

Dan,

Thanks for the information. Sorry I asked.

I must say that I am even more confused and befuddled than I was when the first list came out.

We had our doubts back then about some of the information and how it was obtained but this just solidifies the fact that there is inaccurate, old and conflicting information still coming off these lists and whomever is doing the testing is not doing it well at all.

We have quite a number of linked repeaters co-channeled with ourselves and others that come up simultaneously or individually and sometimes I don't think they know which end is up when trying to discern what they are seeing or listening to.

We have spent literally hundreds of man hours doing our own testing, re-configuring equipment, changing patterns, replacing antennas, transmitters, numerous multi-day road trips, tweaking, re-tweaking, etc...and spent literally thousands of dollars jumping through all these hoops to help them, ourselves and the rest of the Amateur Radio community co-exist together and now this?

What we need is someone from OUR side who knows what they are doing and can watch their information gathering process and be there to help identify things more accurately. Maybe coordinate testing with people who have challenges, serious doubts or conflicts and nail things down once and for all.

Also, doing testing in the heat of the summer in that valley just makes for wildly huge margins of path loss and gain changes especially at VHF & UHF frequencies. This doesn't help the situation in the least.

Of the repeater information we received:

Some of it wasn't there before but is now.

Some of it was there before but vanished.

Some of it changed but we didn't make any changes (based on conversations with Riley).

Some of it says we didn't change anything at all but we did.

Some of the changes we made don't come close to what they say we did.

Some of it is listed twice with different dB figures and for a call-sign that hasn't been listed for years (that was their latest 2008 findings besides).

Some of the frequencies are listed as 5 KHz higher than published or operating on.

And some of it I think is from co-channel repeaters that they may have mixed a call sign from one with a signal from another.

There needs to be a better check and balance of what is being force fed to us. How does one take this information seriously anymore? What or whom are we to believe?

They did their cherry picking in 2007 and now they're shot-gunning everything else in sight that they can remotely come up with as having any sign of a heart beat. I would have hoped that by

now they would have gotten their act together a little more and learned from their mistakes. That doesn't seem to have happened.

It's one thing to cooperate with these changes based on valid, trusted data. It's quite another thing to go to the time, expense, and energy to make changes at sites when the data shows obvious errors that could cause unnecessary changes, as well as leave machines which are causing issues untouched due to inaccurate data.

Dan, what else can we do together to insure that the correct machines are, in fact, on this list and the information presented to us is indeed accurate?

Thanks for your time.

Tom Naso, N6MVT
CARLA