

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of)
)
Request for Waiver to License) **WT 13-212**
Bandedge Frequencies Currently)
Shared Between Part 90 and)
Part 95-A Services)

Reply Comments

Filed by:
Personal Radio Steering Group, Inc.
PO Box 2851
Ann Arbor, MI 48106
October 31, 2013

The PRSG is an advocacy organization for personal licensees and authorized users in the General Mobile Radio Service (GMRS).

Recent History of Technology in the GMRS

From its creation in 1948 (as Class A of the Citizens Radio Service [CRS]) through the early 1980s, the technologies mandated for the GMRS were essentially the same as those used in the other UHF Private Land Mobile Radio Services (PLMRS). Indeed, the spectrum for many of those (now Part 90) services was originally allocated to Class A of the CRS. There were no significant technology differences, except for maximum permissible transmitter output power.

There had always been individual (personal) licensees in the Class A CRS. However, beginning in the early 1970s, there was a marked increase in the number of personal licensees. In 1975, the FCC created the Personal Use Radio Advisory Committee (PURAC), originally focused on the CRS Class D, now known as the Citizens Band Radio Service. PURAC eventually included a subcommittee specifically focused on GMRS. This subcommittee recommended several dozen regulatory and technological changes to GMRS in its 1979 Final Report.

To kick start FCC action, in 1985 PRSG submitted two petitions (RM-5058 and RM-5242) which sought FCC considerations for structural and technological changes in GMRS. The FCC eventually responded with the proposals in WT Docket 87-265, which opened up the GMRS 462 MHz interstitial frequencies but with restrictions:

- > The transmitter output power was limited to 5 watts ERP.
- > Repeaters were not permitted.

- > Transmitter antenna height was limited to not more than 20 feet above the structure on which it was mounted (exclusive of the tower, mast or pole).
- > Only individuals authorized under a GMRS license issued to an individual person were eligible to transmit on these new frequencies.

The FCC did say that it would return to the issue of underlying technology in the future, and *exempted* the GMRS from the ongoing considerations in the other PLMRS Services. This locked GMRS into the transmitting and receiving technological state of the art of the early 1980s “narrow band FM” (NBFM), with its 25 KHz primary channel spacing and +/- 5 KHz maximum deviation standards.

In 1994, Tandy Corporation petitioned the FCC to create the “Family Radio Service” (FRS). When it adopted the rules in FCC Docket WT-95-102, the FCC authorized for the first time operations on the GMRS 467 MHz interstitial frequencies, but with substantial restrictions:

- > The transmitter output power was limited to 0.500 watts ERP.
- > The maximum permissible deviation was +/- 2.0 KHz.
- > Repeaters were not permitted (for either inputs or outputs).
- > Antennas were required to be an integral part of the transceiver, and not be detachable.

There would be no licensing, and thus no eligibility issues.

FCC Dockets WT-87-265 and WT-95-102 further locked GMRS into the NBFM standards of the early 1980s., which is where GMRS remains today.

The MRA Waiver Request Has Several Deficiencies.

Despite extolling the virtues of the ongoing efforts to migrate the other PLMRS Services to new, more frequency-conserving narrowbanding technologies, nowhere in its Request for Waiver did Mobile Relay Associates (MRA) acknowledge that the FCC had previously *exempted* GMRS *in its entirety* from the requirements to use these new technologies.

Likewise, nowhere in its Request for Waiver did MRA acknowledge the prior FCC determination that it was in the public interest that the GMRS interstitial frequencies should be considerably restricted in transmitter output power (especially in the GMRS 467 MHz band), or that non-detachable, integral transmit antennas should now be required in the FRS.

And nowhere in its Request for Waiver did MRA argue that for its anticipated use, would these power and antenna-connectivity restrictions/requirements prevent it from achieving its desired operational objectives.

The spectrum which the MRA seeks in its Waiver is not “fallow,” as they claim. Kenwood also repeats this claim. This spectrum is an integral part of the NBFM operations of GMRS on the 462.550/467.550 MHz and 462.725/467.725 MHz channel pairs.

The “guardband” spectrum for which MRA seeks a waiver is appropriate and necessary to protect existing and future licensed GMRS operations. This guardband must be retained.

In colorful, almost cartoon-like charts accompanying its Waiver Request, MRA purports to show that there would be no overlap in the channels involved. These charts show idealized *transmitter* envelopes, but fail to address the realities of design and adjacent-channel rejection of 1980s NBFM receivers typically used in GMRS today. We especially note the extended susceptibility of GMRS repeater receivers on the GMRS 467 MHz interstitial frequencies.

It is especially notable that MRA seeks this GMRS guardband spectrum to allay the interference which MRA alleges it is currently experiencing on Part 90 channels. This merely an example of the way in which radio interests traditionally acquire new spectrum: Find a weaker opponent, then beat up on them.

In Summary:

Although we acknowledge that MRA has just now posted a copy of its Request for Waiver in the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS), the FCC can correct the deficiencies and irregularities of this Docket *only* by reissuing its Public Notice, acknowledging that the Commission has previously exempted the GMRS *in its entirety* from the requirements for narrowbanding in the other PLMRS Services, and by granting enough time for the public to submit comments and replies on this matter that could affect tens of thousands of GMRS licensees and authorized users. PRSG recommends that the Commission allow for at least 90 days for public comments, and an additional 45 days for public replies.

Sincerely,

Corwin D. Moore, Jr.
Administrative Coordinator
Personal Radio Steering Group, Inc.
prsg@provide.net

Certificate of Service

On this date, I emailed a copy of these Reply Comments to:

Mobile Relay Associates
David J. Kaufman (its attorney)
kaufman@rinioneil.com

On November 1, 2013, I shall mail a copy of these Reply Comments via USPS First Class to:

Kenwood USA Corp.
Christopher D. Imlay (its attorney)
Booth, Freret, Imlay & Tepper P.C.
14356 Cape May Road
Silver Spring, MD 20904-6011