REGARDING: FCC NOTICE OF INQUIRY 9NOI) ET DOCKET 03-104

Dear Sirs:

As an informed citizen and licensed radio amateur, I am strongly opposed to this measure.

I am a long time active radio amateur extra class licensee (W9LQI). Also, I have held a radio telephone commercial license with radar endorsement for many years. i am an active member of Army Military Amateur Radio Service (ARMY MARS).

Presently I am a CPA and business appraiser, but have worked in telecommunications industry in the past. For example, I held the position of Field Engineer in long lines telephone carrier equipment with Lenkurt Electric Company, San Carlos, CA for a number of years. I have traveled extensively worldwide in connection with this field engineering capacity.

The NOI asks how Broadband Over Powerlines (BPL) can be regulated.

I believe that BPL cannot be regulated to protect other licensed users and services from harmful interference because of it's very nature. Power lines are effective antennas and radiate. Thus, whether intentional or not, these opn wire power line radiators of radio frequency energy will cause great harm to other licensed users and serives that would share the propsed spectrum, that being 1.7 - 80.0 mhz.

some of these services include: commercial television operating between 54 mhz and 80 mhz, point to point communications, military and aux. military communications services, shortwave broadcasting, and amateur radio services, just to name a few.

The Amateur radio Service will be greatly harmed by the proposed "relaxed standards" for BPL, also know as carrier current over open power lines.

Amateur Radio service is a valuable national resource. Amateur Radio ids often the first and only communications service available in time of local and national emergency. Amateur radio Service uses portions of the spectrum that is proposed to be used by BPL in a "relaxed way". Amateur radio Service spectrum segments need to be protected from harmful interference that BPL would cause.

I have been an active licensed radio amateur for many years(W9LQI). I have provided no cost amateur radio services to the public during times wild fires, tornados, earthquakes and other calamities.

We are now in a state of heighten alertness dues to certain acts of war that occurred on 09/11/01. the Amateur radio Community stands rady and prepared to help out in uncertain times of national emergency.

As an active of Army MARS, I take great pride in gthe fact that we are providing a valuable service to my Country at no cost to the tax payer.

Both the Amateur Radio Serives of licensed operators and The MARS systems of licensed operators needs to be protected from the harmful interference that BPL would cause.

Even now, the present FCC Part 15 limits for this technology results in substantial interference to Amateur Radio Service as well as other licensed users.

I have personally been a victim of severe interference caused by the localized Broadband systems that are avaialbe and use for local area personal computer networking. yet, I am not able to do much about this unintentional Broadband interference caused by already relaxed FCC Rule 15 enforcement.

I wish to remind the Commission that BPL systems radiate in wide swaths of radio frequency spectrum and will put entire neighborhoods and communities "awash" in high levels of unwanted radio frequency emissions.

As an informed citizen, i do not want my house wiring "awash" in unwanted radio frequency enwergy. I do not want my neighborhood and community open power lines "awash" in unwanted radio frequency energy.

I do not want some power company to usurp my rights and: Prevent me from watching a television channel operating between 54-80 mhz, should I want; or prevent me from listening to a domestic or foreign shortwave radio broadcast shouls I choose to; or any number of frequency spectrum dependent activities such as my recent use of medical EEG radio telemetry for my brain seizure stricken child. Please reconsider the harmful impact thaqt relaxed standards would cause on other licensed services.

Just because some equipment manufacturers and power companies want to jump into the high speed internet provider and telecommunications business with a bunch of improperly designed , interference causing equipment and sytems, in order to make a buck, all done at the expense of licensed spectrum users is not a good or valid reason. What is proposed is clearly not right.

As the controlling Federal Communications Agency, you have promised to protect licensed users of the radio frequency spectrum. That is your end of the bargain in a social contract. What is proposed in this NOI would result in shear anarchy from a radio frequency spectrum usage point of view. This propsal, if implemented, will causwe great harm to licensed users of the spectrum in question.

There are many other ways of providing high speed internet communications already available. They include: telephone line access, cable DSL systems, microwave, cable services, low and high orbiting communications sat. services and fibre optical systems. To suggest "relaxed standards" use of an archaic interference causing technology, such as carrier current waves over open power lines (BPL) is madness.

Please reconsider this Proposal to relax standards. in fact

present FCC Part 15 Rules need to be enforced as they were intended. You as the enforcing Federal Agency have an obligation to protect licensed users of the frequency spectrum in question.

I believe that licensed users of the spectrum in question, such as myself, will be caused great harm by the implementation of relaxed standards as outlined in this NOI (ET Docket 03-104)

Very truly yours,

Robert F. Hutchinson, cpa
23245 Sylvan St
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
tel: (818) 888-8175
fax; (818) 888-8220
e-mail; r.f.hutchinson-cpa @worldnet.att.net