Please DO NOT support RM-10352. I'm against.

It just creates a VE phone band. Why should
we expect VE's to honor a voluntary band plan
on 160 when US stations won't? On all the
other bands, VE's use the top end of the US
CW band as their private phone band. When the US
phone bands expanded, the VE's just moved
farther into CW territory. This seems like
unilateral disarmament.

Also:
I'm against for the following reasons:

1.) A division of narrow and wide modes would
give privileges to use of narrow modes, including digital
modes of the future against SSB modes.

CW will have all the band when SSB users will have only part of the band. This is unfair.

CW users will move down NOW but will have under the rulemaking, privileges all over the band and a " special" right when all modes and users in ham radio MUST have the same privileges. Rulemaking of the RM-10352 is unfair under any kind of circunstances.

2.) A bandplan will originate More FCC involvement and resources used for 160-meters because it would cause more disputes
and conflicts between operators asking for FCC involvement in a band that is JUST used by a very small group of people since the normal amateur do not have conditions to built the antenna needed for this band and is just a privilege of a few willing to work this band.

5.)160-meters can't have the same basic
structure as other bands below since there are less users, is noisy, is a night time band only and used ONLY (mainly) in winter time. Is used by a very small group and we don't need any rules.

We , (a big 160 meters users in Florida) have lots of noise all year around and the banplan would be a big disadvantage not to mention again the troubles with the Canadian that will create the rulemaking of RM-10352

As somebody said ..."if is not broken why fix it?..."

Thanks

Fernando Vigueras, KC4ZDR