

I oppose the implementation of BPL as modulated signals in the HF spectrum for the reasons stated below. Thank you for considering my comments.

Other countries have found considerable interference resulted and have stopped or altered BPL implementation plans.

Much short wave listening is the reception of weak overseas signals possibly overpowered by nearby BPL transmissions, clearly not conducive to good will with other countries having services beamed to listeners in the U.S. Amateur radio communications, whether practice of the art in hobby pursuits or in disaster emergency communication also requires weak signal reception.

In my personal case, power line noise, radiation from “approved” photoelectric devices on county streetlights one-half mile away, and “approved” touch sensitive consumer devices (lights) in my neighborhood have caused disruptions to my amateur radio communications. Why would the FCC consider possibly allowing additional interference-causing devices?

As the amateur and other services use high gain antennas for reception, the effect of interfering radiation will be enhanced.

Having communication with other amateurs over 1000 miles using only 100 milliwatts of power, I believe it is possible even very low level radiation from the long “antenna” of power lines will be reflected by the ionosphere. This could result in long distance, untraceable interference. For example, I have heard interstate highway announcements in the AM band on my sensitive communications receiver from sources miles away. Yet this service is intended to transmit only to vehicles driving on the adjacent highway.

In our era of a national emergency with the war on terror I am concerned that BPL could interfere with public service and overseas aircraft transmissions in the HF spectrum.