DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ANN BAVENDER*
ANNE GOODWIN CRUMP*
VINCENT J. CURTIS, JR
RICHARD J. ESTEVEZ
PAUL J. FELDMAN
ERIC FISHMAN
RICHARD HILDRETH
FRANK R. JAZZO
ANDREW S. KERSTING*
EUGENE M. LAWSON, JR.
HARRY C. MARTIN
GEORGE PETRUTSAS
LEONARD R. RAISH
JAMES P. RILEY
KATHLEEN VICTORY
HOWARD M. WEISS
* NOT ADMITTED IN VIRGINIA

FLETCHER, HEALD & HILDRETH, P.L.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
11th FLOOR, 1300 NORTH 17th STREET
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209-3801

(703) 812-0400
TELECOPIER
(703) 812-0486
INTERNET
office@fhh-telcomlaw.com

FRANK U. FLETCHER (1939-1985)
ROBERT L. HEALD (1956-1983)
PAUL D.P. SPEARMAN (1936-1962)
FRANK ROBERSON (1936-1961)
RUSSELL ROWELL (1948-1977)
RETIRED
EDWARD F. KENEHAN
CONSULTANT FOR INTERNATIONAL AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
SHELDON J. KRYS
U. S. AMBASSADOR (ret.)
OF COUNSEL
EDWARD A. CAINE*
MITCHELL LAZARUS*
EDWARD S. O'NEILL*
JOHN JOSEPH SMITH*
WRITER'S DIRECT
812-0474

RECEIVED
APR 2 0 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

April 20, 1998

BY HAND DELIVERY
Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact Upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service
MM Docket No. 87-268

Dear Ms. Salas:

Transmitted herewith on behalf of Fant Broadcast Development, L.L.C., are an original and four copies of its "Petition for Reconsideration," which is being filed in response to the Commission's *Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of the Sixth Report and Order*, FCC 98-24 (released February 23, 1998), in the above-referenced proceeding.

Should any questions arise concerning this matter, please communicate directly with this office.

Very truly yours,

Andrew S. Kersting
Counsel for
Fant Broadcast Development, L.L.C.

Enclosures
cc (w/ encl.): Certificate of Service (by hand & first-class mail)

No. of Copies rec'd 0+4
List ABCDE

BEFORE THE

Federal Communications Commission

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
APR 2 0 1998
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Advanced Television Systems	)	
and Their Impact Upon the Existing	)	MM Docket No. 87-268
Television Broadcast Service	)	

To: The Commission

PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Fant Broadcast Development, L.LC. ("Fant"), by its counsel, hereby seeks reconsideration of the Commission's *Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of the Sixth Report and Order*, FCC 98-24 (released February 23, 1998) ("*MO&O*"), in the above-captioned proceeding. In support of this petition, the following is stated:

I. Background.

On July 23, 1996, Fant filed a petition for rulemaking requesting the Commission to allot Channel 50 to Plaquemine, Louisiana, as that community's first local television service. On the same date, Fant filed an accompanying application for a new television station to operate on Channel 50 at Plaquemine, Louisiana.[1]

In its *Sixth Report and Order* in this proceeding, 12 FCC Rcd 15088 (1997), the Commission noted that, in its *Sixth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, it stated that it would not accept

---

[1] Fant's rulemaking petition and accompanying application included a request for waiver of the Commission's order in *Advanced Television Systems and Their Impact on the Existing Television Broadcast Service*, RM-5811, 1987 FCC LEXIS 3477 (July 17, 1987), 52 Fed.Reg. 28346 (1987) ("Freeze Order").

additional applications for new NTSC stations that were filed after September 20, 1996.[2] The Commission also noted, however, that it would continue to process applications already on file and those that were filed on or before September 20, 1996, because the Commission did not believe that these applications would have a "significant negative impact" on the development of the DTV Table of Allotments. *Sixth Report and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 14635, ¶104. The Commission further noted that it also stated in its *Sixth Further Notice* that it would continue to accept petitions for rulemaking proposing to amend the existing TV Table of Allotments in Section 73.606(b) of the rules through July 25, 1996. *Id.* at ¶105. Any petitions that were on file and any rulemaking proceedings that were pending on that date would be addressed on a case-by-case basis, taking into account their impact on the DTV Table.[3] *Id.*

II. The *MO&O* Failed to Protect Fant's Pending NTSC Rulemaking Petition and Accompanying Application.

In its recent *MO&O*, the Commission repeatedly confirmed that it fully intended to protect pending NTSC applications filed by the September 20, 1996, deadline. *See, e.g., MO&O* at ¶¶571, 575, 608, 627. Nevertheless, the DTV Table set forth in the *MO&O* fails to protect Fant's pending rulemaking petition seeking the allotment of NTSC Channel 50 at Plaquemine, Louisiana, as well as Fant's pending application for that facility. As stated above, Fant's rulemaking petition and

---

[2] *See Sixth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, 11 FCC Rcd 10968, 10992 ¶60 (1996) ("*Sixth Further Notice*"). Specifically, the Commission stated that it would not accept additional applications for NTSC stations that were filed after 30 days from the publication of the *Sixth Further Notice* in the Federal Register. A summary of the *Sixth Further Notice* was published in the Federal Register on August 21, 1996. *See* 61 Fed.Reg. 43209 (1996).

[3] The Commission also stated that, in those pending cases in which a new NTSC channel is allotted, it would make an exception to its September 20, 1996, deadline and accept applications for the new stations. *Sixth Report and Order*, ¶105.

accompanying application for the Channel 50 facility at Plaquemine were on file with the Commission prior to the respective July 25 and September 20, 1996, filing deadlines. In its *Sixth Further Notice,* the Commission noted that there were more than 300 applications then on file which, if processed, would result in more than 100 new NTSC stations. *Sixth Further Notice*, 11 FCC Rcd at 10992, ¶60. The Commission further stated:

> As we process the applications on file now and those that are filed before the end of this filing opportunity, <u>we will continue our current policy of considering requests for waiver of our 1987 freeze *Order* on a case-by-case basis</u>.

Id. (emphasis added).[4] The Commission provided no notice, however, that, with respect to these pending applications for new television stations, it had no intention of acting on requests for waiver of the 1987 Freeze Order, but, instead, was merely going to treat applications containing such a waiver request as if they had never been filed.[5] The Commission also failed to provide any notice that an application would be considered to be "pending" only if it had been formally "accepted for filing," or if the application did not include a request for waiver of the 1987 Freeze Order. Indeed, rather than "considering requests for waiver of the 1987 Freeze Order on a case-by-case basis," as the Commission stated it would in its *Sixth Further Notice* (and as the Commission claimed to have done in its *Sixth Report and Order*), the Commission simply disregarded all applications that

---

[4] The Commission reiterated this statement in its *Sixth Report and Order* at ¶104.

[5] After conducting a comprehensive review of the FCC's engineering database with respect to those television applications that were filed either on or shortly before the September 20, 1996, filing deadline, and the cut-off lists that have been issued since the release of the *Sixth Further Notice*, Fant has been unable to find even one instance where the Commission processed such an application and "considered" a request for waiver of the 1987 Freeze Order.

contained a request for waiver of the 1987 Freeze Order in establishing the DTV Table, and treated such applications as if they had never been filed.[6]

The Commission's failure to protect the proposed allotment of Channel 50 at Plaquemine and Fant's pending application for that facility is inconsistent with the statements the Commission made in its *Sixth Further Notice* and *Sixth Report and Order*, and the Commission neglected to provide any explanation for its failure to consider Fant's pending proposals in establishing the DTV Table. Therefore, for this reason alone, the DTV Table contained in the *MO&O* should be revised to accommodate the proposed NTSC allotment of Channel 50 at Plaquemine, Louisiana, and Fant's pending application for that facility.

III. The Commission Should Substitute an Alternative DTV Channel For the Existing DTV Channel 50 Allotment at New Orleans, Louisiana, or, Alternatively, Fant Should be Permitted to Amend its Pending NTSC Rulemaking Petition and Accompanying Application to Specify an Available Alternative Channel.

In this case, the proposed NTSC allotment of Channel 50 at Plaquemine, Louisiana, is short-spaced to a co-channel DTV allotment for Station WCCL(TV), New Orleans, Louisiana. Assuming, *arguendo*, the Commission should determine that its failure to consider Fant's pending rulemaking petition and accompanying application for a Channel 50 NTSC facility at Plaquemine does not constitute a sufficient basis, in itself, for granting reconsideration of the DTV allotment of Channel 50 at New Orleans, the Commission has stated throughout this proceeding that it intends to give broadcasters the flexibility to develop alternative allotment plans where they do not result in additional interference to other stations and/or allotments. In order to accommodate Fant's pending

---

[6] The Commission repeatedly stated throughout its *MO&O* that applications containing such waivers had not been accepted, no action had been taken on the waiver request, and that the subject channel was used for DTV purposes. *See, e.g., MO&O* at ¶¶608, 627; *see also* ¶575.

rulemaking petition proposing the NTSC allotment of Channel 50 at Plaquemine, Fant respectfully requests that the Commission change the DTV allotment for Station WCCL(TV), New Orleans, from Channel 50 to a channel outside the core (*i.e.*, channels 52-59). Alternatively, in the event the Commission elects not to substitute an alternative DTV channel for the Channel 50 allotment at New Orleans, Fant requests that it be permitted to amend its pending rulemaking petition and accompanying application to specify operation on either Channel 52, 55, or 57 at Plaquemine. The attached engineering materials contain a study demonstrating the viability of Channel 52 at Plaquemine.

The proposed substitution of an available alternative DTV channel for Channel 50 at New Orleans, or, alternatively, permitting Fant to amend its pending NTSC rulemaking petition and accompanying application to specify operation on one of the available alternative channels specified above, would effectuate the Commission's pronouncements in its *Sixth Further Notice* and *Sixth Report and Order* that it would protect those pending NTSC rulemaking petitions and applications that were filed before July 25 and September 20, 1996, respectively.

IV. The Proposals Set Forth Herein Would Provide Substantial Public Interest Benefits.

In this case, either substituting an alternative DTV channel for Channel 50 at New Orleans, or permitting Fant to amend its pending rulemaking petition and accompanying application to specify operation on any one of the available alternative NTSC channels set forth above would provide the community of Plaquemine with its first local television service, which would promote the objectives of Section 307(b) of the Communications Act of providing a fair, efficient and equitable distribution of television broadcast stations among the various states and communities. 47 U.S.C. §307(b). *See*

National Broadcasting Co. v. U.S., 319 U.S. 190, 217 (1943) (describing goal of Communications Act to "secure the maximum benefits of radio to all the people of the United States"); *FCC v. Allentown Broadcasting Co.*, 349 U.S. 358, 359-62 (1955) (describing goal of Section 307(b) to "secure local means of expression"). In addition, the proposed allotment would promote the second television allotment priority established in the *Sixth Report and Order* in Docket Nos. 8736 and 8975, 41 FCC 148, 167 (1952), of providing each community with at least one television broadcast station.

Furthermore, the substitution of an alternative DTV channel for Channel 50 at New Orleans or permitting Fant to amend its pending rulemaking petition and accompanying application to specify an available alternative NTSC channel at Plaquemine would serve the public interest by promoting the emergence and development of new networks.[7] As far back as 1941, when the Commission adopted its Chain Broadcasting Rules,[8] a primary goal of the Commission was to remove barriers

---

[7] Fant's application for the Plaquemine facility was filed in tandem with a series of other applications which, together, cover many of the top 100 markets in which there are no full power television stations to primarily affiliate with The WB Television Network ("The WB"), with whom these respective applicants have existing affiliations. Although there is no commitment on the part of either the applicants or The WB to enter into an affiliation agreement, The WB has indicated a willingness to enter into an affiliation agreement with these applicants in the event they are successful in acquiring a station in their respective communities. It should be made clear, however, that the public interest benefit of promoting an emerging network will be achieved regardless of which applicant ultimately acquires the construction permit. The important element is that the NTSC allotment be preserved and that the station become operational and available for affiliation. By the same token, the public interest benefit of promoting emerging networks is served regardless of whether it is The WB or some other new network that gains a primary affiliate in a top 100 market.

[8] *See Report on Chain Broadcasting*, Commission Order No. 37, Docket 5060 (May 1941) at 88 ("*Report on Chain Broadcasting*"); *Amendment of Part 73 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations with Respect to Competition and Responsibility in Network Television Broadcasting*, 25 FCC 2d 318, 333 (1970); *Fox Broadcasting Co. Request for Temporary Waiver*

(continued...)

that would inhibit the development of new networks. The Commission explained that the Chain Broadcasting Rules were intended to "foster and strengthen broadcasting by opening up the field to competition. An open door to networks will stimulate the old and encourage the new." *Report on Chain Broadcasting* at 88.

The successful emergence of new networks, however, depends in large part upon their ability to attract and retain local affiliates, which is the life blood of any national network. Moreover, for emerging networks, it is critical that they be afforded the opportunity to compete for affiliates as quickly as possible. Indeed, the large financial losses that confront any national network in its initial years of operation can be stemmed only by obtaining additional affiliates to carry the emerging network's programming. In many markets, however, there simply are not enough stations to provide affiliates for emerging networks in addition to those of the more established networks. Thus, the Commission should make the requested change in the DTV Table which, by permitting an additional broadcast station to serve the Baton Rouge, Louisiana television market, will help promote emerging networks.

Although the Commission has noted that it is not its function to assure competitive equality in any given market, it has acknowledged its "duty at least to take such actions as will create greater opportunities for more effective competition among the networks in major markets."[9] The history

---

[8](...continued)
of Certain Provisions of 47 C.F.R. §73.658, 5 FCC Rcd 3211, 3211 n.9 (1990), (*citing,* Network Inquiry Special Staff, *New Television Networks: Entry, Jurisdiction, Ownership, and Regulation* (Vol. 1 Oct. 1980)), waiver extended, 6 FCC Rcd 2622 (1991).

[9] *See, e.g., Television Broadcasters, Inc.*, 4 RR 2d 119, 123 (1965) (Commission granted a short-spacing waiver to an ABC affiliate based largely upon its finding that the station
(continued...)

of the Commission's financial interest and syndication ("finsyn") rules provides a good illustration of how the Commission has remained steadfast in its commitment to the goal of nurturing new networks. In 1970, when the Commission first adopted the finsyn rule, it noted that "[e]ncouragement of the development of additional networks to supplement or compete with existing networks is a desirable object and has long been the policy of this Commission." *Competition and Responsibility in Network Television Broadcasting*, 25 FCC 2d at 333. More than two decades later, when the Commission first relaxed and later eliminated the finsyn rule, it did so at the behest of the then-newest network entrant, Fox.[10] The FCC's goal of fostering new networks also is reflected in the Commission's relaxation of its multiple ownership rules. *See Amendment of Section 73.3555 of the Commission's Rules Relating to Multiple Ownership of AM, FM, and Television Broadcast*

---

[9](...continued)
had inferior facilities compared to those available to other national networks in the market, which resulted in a "serious competitive imbalance"), *recon. granted in part on other grounds*, 5 RR 2d 155 (1965); *New Orleans Television Corp.*, 23 RR 1113 (1962) (short-spacing waiver granted for the purpose of assuring the existence of a third truly competitive station in the market, thereby making available competitive facilities to the networks).

[10] Pending its review of the finsyn rule, the Commission granted Fox's request for a limited waiver of the rule. *Fox Broadcasting Co.*, 5 FCC Rcd at 3211 (1990). As Commissioner Duggan explained, "Fox has been a bright and innovative force. The existence of a fourth network is certainly in the public interest. . . . Fox deserves to be encouraged." *Broadcasting & Cable*, May 7, 1990, ed., p. 28; *accord, Application of Fox Television Stations, Inc. for Renewal of License of Station WNYW-TV, New York, New York*, 10 FCC Rcd 8502, 8528-29 (1995) (Commissioner Quello stating in his concurring statement, "I believe . . . that the creation of the fourth network was a compelling public interest goal."). Similarly, in deciding to phase out the finsyn rule entirely in 1995, the Commission evaluated the rule's impact on "[t]he overall business practices of emerging networks, such as Fox, in the network television and syndication business . . . [and t]he growth of additional networks, including the development of Fox and its position vis-
à-vis the three major networks." *Evaluation of Syndication and Financial Interest Rules*, 10 FCC Rcd 12165, 12166 (1995).

Stations, 100 FCC 2d 17, 50 (1984) (relaxing restrictions on multiple ownership advances the Commission's diversity goal by providing alternatives to the three television networks).

The Commission also has crafted other rules and granted a variety of waivers designed to foster the development of new networks over the years. In 1967, for example, the Commission granted a waiver of the dual network rule to ABC, the then-new network entrant, in connection with ABC's four new specialized radio networks. Although operation of the four networks violated the dual network rule, the Commission nevertheless concluded that waiver of the rule was appropriate because ABC's proposal "merits encouragement as a new and imaginative approach to networking." *Proposal of American Broadcasting Cos., Inc. to Establish Four New Specialized "American Radio Networks,"* 11 FCC 2d 163, 168 (1967). The Commission explained that it was "of more than usual importance to encourage to the extent possible innovation and experimentation in the operation of networks." *Id.* at 165.

As these examples illustrate, the Commission has remained steadfast in its commitment to the goal of encouraging new networks. Indeed, the Commission has consistently concluded for more than fifty years that the development of new networks -- with the accompanying diversity of viewpoint that they bring -- serves the public interest. In order for emerging networks to survive, however, it is imperative that they be afforded the opportunity to compete for additional local affiliates. The requested change in the DTV Table of Allotments will help facilitate the Commission's longstanding interest in promoting the emergence of new networks by providing an additional broadcast station with which to affiliate in the Baton Rouge market.

WHEREFORE, in light of the foregoing, Fant Broadcast Development, L.L.C., respectfully requests that the Commission GRANT reconsideration of its *MO&O* by substituting an alternative DTV channel for the existing DTV Channel 50 allotment at New Orleans, Louisiana, or, alternatively, permit Fant to amend its pending NTSC rulemaking petition and accompanying application to specify operation on any one of the available alternative NTSC channels specified above.

Respectfully submitted,

FANT BROADCAST DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.

By: _____
Vincent J. Curtis, Jr.
Andrew S. Kersting

Its Counsel

Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C.
1300 N. Seventeenth Street, 11th Floor
Arlington, Virginia 22209
(703) 812-0400

April 20, 1998

c:\ask...wb\rm\plaquemn.pet

Engineering Statement

Plaquemine, LA Channel 50

Wes, Inc. Broadcast Consultants

The program used to demonstrate interference and service replication percentages in this study was the OET FLR program, OET Bulletin 69, running on our own Sun Microsystems computers. These computers have been verified to give identical results to the runs generated by OET. The spacing programs are our own proprietary programs utilizing the FCC broadcast database and DTV database.

Due to a digital channel 50 being assigned to New Orleans, LA 104.7 km away, a study was conducted to propose moving the digital channel 50. The study showed that it might be necessary to move this digital above the 2-51 core.

Should the Commission prefer moving the proposed NTSC channel 50 in Plaquemine, LA, the TV channel spacing study shows channels 52, 55, and 57 open to such a change. An OET FLR study was performed and is attached showing the viability of channel 52. Also, attached list of digital channels within 300 km shows no conflict with any digital channels.

4/17/98

Pete E Myrl Warren, III Date
Whose qualifications are a matter of
record with the Commission

****** TV CHANNEL SPACING STUDY ******

Job title: PLAQUEMINE, LA
Channel: 52
Database file name: c:\tvsr\tv980408.edx

Latitude: 30 25 11
Longitude: 90 56 50

CH	Call	Record No.	City	ST	Z	STS	Bear.	Dist.	Reqd. Dist.	Result
38+	WNOLTV	4189	NEW ORLEANS	LA	3	L	116.7	108.6	95.7	12.9
45o	ALLOTM	4203	COLUMBIA	MS	3		48.6	141.0	95.7	45.3
45o	NEW	4204	COLUMBIA	MS	3	A	48.2	142.1	95.7	46.4
50-	ALLOTM	4421	PLAQUEMINE	LA	3	A	.0	.0	31.4	-31.4
44+	WGMB	4632	BATON ROUGE	LA	3	L	251.9	33.3	31.4	1.9
52o	ALLOTM	4840	EL DORADO	AR	2	A	332.6	296.2	280.8	15.4

****** End of channel 52 study ******

****** TV CHANNEL SPACING STUDY ******

Job title: PLAQUEMINE, LA
Channel: 55
Database file name: c:\tvsr\tv980408.edx

Latitude: 30 25 11
Longitude: 90 56 50

CH	Call	Record No.	City	ST	Z	STS	Bear.	Dist.	Reqd. Dist.	Result
55o	ALLOTM	3773	GULF SHORES	AL	3		92.1	314.2	329.0	-14.8
55o	NEW	3774	GULF SHORES	AL	3	A	87.3	303.0	329.0	-26.0
55o	NEW	3775	GULF SHORES	AL	3	A	92.0	314.3	329.0	-14.7
54+	WUPL	4194	SLIDELL	LA	3	L	98.2	101.3	87.7	13.6
50-	ALLOTM	4421	PLAQUEMINE	LA	3	A	.0	.0	31.4	-31.4
62+	ALLOTM	4422	HAMMOND	LA	3		78.8	47.5	95.7	-48.2
62+	NEW	4639	HAMMOND	LA	3	A	273.5	22.9	95.7	-72.8

****** End of channel 55 study ******

****** TV CHANNEL SPACING STUDY ******

Job title: PLAQUEMINE, LA
Channel: 57
Database file name: c:\tvsr\tv980408.edx

Latitude: 30 25 11
Longitude: 90 56 50

CH	Call	Record No.	City	ST	Z	STS	Bear.	Dist.	Reqd. Dist.	Result
50-	ALLOTM	4421	PLAQUEMINE	LA	3	A	.0	.0	95.7	-95.7
62+	ALLOTM	4422	HAMMOND	LA	3		78.8	47.5	31.4	16.1
62+	NEW	4639	HAMMOND	LA	3	A	273.5	22.9	31.4	-8.5
42+	ALLOTM	4643	NATCHEZ	MS	3		341.2	133.8	119.9	13.9
42+	NEW	4644	NATCHEZ	MS	3	A	340.3	128.5	119.9	8.6

****** End of channel 57 study ******

Study not including Plaquemine, LA

Run begins Wed Apr 15 16:49:01 1998, host providence
Analysis of: 12N MS JACKSON

	POPULATION	AREA (sq km)
within Noise Limited Contour	789099	39435.4
not affected by terrain losses	770488	37885.9
lost to NTSC IX	49637	4579.9
lost to additional IX by ATV	104	20.2
lost to all IX	49741	4600.1

Analysis of: 52A MS JACKSON
HAAT 497.0 m, ATV ERP 1000.0 kW, Cap Adj 0.3 dB

	POPULATION	AREA (sq km)
within Noise Limited Contour	789099	39435.4
not affected by terrain losses	786035	39213.5
lost to NTSC IX	0	0.0
lost to additional IX by ATV	1878	278.4
lost to ATV IX only	1878	278.4
lost to all IX	1878	278.4
percent match ATV/NTSC	99.8	99.3

Finished Wed Apr 15 17:15:49; run time 0:12:59
49088 calls to Longley-Rice; path distance increment 1.00 km

Study including Plaquemine, LA, with 5MW omni moved to Channel 52

Run begins Wed Apr 15 17:35:33 1998, host providence

Analysis of: 52N LA PLAQUEMINE

	POPULATION	AREA (sq km)
within Noise Limited Contour	1181781	20358.5
not affected by terrain losses	1181580	20330.5
lost to NTSC IX	0	0.0
lost to additional IX by ATV	5133	605.3
lost to all IX	5133	605.3

Analysis of: 69A LA PLAQUEMINE

HAAT 302.0 m, ATV ERP 232.1 kW

	POPULATION	AREA (sq km)
within Noise Limited Contour	1181781	20358.5
not affected by terrain losses	1181781	20354.5
lost to NTSC IX	0	0.0
lost to additional IX by ATV	0	0.0
lost to ATV IX only	0	0.0
lost to all IX	0	0.0
percent match ATV/NTSC	100.0	100.0

Analysis of: 12N MS JACKSON

	POPULATION	AREA (sq km)
within Noise Limited Contour	789099	39435.4
not affected by terrain losses	770488	37885.9
lost to NTSC IX	49637	4579.9
lost to additional IX by ATV	104	20.2
lost to all IX	49741	4600.1

Analysis of: 52A MS JACKSON

HAAT 497.0 m, ATV ERP 1000.0 kW, Cap Adj 0.3 dB

	POPULATION	AREA (sq km)
within Noise Limited Contour	789099	39435.4
not affected by terrain losses	786035	39213.5
lost to NTSC IX	16647	819.1
lost to additional IX by ATV	1849	266.3
lost to ATV IX only	1878	278.4
lost to all IX	18496	1085.5
percent match ATV/NTSC	99.6	99.1

Finished Wed Apr 15 18:08:52; run time 0:18:12

75524 calls to Longley-Rice; path distance increment 1.00 km

Computing Tools FCC Database Reports Rev 1.4
Digital TV Stations within 280.000 of 030-25-11 090-56-50
Accuracy and completeness of these results is NOT assured.

St	City	channel	latitude	longitude	distance, (km),	bearing (degrees)
LA	Lake Charles	8	30-23-43	093-00-08	197.487,	269.21380
LA	New Orleans	11	29-57-14	089-56-58	109.089,	118.25267
LA	New Orleans	14	29-55-11	090-01-29	104.727,	121.95393
LA	New Orleans	15	29-58-55	089-56-58	107.639,	116.79777
LA	Lafayette	16	30-21-44	092-12-53	121.983,	267.00468
MS	Biloxi	16	30-45-14	088-56-44	195.532,	79.07882
MS	B\ude	18	31-22-19	090-45-05	107.215,	10.05752
LA	Monroe	19	32-11-45	092-04-10	224.033,	331.51910
LA	Lake Charles	20	30-23-59	093-00-10	197.530,	269.35689
MS	Jackson	20	32-12-46	090-22-54	205.959,	15.15241
MS	Jackson	21	32-16-39	090-17-41	215.130,	16.77513
LA	Lafayette	23	30-02-38	092-22-14	143.209,	253.08706
LA	Slidell	24	30-17-08	089-54-18	101.303,	98.44254
LA	Baton Rouge	25	30-22-22	091-12-16	25.262,	258.11160
LA	Alexandria	26	31-33-56	092-32-50	198.726,	309.73514
LA	Lafayette	28	30-02-19	092-22-15	143.409,	252.86696
MS	Laurel	28	31-27-12	089-17-05	195.896,	54.20001
LA	New Orleans	29	29-57-14	089-56-58	109.089,	118.25267
LA	Lake Charles	30	30-17-26	093-34-35	253.181,	266.75789
LA	New Orleans	30	29-54-23	090-02-23	104.308,	123.06113
LA	New Orleans	31	29-58-57	089-57-09	107.349,	116.83930
LA	Alexandria	32	31-33-54	092-33-00	198.891,	309.67255
LA	Baton Rouge	34	30-19-35	091-16-36	33.315,	251.90691
LA	Alexandria	35	31-02-15	092-29-45	163.368,	294.78547
LA	West Monroe	36	32-05-41	092-10-39	219.588,	327.74781
LA	West Monroe	38	32-30-21	092-08-54	257.932,	333.73130
MS	Biloxi	39	30-43-25	089-05-29	181.190,	79.28468
LA	New Orleans	40	29-58-41	089-56-26	108.600,	116.79673
MS	Jackson	41	32-14-26	090-24-15	208.390,	14.36061
LA	Baton Rouge	42	30-17-49	091-11-40	27.389,	240.20274
LA	New Orleans	43	29-57-01	089-57-28	108.575,	118.63878
MS	Meridian	44	32-08-18	089-05-36	259.756,	42.81542
LA	Baton Rouge	45	30-19-35	091-16-36	33.315,	251.90691
LA	Baton Rouge	46	30-21-58	091-12-47	26.230,	256.90462
MS	Gulfport	48	30-44-48	089-03-30	184.770,	78.68750
MS	Natchez	49	3140-08	091-41-30	96.206,	312.16206
LA	New Orleans	50	29-55-11	090-01-29	104.727,	121.95393
MS	Jackson	51	32-12-46	090-22-54	205.959,	15.15241
MS	Jackson	52	32-14-26	090-24-15	208.390,	14.36061
LA	Monroe	55	32-11-45	092-04-10	224.033,	331.51910
LA	Lafayette	56	30-19-18	092-22-41	137.971,	265.48133
LA	Columbia	57	32-03-19	092-11-12	216.391,	326.92876
MS	Hattiesburg	58	31-24-20	089-14-13	196.658,	56.23730

End of report.

Study Title:
Plaquemine, LA Channel 52

NTSC Study Station, Transmitter Coordinates: 30-25-11 N 90-56-50 W

Study distance: 280 km

NTSC TO DTV STUDY RESULTS

City of License	ST	Chan	Distance	Bearing	Req.Dist	Diff.
Baton Rouge	LA	45	33.32	251.91	96.60	-63.28
Lafayette	LA	56	137.97	265.48	96.60	41.37
Lake Charles	LA	53	197.49	269.21	88.50	108.99
Monroe	LA	55	224.03	331.52	96.60	127.43
New Orleans	LA	50	104.73	121.95	96.60	8.13
Gulfport	MS	48	184.77	78.69	96.60	88.17
Jackson	MS	51	205.96	15.15	88.50	117.46
Jackson	MS	52	208.39	14.36	244.60	-36.21
Meridian	MS	44	259.76	42.82	96.60	163.16
Natchez	MS	49	155.66	332.84	96.60	59.06

Station is short-spaced to 2 stations.

Study Title:
Plaquemine, LA Channel 55

NTSC Study Station, Transmitter Coordinates: 30-25-11 N 90-56-50 W

Study distance: 280 km

NTSC TO DTV STUDY RESULTS

City of License	ST	Chan	Distance	Bearing	Req.Dist	Diff.
Columbia	LA	57	216.39	326.93	96.60	119.79
Lafayette	LA	56	137.97	265.48	88.50	49.47
Lake Charles	LA	53	197.49	269.21	96.60	100.89
Monroe	LA	55	224.03	331.52	244.60	-20.57
Gulfport	MS	48	184.77	78.69	96.60	88.17
Hattiesburg	MS	58	196.66	56.24	96.60	100.06
Jackson	MS	51	205.96	15.15	96.60	109.36
Jackson	MS	52	208.39	14.36	96.60	111.79

Station is short-spaced to 1 stations.

Study Title:
Plaquemine, LA Channel 57

NTSC Study Station, Transmitter Coordinates: 30-25-11 N 90-56-50 W

Study distance: 280 km

NTSC TO DTV STUDY RESULTS

City of License	ST	Chan	Distance	Bearing	Req.Dist	Diff.
Columbia	LA	57	216.39	326.93	244.60	-28.21
Lafayette	LA	56	137.97	265.48	88.50	49.47
Lake Charles	LA	53	197.49	269.21	96.60	100.89
Monroe	LA	55	224.03	331.52	96.60	127.43
New Orleans	LA	50	104.73	121.95	96.60	8.13
Hattiesburg	MS	58	196.66	56.24	88.50	108.16
Natchez	MS	49	155.66	332.84	96.60	59.06

Station is short-spaced to 1 stations.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Barbara Lyle, a secretary in the law firm of Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C., hereby certify that on this 20th day of April, 1998, copies of the foregoing "Petition for Reconsideration" were hand delivered or mailed first-class, postage pre-paid, to the following:

Roy J. Stewart, Chief*
Mass Media Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 314
Washington, DC 20554

Mr. Bruce A. Franca*
Office of Engineering and Technology
Federal Communications Commission
Room 416
2000 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Barbara A. Kreisman, Chief*
Video Services Division
Mass Media Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 702
Washington, DC 20554

Flinn Broadcasting Corp.
6080 Mount Moriah
Memphis, TN 38115
(licensee of Station WCCL)

Barbara Lyle

Barbara Lyle

* Hand Delivered