

Western Washington corrodicator thread
Karl Shoemaker
Jul 12 #216629

Any of us older folks that run normal bandwidth might want to get in on the thread out about narrow banding.

Under Groups find the one of wwara. The main issue with narrow banding is interference to the other guys. it's only a temp. band-aid to over population.

--

-

Regards, Karl Shoemaker

Please remember not to reply (email) from this group as I won't get it.

Please visit SRG's web site at <https://www.srgclub.org>

under "contacts" for the current email address.

narrowbanding plans.jpg

RFI-EMI-GUY
Jul 12 #216635

Narrowbanding in Part 90 LMR crippled that service with respect to recovered audio quality and coverage reliability. The penalty is well documented if one reads and understands TIA TSB-88D. APCO 25 was supposed to be the savior of Part 90. In reality the expected spectrum congestion was never encountered because many business users moved off of Part 90 to use cellular and PCS.

For the amateur radio service to believe their numbers of licensees somehow justify the inconvenience and loss of performance justifies narrow banding all existing repeaters is delusional. The solution is easy, if someone wants a repeater that won't fit into the existing plan, then require them to use a narrow bandwidth and find them an interstitial channel that has sufficient geographic separation from adjacent repeaters.

--

The Real RFI-EMI-GUY

Jay Nugent
Jul 13 #216638

Greetings,

On Sat, 12 Jul 2025, RFI-EMI-GUY wrote:

Narrowbanding in Part 90 LMR crippled that service with respect to recovered audio quality and coverage

reliability. The penalty is well documented if one reads and understands TIA TSB-88D. APCO 25 was

supposed to be the savior of Part 90. In reality the expected spectrum congestion was never encountered

because many business users moved off of Part 90 to use cellular and PCS.

For the amateur radio service to believe their numbers of licensees somehow justify the inconvenience

and loss of performance justifies narrow banding all existing repeaters is delusional. The solution is

easy, if someone wants a repeater that won't fit into the existing plan, then require them to use a

narrow bandwidth and find them an interstitial channel that has sufficient geographic separation from adjacent repeaters.

The audio quality drops so badly that us 'older' Hams can't understand it with our "old ears". But being that older (and grumpy) old Ham, I gotta propose the following:

Any narrowband repeaters MUST show that the repeater gets no less than THREE HOURS of solid 'conversation' on their repeater EVERY DAY, or the coordination gets cancelled!

NOTE: The "Networking" of multiple repeaters together (via AllStar, etc.) is NOT a way around this rule.

Repeater sub-bands are FULL with no more 'pairs' available, yet these repeaters sit idle for days or weeks with NO USAGE! This does not justify the need for MORE repeaters that will also sit idle. Every Ham DOES NOT need their own personal repeater so they can chat with their two or three friends. Repeaters are COMMUNITY systems where many Hams gather - not private channels that only stroke the EGO of a few. Narrowbanding to make more room for more EGO's is not the way to move forward.

--- Jay WB8TKL

"Grumpy Old Ham"

Kory Oldham W4RZ

Jul 13 #216639

We had the issue here of multistate coordination, and no usable repeater pairs. The fix we ended up going with was a Wide Split pair, versus the standard 600k split.

This is just a thought versus going narrow band.

Kory

W4RZ

toggle quoted message Show quoted text

Matt

Jul 13 #216643

Wow. "3 hours" per day? I live in middle America, where the statewide amateur count is ~4,000 for the entire state (Nebraska, 400x200mi). In Omaha, the largest city (~500,000), we often/usually don't see "3 hours" in total across the 20+ repeaters (VHF/UHF, analog/digital) in a single day.

I run the only 220 repeater in the Omaha, NE, area, and over the past 9

months, it has averaged a whopping 1.5 hours per MONTH. I've questioned if I'll ever spend the effort to repair it if it has an issue, but have continued its maintenance simply because it is the only 220 repeater in the area.

Following this mindset of usage, we'd have to cancel all coordinations. Of course we wouldn't. But who gets cancelled? Do we say that because there are only half a dozen P25 users that they get pulled? The same for the NXDN users? What about M17? DMR? Fusion? DStar?

There is one wide area analog pair that covers a 60 mile radius, however, there are users just a few miles from that pair that are shadowed and can't get into it. Do we say too bad? Their alternative is to use an even less utilized pair, but that pair wouldn't exist with this baseline of usage (of course, neither would the primary pair.)

I do agree that the "community" is fractured. We simply have too many modes for a finite user base. As noted above, there are at least 6 digital voice modes in addition to analog to split the user base against. It's nice to experiment and dabble, but we must be cognizant that a portion of our reduced air time on a given repeater is reduced due to users choosing this mode over that mode. I have radios for many modes that sit on a shelf and rarely see use (NXDN, P25, DStar) simply because there are literally no other users in the area. But that again begs the question, when a "new" mode comes along, do we say "too bad"?

Matt
ALOR
toggle quoted message Show quoted text

Jim Aspinwall
Jul 13 #216646

Striking, chilling, is the first sentence of that post: "We have started a spreadsheet to document radios that are and are not narrowband capable. "

That should have been surveyed - both user and system equipment - when they started this.

Apparently not enough professional experience engaged, or it was disregarded/out-voted. Serious engineering and coordination interests take narrow-band literally in all the proper ways - occupied bandwidth, emission mask, designators, et al - not just some 'progressive' gesture of simply reducing deviation or radio 'mode'. Then too, a review of their organization, by-laws, quorum - this effort was approved by an obviously low percentage of the entire membership/systems involved.

About 2022-23 I ran a survey of repeater owners and ham clubs toward this as part of discussions to assess if and where in the current 2M spectrum NorCal could, maybe, effect/re-farm for some narrow-band opportunities. Response was not significant, but the

results indicated that 30% of both existing on-air repeater equipment and user radios were not and could not easily if at all, be compatible/truly compliant with narrow band operations.

There was/is almost no way without a LOT of money, and a LOT of re-coordination 'engineering' efforts, that would obviously take years, such an effort seemed feasible. The idea never even got to a "motion to narrow-band" - and effectively died at that point - as it did back in about 2009 prior. For now.

Of course in California is basically two-states as far as coordination, plus working with adjoining states - so just that much more long-term work to negotiate, much less effect such an effort.

Ed Marciniak
Jul 13 #216647

In event of a natural (or manmade) disaster, we could expect utilization would radically increase if the telephone network (and/or internet) were suddenly unavailable in an area. If the same disaster also damaged some hardware, a bug might become a feature.

A great question is whether some repeaters should cooperate together and serve as remote receivers for others with an RF link to backhaul the remote receive, or even look at simulcasting with multiple linked transmitters to create repeater (systems) with larger coverage area.

In a land where cheap rubidium frequency standards can be had for sometimes under 100 USD with frequency stabilities better than 10^{-10} it's technically feasible.

toggle quoted message Show quoted text

Chuck Kelsey
Jul 13 #216648

Yep, take away linking and probably very few repeaters would meet a 3-hour criteria.

The real answer is to tell applicants that they'll need to utilize a different band in the event all coordinations are full. That, or buy out an under-used coordinated repeater.

OK, I'll just go ahead and say it... Digital repeaters should have all been on 900 MHZ and above. They are Internet connected anyway - a network - and would have fit there nicely. Now I'll go hide.

Chuck
WB2EDV

On 7/13/2025 10:37 AM, Matt via groups.io wrote:
toggle quoted message Show quoted text

Jay Nugent
Jul 13 #216650

Greetings,

On Sun, 13 Jul 2025, Chuck Kelsey via groups.io wrote:

Yep, take away linking and probably very few repeaters would meet a 3-hour criteria.

I stated "3 hours" as a starting point to get the conversation going. I just pulled that number out of my....err...whatever....

The real answer is to tell applicants that they'll need to utilize a different band in the event all coordinations are full. That, or buy out an under-used coordinated repeater.

Agreed! We are all full-up here, move to the higher bands :)

In my case, I maintain 3 repeaters for my local club (2, 220, and 440), another that I am a co-owner (previous owner got sick and sold it to 4 of us who are co-owners), and my own repeater I "inherited" through our Repeater Council's program where an owner can designate his/her successor upon their demise. The owner went SK and I had been named as the successor. I have since listed "my" repeater to go to my local club upon my demise.

I'd like to see more undeutilized, poorly maintained, and/or "paper" repeaters get handed over to those who will make them operational and work to build a solid 'user base'.

OK, I'll just go ahead and say it... Digital repeaters should have all been on 900 MHZ and above. They are Internet connected anyway - a network - and would have fit there nicely. Now I'll go hide.

Agreed. We have 3 Fusion/C4FM near me and *NONE* get ANY users running that mode - and other "multi-mode digital" repeaters no-one listens to anymore as people don't want to listen to then squelling away! No, you can't filter by PL tone when using a SCANNER. The D-Star repeaters in the area are used FAR LESS often than the FM ones. And the few DMR repeaters only get used for a Net once per WEEK!!! The AllStar-linked (statewide) repeaters get a few hours of airtime every day :)

--- Jay WB8TKL

On 7/13/2025 10:37 AM, Matt via groups.io wrote:

Wow. "3 hours" per day? I live in middle America, where the statewide amateur count is ~4,000 for the entire state (Nebraska, 400x200mi). In Omaha, the largest city (~500,000), we often/usually don't see "3 hours" in total across the 20+ repeaters (VHF/UHF, analog/digital) in a single day.

Bob Dengler
Jul 13 #216653

At 7/13/2025 09:01 AM, you wrote:

Greetings,

On Sun, 13 Jul 2025, Chuck Kelsey via groups.io wrote:

- > Yep, take away linking and probably very few repeaters would meet a
- > 3-hour criteria.

I stated "3 hours" as a starting point to get the conversation going.
I just pulled that number out of my....err...whatever....

- > The real answer is to tell applicants that they'll need to utilize a
- > different band in the event all coordinations are full. That, or buy out
- > an under-used coordinated repeater.

Agreed! We are all full-up here, move to the higher bands :)

And just who decides when a band is "full"? We've had coordinators here say bands have been "full" for over 40 years. If I had listened to them over 40 years ago I would've let my license expire & wouldn't be here today.

A band is never "full", just more or less crowded. If we can still find room on 2 meters here in SoCal for new systems, WWARA certainly can in their less crowded environment without having to resort to ridiculous bandplan changes.

Bob NO6B

Karl Shoemaker
9:45am #216757

Right on Bob !

Update: that thread has been "locked" whatever term that came up with.
I confirmed with Scott the discussion moved away from the original post (so what, right?) he started about "what" they plan. That's the downside to moderated groups/posts.
So I guess I have to give up? I have to "play" nice in the sandbox or "they" could make my life miserable.

Anyway, one nice guy on that thread said:

"So I'm pretty convinced that this situation is just going to turn into a big mess.

As I said if certain sections of the band want to go narrowband with an abandoned repeater pairs that's one thing.

The WWARA in my opinion is trying to use their administrative authority to regulate specific modes in Pacific Northwest. The FCC is the only one who has the authority to do that.

It's clear my statements are falling on deaf ears. I guess what is being said is don't confuse me with the facts my mind is made up.

So I guess all I can do is watch this whole situation self-destruct."

I should not disclose his name/call yet without contacting him first. You guys know the drill of that crap in this crazy world we are stuck with.

But you guys get that idea from the thread and thanks for your input. Contact me if you want to read the complete thread.

I'm amazed at the lack of corporation among amateurs to pull together to help the current repeaters out that.

I guess there's too many dictators with egos that want their own little repeater to play with.

If this goes through it will only buy time for the inevitable the crowding on 2-meters will catch up. Argg ! I think they don't "get it".

The scary part I'm starting to get used to this type of treatment to the community and may become a zombie :(

I've been doing the repeater thing since 1976. This is why I have a large coverage area repeater so every (responsible) amateur can communicate. (details on the web site).

--

Regards, Karl Shoemaker

Please remember not to reply (email) from this group as I won't get it.

Please visit SRG's web site at <https://www.srgclub.org>

under "contacts" for the current email address.

Reply

Like

More

Karl Shoemaker

9:50am #216758

Someone (did not get his call sign or real name) mentioned the TIA TSB-88D. APCO 25 but I find it's a needle in the haystack. I would like (and post) the document.

Please post a direct link or better yet the document (pdf or whatever) on here, please.

I am looking for traceable and authority data to send to the wwara why this won't work in the future.

--

-

Regards, Karl Shoemaker

Please remember not to reply (email) from this group as I won't get it.

Please visit SRG's web site at <https://www.srgclub.org>

under "contacts" for the current email address.