EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Commission's Secretary,
Office of the Secretary,
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW,
Washington, D.C. 20554

16/03/2004

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 26 2004
FCC - MAILROOM

RE: Cover letter for ET Docket No. 03-104, No. 04.37 comments

To Whom It May Concern:

Please find the enclosed diskette and paper copies of my comments regarding ET Docket No. 03-104, Carrier Current Systems, including Broadband over Power Lines systems and ET Docket No. 04-37, Amendment of Part 15 regarding new requirements and measurement guidelines for Access Broadband over Power Lines.

I have also sent a diskette and paper copy to the Commission's copy contractor, Natek, Inc.

Thank you for your time and I hope I got the number of copies and formats correct.

Sincerely, Scott R. Barbour Jr.

Scott R. Barbour Jr.
P.O. Box 893,
Intervale, N.H. 03845

No. of Copies rec'd 0+
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
MAR 26 2004
FCC - MAILROOM

Commission's Secretary,
Office of the Secretary,
Federal Communications Commission,
236 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E., Suite 110,
Washington, D.C. 20554

ORIGINAL

16/03/2004

RE: ET Docket No. 03-104, Carrier Current Systems, including Broadband over Power Line Systems; ET Docket No. 04-37, Amendment of Part 15 regarding new requirements and measurement guidelines for Access Broadband over Power Lines.

Honorable Chairman, Mr. Michael Powell,

I am writing you this day with my comments and concerns regarding the proposed Access to Broadband over Power Lines, a.k.a. BPL. I have been following the comments, both pro and con, about this new technology and I am very concerned about the potential for harmful interference to the present HF users, amateur radio operators and especially, international short wave broadcasters.

I have read the comments from the various FCC Commissioners, all of whom reference the need to address interference concerns and express optimism in correcting them. While I find this encouraging, I am dismayed at the suggestions that any BPL interference complaints be up to the BPL service provider to correct and the burden of proving the interference put upon those reporting it. This is unacceptable, as many short wave listeners I know are non-technical and should not have to be the ones required to address issues of interference. How can these listeners, be expected to identify BPL interference from other sources of electro-magnetic noise? This should be corrected long before BPL is implemented on a wide scale.

As you are well aware, the Amatuer Radio Relay League, ARRL, has been active in monitoring and recording interference at various BPL field test sites, and their findings have shown that interference from BPL is in excess of Part 15 limits across the entire HF spectrum. Several countries, Australia, Japan and Israel have done BPL field tests and yielded the same results, to the point that these countries have either abandoned or postponed BPL.

In spite of these findings and questions raised by all FCC Commissioner's regarding interference, Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein made the statement that ,"..we cannot let unsupported claims stand in the way of such and innovation as BPL systems." I am deeply disturbed by this statement. It leads me to believe that BPL, will be implemented, no matter what and the references of "interference concerns" are not in fact serious, being only to eleviate the concerns of radio listeners such as myself.

I have been an active short wave radio listener and member of NASWA, the North American Short Wave Association, for several years and I enjoy the free flow of news and information the medium offers. As members of a free society, the United States of America, we have the right to inform ourselves by what ever means we choose which includes protected, licensed, international short wave broadcasters. Based on ARRL tests and those conducted around the world, I believe that BPL will interfere with short wave radio.

In closing, I would like to point out that I am not against new technologies and I believe that both old and new can peacefully co-exist and not interfere with one another. I too, understand that the economic potential for BPL technology is huge, yet it is the responsibility of the Federal Communications Commission to address interference concerns and work to correct them and not work to create more. I hope that a solution can be reached that is compatible with all parties involved.

Sincerely,

Scott R. Barbour Jr.
P.O. Box 893,
Intervale, N.H. 03845

Phone: (603)-356-0795
E-mail: srbjrswl@yahoo.com

DOCKET NO. 04-37

DOCUMENT OFF-LINE

This page has been substituted for one of the following:

o This document is confidential (**NOT FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION**)

o An oversize page or document (such as a map) which was too large to be scanned into the ECFS system.

o Microfilm, microform, certain photographs or videotape.

● Other materials which, for one reason or another, could not be scanned into the ECFS system.

The actual document, page(s) or materials may be reviewed (**EXCLUDING CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS)** by contacting an Information Technician at the FCC Reference Information Centers) at 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC, Room CY-A257. Please note the applicable docket or rulemaking number, document type and any other relevant information about the document in order to ensure speedy retrieval by the Information Technician

One diskette. For the diskette see docket # 03-104.