dated *1960* and are 40 years old! Such responses are therefore woefully out of date; while attitudes and opinions currently held by the League may possibly reflect

those of 1960, the rest of the world has in fact moved on 40 years. Considerable changes in BOTH CB and Amateur Radio have occurred in that time period. I submit that the use of 40 year-old comments from the FCC reflects an inability to come up with any reason for opposition other than fear of competition with the relative stranglehold that the ARRL has held over Amateur Radio in past decades, and by default, also over any hobby-type communications that may involve long-distance propagation. If they cannot control it, they do not wish it to exist.

"This proposal, if adopted, would encourage the use of power amplifiers ("linear amplifiers")....."

I find this statement illogical. The ARRL statement admits just a line or so further on that said amplifiers ".....have long been an enforcement problem for the Commission." The latter statement is probably not in debate by anyone; however I would submit that those folks who intend to operate an illegal amplifier on the CB channels (or worse yet, outside of those channels in the so-called "Freeband") are ALREADY doing so; and anyone who is NOT doing so probably understands that such illegal power operation is one of the FEW things that can result in an enforcement action. Therefore, it seems unlikely that a whole new generation of amplifier users would be created.

"....power and distance limitations were necessary for the orderly operation of the service."

Again, the ARRL seems clearly out of its league with this statement. I submit that there hasn't been "orderly operation of the service" on CB in at least 30 years if not more. The long standing lack of enforcement manpower that the League frequently trumpets in its response seems evidence enough of that.

"The ability of CB users to share and re-use channels simultaneously would be compromised by the Dixon proposal."

I disagree. That ability is compromised by the very propagation effects that are a real physical phenomena. The only time when local channel usage is disrupted is typically when such effects occur, and the large number of CB users crowded into 40 channels can be heard all at once. The resulting noise can be difficult to make a local contact through. This would occur whether the CB operators were TRYING to make DX contacts or NOT.

Perhaps the league should work to apply that concept more to an area that they should be more familiar and more in touch with - the poor coordination of 2 meter repeaters that are too close together and yet on the same frequency pairs....which is, after all "an Amateur Radio issue".

"The Amateur Radio Service is the proper forum for the desired long-distance communications sought by the Dixon Petition."

Once again, I can only interpret such a statement as to suggest that the ARRL wants to control who gets to make DX contacts. Considering the way that ARRL and other Amateur organizations have lumped ALL CB operators together and labelled them as criminals in the past may explain why many CB operators, IN SPITE of simplified Amateur licensing, are NOT eager to become Amateurs - NOR to hand any membership money over to the ARRL.

The ARRL also coveniently fails to mention, while observing that "....(amateur-type) communications in the CB band.....is capable of creating interference" while again suggesting that there will be a mass proliferation of illegal power amplifiers, is that these same conditions also exist on the Amateur 10 meter band and that all too many Amateurs fail to reduce their power output to that which is neccessary (reference to the Amateur Radio rules in 47 CFR 97). That too is perhaps an issue that the ARRL would be better off addressing than dabbling in the Citizens Band, which "is not an Amateur Radio issue". Or perhaps the truism that "people who live in glass houses should not throw stones" applies very well to this situation.

NAB - The National Association of Broadcasters (the same folks who are busy lobbying congress to prevent small groups from having open access to the airwaves via the LPFM (Low Power FM) service) states that "Consumers must be protected from illegal CB radio transmissions that interfere with radio, television, telephone and other forms of electronic communication."

I agree that consumers deserve protection from ILLEGAL transmissions. But I find that irrelevant to the essence of the Dixon petition which seeks NOT to legalize amplifiers (which CAN indeed be a major source of interference) or modifications that would violate the type acceptance of a radio (which are another source of interference) but would simply allow a legally

operating CBer who uses legal power levels and legal equipment to make use of the propagation conditions that can exist in the 11 meter band. IT IS NOT NECCESSARY TO USE AN ILLEGAL POWER AMPLIFIER TO PROPAGATE A SIGNAL LONG DISTANCES. The NAB's argument seems to be based largely on that idea. While decrying the interference caused to consumer devices by illegal operations, (which is a problem) they seemed to have ignored the admonition in the FCC's own Interference Handbook that states that many if not most consumer devices are inadequately designed to reject RF signals, even if such signals are at a legal level for their particular service. They are also remiss in that respect, in failing to point out that consumers living in close proximity to the transmitting facility of a broadcasting station can also be plagued by RFI (Radio Frequency Interference). Does that mean that the TV or Radio station is doing anything illegal? No, it simply underscores another physical fact - an improperly designed piece of consumer electronics is VERY likely to suffer from interference when placed near an RF source. Even a LEGALLY transmitting RF source.

I submit that both the ARRL and the NAB have missed the point completely and for reasons which I personally find suspect are in effect finding CB operators "guilty until proven innocent".

Mr. Dixon's petition makes sense to me, and I (as a long term licensed Amateur) do NOT feel threatened by having CBers also able to make long distance contacts. I therefore submit to the Commission my support for Mr. Dixon's petition and request that the Commission act favorably on it in the near future.

Duane Mantick
WB9OMC
Extra Class Licensee
Licensed since 1974