

lost as a result of additional interference to existing stations.

**WKRC-TV (ch. 12) Cincinnati**—The proposed Dayton drop-in would conflict with several criteria the FCC has established if the agency is to take the "exceptional course of violating its own rules." Interference within WKRC-TV's grade B contour would affect 785,322 persons in an area of 2,468 square miles. "This would be major, not minimal dislocation," WKRC-TV maintained, and pointed out interference to other stations would be caused affecting 575,000 persons. These losses far outweigh any gains that would accrue through a ch. 11 Dayton assignment.

**Miami Valley Telecasting Corp.**—Another potential ch. 11 applicant, Miami Valley said that of all the major markets which have only two vhf stations, "none more clearly meets the commission's requirements for the addition of a third vhf service than does Dayton." Dayton demands and can support more tv stations than are presently available, with the two present stations being unable to adequately meet the needs of the area.

**Buckeye Broadcasting Corp.**—Uhf is "dead" in Dayton and there is no prospect for its revival; Buckeye supported the proposed addition of ch. 11. "The need for a third competitive facility in Dayton exists now and the tenuous hope that uhf might have a chance some 10 or more years [from now] obviously provides no solution for a problem that cries for solution now." The petitioner said that it will promptly apply for ch. 11 upon its allocation to Dayton.

**Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.)**—Maintained that the proposed drop-in of ch. 11 in Dayton, Ohio, would "seriously affect" reception of WHAS-TV Louisville in Kentucky and Indiana. The senator enclosed a "fact sheet" sent to him by WHAS-TV. He hoped the FCC "might find a way to achieve its objectives without causing the difficulties to WHAS-TV which are now feared."

**WIC (TV) (ch. 11) Pittsburgh**—Opposed "squeeze-in" of ch. 11 in Dayton because it would be "wasteful assignment, not justifiable in the public interest." WIC said that it would be subjected to substantial interference from a ch. 11 station in Dayton. The proposed station would cause 1,356,644 persons to lose service and, by contrast, a Dayton station on ch. 11 would bring a new service to only 1,005,892 people.

**Gem City Tv Corp.**—Said it plans to file for a Dayton station on ch. 11 at the "earliest possible time" in supporting the proposed assignment. Full protection can be rendered to adjacent and co-channel stations by ch. 11 in Dayton through suppression of radiation and directional antennae.

#### Johnstown, Pa., drop-in

**WGAL-TV (ch. 8) Lancaster, Pa.**—Urged that ch. 3 be assigned Johnstown rather than ch. 8, which was proposed to be deleted from Lancaster. If ch. 8 is deleted, several Pennsylvania communities will lose all service, but addition of ch. 3 will increase the number of persons receiving service. Additionally, the use of a lower vhf channel would prove advantageous in overcoming the rugged terrain in the Johnstown-Altoona area.

**WCRO Johnstown**—Supported drop-ins, asked that both ch. 3 and ch. 8 be assigned Johnstown, cited market facts about population, industry, retail sales, expansion, etc. WCRO would apply for one of the vhf channels. It said two channels would permit truly competitive service from all three networks and a diversity of outlets for local self-expression.

**WTAE (TV) (ch. 4) Pittsburgh**—Had no comment on proposal to add ch. 8, but objected to plan to add ch. 3 because of adjacent-channel mileage separation violation involved. Asserted right to a hearing on the modification of its license which would result if ch. 3 is dropped in. WTAE said no necessity for adding ch. 3 has been shown.

**WSVA-TV (ch. 3) Harrisonburg, Va.**—Ignored proposal to add ch. 8, objected to drop-in of ch. 3 because of co-channel separation shortage. Said drop-in of ch. 3 would seriously degrade WSVA-TV service and deprive a large rural community of its only tv service.

**WJW-TV (ch. 8) Cleveland**—"... under all pertinent criteria the assignment of ch. 3+ is by far preferable to the assignment of ch. 8+." Johnstown alone would not qualify for a drop-in but as a combined

market with Altoona, Pa., it would. Because WJAC-TV (ch. 6) Johnstown and WFBG-TV (ch. 10) Altoona provide Grade A service to each other's cities, a third competitive service would have to be able to serve both cities. WJW-TV suggested a ch. 3 site for an added station which it said would involve only one substandard separation and permit substantially greater interference-free service than is possible of ch. 8. Other reasons were listed to demonstrate the superiority of a ch. 3 assignment to that of a ch. 8, and station said 53% more people would be served by the lower channel (which would not provide co-channel interference to WJW-TV).

**WARD-TV (ch. 56 and permittee of ch. 19) Johnstown**—Asked that ch. 8 be assigned to Johnstown and that an amendment to the order specify show-cause why WARD-TV should not be authorized to operate on ch. 8. That ch. assignment is technically feasible and should be finalized. Directional antenna can protect other ch. 8 stations (WGAL-TV Lancaster, WJW-TV Cleveland and WCHS-TV Charleston, W. Va.) and maximum power should be permitted in other directions. If show-cause order is not issued there would be delay of ch. 8 service to public and WARD-TV may be compelled to cease operation of uhf because of curtailed network and advertiser support, thus depriving that area's public of a third tv service.

**Penn Traffic Co.**—Supported drop in of either ch. 8 or ch. 3, said both assignments would satisfy FCC drop-in criteria and would have no adverse effect on uhf. Penn Traffic, which operates a Johnstown department store, would apply for either channel, would prefer that ch. 3 be added.

#### Baton Rouge, La., drop-in

**Baton Rouge Tv Inc.**—Supported addition of ch. 11 to that city, said that with proper transmitter site, the assignment can meet mileage separation criteria. Baton Rouge is a growing market which needs a third tv service.

**KLFY-TV (ch. 10) Lafayette, La.**—Opposed the assignment of ch. 11 at any adjacent mileage separation which is in violation of FCC rules. Permitting any application for ch. 11 at less than a 60-mile separation from KLFY-TV constitutes a modification of the construction permit of KLFY-TV and, in the absence of a proper hearing, is unlawful.

**Walter E. Hussman**—Supported deletion of ch. 11 from Houma, La., and reassignment to Baton Rouge where he would apply for the channel. Station can be so situated as not to violate spacing requirements vis-a-vis KLFY-TV. He cited need of market for third tv service.

**La. State Board of Education**—Urged FCC to consider reserving ch. 11 Baton Rouge for educational use.

**WLCS Baton Rouge**—Favored drop-in of ch. 11 and intends to apply for it. Said technical shortage is outweighed by need for service, that there is no significant uhf development in Louisiana with which the assignment of ch. 11 would interfere.

**KHMA (ch. 11 cp) Houma, La.**—Resubmitted petition for immediate grant, asking FCC to shift ch. 11 from Houma to Baton Rouge and grant it to KHMA. Said in similar cases where FCC proposes to shift channels to larger markets, it is customary and fitting to issue a show-cause order why the incumbent permittee should not operate the same channel after it is reassigned.

#### Oklahoma City drop-in

**KOCO-TV (ch. 5) Enid, Okla.**—Filed earlier asking that ch. 5 be shifted from Enid to Oklahoma City and that a show-cause order be issued why KOCO-TV should not operate ch. 5 in Oklahoma City.

**KFSA-TV (ch. 5) Fort Smith, Ark.**—The proposed assignment of ch. 5 to Oklahoma City would involve a separation less than the standard 190 miles. KFSA-TV reserved its rights to a hearing if any proposal is made which would result in modification of its license.

#### Birmingham, Ala., drop-in

**WRBL-TV (ch. 3) Columbus, Ga.**—Opposed the drop-in of ch. 3 at Birmingham, Ala., on the grounds that undue interference to the WRBL-TV signal would result, and said that under present FCC requirements the only spot in the direction of Birmingham at which a drop-in of ch. 3 could be made was at Memphis, Tenn.

**WTWV(TV) (ch. 9) Tupelo, Miss.**—Counterproposed that the FCC delete ch. 4

(WCBI-TV) from Columbus, Miss., and drop it in at Birmingham in place of ch. 3, and that it award ch. 9, presently in Tupelo, to WCBI-TV, and grant WTVV (TV) ch. 4 in Birmingham.

**Alabama Telecasting Corp.**—Opposed the drop-in on the grounds that the proposed channel would suffer from such technical deficiencies from interference so that the third station would not be able "to provide a technical service which would be competitive with the two existing Birmingham stations."

**WRGP-TV (ch. 3) Chattanooga, Tenn.**—Opposed the drop-in at Birmingham saying that the move would impair "the current service rendered by ch. 3 from Chattanooga, and would mean additional requests for further and greater impairment to WRGP-TV" because of ch. 3 Birmingham's inability to provide technically uncluttered service.

**Birmingham T.V. Inc.**—Supported the drop-in, and indicated its intention to apply for the ch. 3 license.

**WVOK Birmingham, Ala.**—Supported the reallocation of ch. 3 to its city, and suggested methods to relieve interference that might result to other ch. 3 outlets. The radio station said it would apply for the reallocated channel.

Other interested parties in the Birmingham question filed earlier, and summaries of their positions were carried last week (At DEADLINE, Feb. 19).

#### Jacksonville, Fla., drop-in

**Jacksonville Television Corp.**—Supported the allocation of ch. 10 to that city, arguing that the city was important enough to have three commercial outlets and that the addition of a new channel would ensure competition.

**WTSP-TV (ch. 10) Largo, Fla.**—Suggested that FCC alter the antenna site specified for the station in its cp, so that interference between WTSP-TV and the proposed ch. 10 in Jacksonville would be reduced.

**Post-Times Co.**—Supported the drop-in of ch. 10 on the basis of public service, and proposed to apply for the license.

**Donald Bolton Jr. and Joseph Speidel**—Supported the allocation of ch. 10 to Jacksonville, and announced intention to apply for it.

**Community First Corp.**—Supported the ch. 10 drop-in on the basis of urgent community need and as a method for ensuring imaginative competition.

**WMBR Jacksonville, Fla.**—Supported the FCC proposal, saying that technical drawbacks to it would be minimal and outweighed by the advantages.

**WAPE Jacksonville, Fla.**—Supported the ch. 10 assignment to that city on the grounds of area need. Brennan Broadcasting Co., licensee of WAPE, has not reached a final decision as to whether it will apply for the channel if it is dropped-in.

**WZOK-AM-FM Jacksonville, Fla.**—Supported the reallocation as a means of ensuring community service, and argued that technical standards do not militate against the ch. 10 drop-in.

#### Knoxville, Tenn., drop-in

**National Assn. of Educational Broadcasters**—Supported the proposal to reallocate ch. 8 to Knoxville, and urged that uhf ch. 26 in that city be reserved for non-commercial educational use. In its comments, NAEB supported the application of WTVK (TV) to move from ch. 26 to ch. 8 in Knoxville.

**WISH-TV (ch. 8) Indianapolis, Ind.**—Opposed the assignment of ch. 8 to Knoxville on grounds that the allocation would violate FCC mileage separation rules, and cause "destructive and degrading" interference to the WISH-TV signal.

**WSIX-TV (ch. 8) Nashville, Tenn.**—Opposed the proposed drop-in at Knoxville, saying that such allocation would be a violation of standing FCC rules, and would cause a substantial and needless loss of service.

#### Charlotte, N. C., drop-in

**WJBF(TV) (ch. 6) Augusta, Ga.**—Opposed the drop-in of ch. 6 in Charlotte because it would damage WJBF's service area—and that of other existing ch. 6 stations in the general mileage area—and would limit its coverage, and not adequately compensate for this harm by outstanding merit. As alternative, WJBF proposed that ch. 10 be assigned Charlotte if the FCC decides to de-

Continued on page 143