

As an amateur radio operator, emergency management director, and a citizen that lives in rural Missouri, I would like to make the following comments.

Please understand that this in the context of the FACT that rural residents that don't have access to DSL or high speed cable service now have affordable options such as Direcway satellite service as well as in some areas, DTNSpeed.net. BPL will have to be affordable such that it competes with these and other service options available to rural America.

With that said, I still understand there is a large controversy about the fact that BPL 'may' cause harmful interference to existing licensed services. I firmly believe we should not limit BPL growth because of a fear of interference that is not real.

However, it is the FCC's job to protect the licensed services that may be effected. I would feel comfortable with allowing BPL to proceed ONLY if the burden of interference issues are clearly the responsibility of the BPL service provider. For example:

BPL service providers should be expected to disable their network in the areas effect to allow quick identification of interference problems.

If BPL is identified as the source, it must remain off until the interference is eliminated, regardless of the cost incurred by the BPL service provider. This must be a risk the BPL service provider considers when creating their network.

Rural America is where BPL stands to provide the most service...but yet Rural America is where older low-band VHF and HF systems are used every day by critical public safety agencies. These systems should not have to suffer from interference, and taxpayers should not have to pay for any upgrades or modifications to their systems when there are alternatives to BPL for high-speed internet access.

Thank you,
Kurt Bleich