

ORIGINAL

DOW, LOHNES & ALBERTSON, PLLC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

To-QUYEN T. TRUONG
DIRECT DIA: 202-776-2058
ttruong@dialaw.com

WASHINGTON, D.C.
1200 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W. • SUITE 800 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-6802
TELEPHONE 202-776-2000 • FACSIMILE 202-776-2222

ONE RAVINIA DRIVE • SUITE 1600
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30346-2108
TELEPHONE 770-901-8800
FACSIMILE 770-901-8874

June 3, 2003

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
JUN - 3 2003
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: Written *Ex Parte*
MB Docket No. 02-277 and MM Docket Nos. 01-235, 01-317 and 00-244
2002 Biennial Regulatory Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership
Rules and Other Rules

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On May 29, 2003, Mr. Alexander Netchvolodoff, Senior Vice President of Public Policy for Cox Enterprises, Inc. ("Cox"), filed a written *ex parte* submission in the above-referenced proceeding which attached, as Appendix B, a copy of an engineering analysis prepared and signed by Denny & Associates, P.C.. Please find attached to this letter the signed original of that engineering analysis for submission into the record.

Also on May 29, 2003, the undersigned submitted a letter in the above-referenced proceeding stating that two meetings had occurred on April 29, 2003, between Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein, their respective legal advisors Ms. Stacy Robinson and Ms. Johanna Mikes, and Mr. Netchvolodoff, Ms. Alexandra Wilson (Vice President of Public Policy for Cox) and the undersigned. The correct date for those two meetings was May 29, 2003.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b) of the Commission's rules, an original and one copy of this letter are being submitted to the Secretary's office for the above-captioned docket. Should there be any questions regarding this filing, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



To-Quyen Truong

cc: Qualex International (2 copies)

No. of copies rec'd 014
Date 6/3/03

DENNY & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
OXON HILL, MARYLAND

ENGINEERING EXHIBIT
MEDIA BUREAU DOCKET NO. 02-277
COX BROADCASTING

ENGINEERING STATEMENT

This engineering statement has been prepared on behalf of Cox Broadcasting (Cox). We have reviewed the *ex parte* filing of the Fox Entertainment Group, Inc. and Fox Television Stations, Inc., National Broadcasting Company, Inc., and Telemundo Communications Group, Inc., and Viacom (“the Joint Networks”) of May 20, 2003, with particular attention to the document entitled “The UHF Discount.” In support of its discussion, three attachments are included that compare the area enclosed by the Grade B contour of a VHF TV station with the area enclosed by a related UHF TV station. The area-based coverage studies submitted by the Joint Networks do not consider the critically important metric of population served. The size of a TV station’s Grade B contour is a measure of the extent of coverage, and the location of the Grade B contour identifies the geographic area with which the TV station is associated. However, coverage, in audience measurement terms, is the ability of a TV household to view a TV station. The population

DENNY & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS
OXON HILL, MARYLAND

Engineering Exhibit
Cox Broadcasting

Page 2

predicted to receive an interference-free Grade B or better signal from a TV station is a far better predictor of coverage than the area enclosed by that station's Grade B contour.


The Joint Networks' Attachments A, B, and C compare areas within the conventional Grade B contours, which were not adjusted as they should have been to exclude large bodies of water. Figures 1 through 3 of this engineering exhibit restate the Joint Networks' Attachments A, B, and C in terms of population predicted to receive interference-free Grade B or better signal strength.¹ The same UHF TV stations that the Joint Networks say will reach 56 to 61 percent of the coverage area reached by the related VHF TV stations are predicted to provide interference-free Grade B or better signal strength to between 87.1 percent and 94.7 percent of the populations served by the related VHF TV stations. Although the Joint Networks did not present information related to the ABC TV stations, Figure 4 of this engineering exhibit presents population data showing that UHF TV stations in the markets where ABC owns and operates VHF TV stations provide

¹ The population data used in Figures 1 through 4 of this engineering exhibit were obtained from Appendix B, Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of the Sixth Report and Order, MM Docket No. 87-268, 13 FCC Rcd 7418 (1998).

interference-free Grade B or better signal strength to 95.5 percent of the population served by the ABC TV stations. A similar study was prepared comparing the populations receiving interference-free Grade B or better signal strength from the Cox owned VHF TV stations to the populations receiving interference-free Grade B or better signal strength from UHF TV stations in each Cox market.² That study may be found following Figure 4 of this engineering exhibit.

CERTIFICATION

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 29, 2003.


Robert W. Denny, Jr., P.E.



² An exception was made in El Paso, where Cox owns KFOX-TV, channel 14. In this market, the Cox UHF TV station was compared to VHF TV station KDBC-TV, channel 4.

**ENGINEERING EXHIBIT
MEDIA BUREAU DOCKET NO. 02-277
COX BROADCASTING**

**VHF-UHF INTERFERENCE-FREE GRADE B SIGNAL STRENGTH
COMPARISON OF POPULATION SERVED**

NBC/TELEMUNDO SAME-MARKET STATIONS

<u>Market</u>	<u>VHF Station/ Channel</u>	<u>NTSC Current Service Population</u>	<u>UHF Station/ Channel</u>	<u>NTSC Current Service Population</u>	<u>UHF Pop./ VHF Pop.</u>
New York	WNBC/4	17,182,000	WNJU/47	16,110,000	93.7%
Los Angeles	KNBC/4	14,262,000	KVEA/52 KHWY/22	12,070,000* 12,151,000	84.6% 85.2%
Chicago	WMAQ/5	8,322,000	WSNS/44	8,189,000	98.4%
Dallas	KXAS/5	4,227,000	KXTX/39	4,095,000	96.9%
Miami	WTVJ/6	2,793,000	WSCV/51	3,627,000	129.9%
San Francisco	KNTV/11	4,933,000	KSTS/48	4,803,000	97.4%
TOTAL		51,719,000		48,975,000	94.7%
AVERAGE		8,619,833		8,162,500	94.7%

*Not included in total or average to avoid double count in market.

Note: Population data obtained from Appendix B, Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of the Sixth Report and Order, MM Docket No. 87-268, 13 FCC Rcd 7418 (1998).

**ENGINEERING EXHIBIT
MEDIA BUREAU DOCKET NO. 02-277
COX BROADCASTING**

**VHF-UHF INTERFERENCE-FREE GRADE B SIGNAL STRENGTH
COMPARISON OF POPULATION SERVED**

CBS SAME-MARKET STATIONS

<u>Market</u>	<u>VHF Station/ Channel</u>	<u>NTSC Current Service Population</u>	<u>UHF Station/ Channel</u>	<u>NTSC Current Service Population</u>	<u>UHF Pop./ VHF Pop.</u>
Philadelphia	KYW-TV/3	7,578,000	WPSG-TV/57	6,210,000	81.9%
San Francisco	KPIX-TV/5	5,968,000	KBHK-TV/44	4,859,000	81.4%
Boston	WBZ-TV/4	6,716,000	WSBK-TV/38	6,037,000	89.9%
Dallas	KTVT/11	4,150,000	KTXA/21	4,053,000	97.7%
Miami	WFOR-TV/4	4,013,000	WBFS-TV/33	3,598,000	89.7%
TOTAL		28,426,000		24,757,000	87.1%
AVERAGE		5,685,200		4,951,400	87.1%

Note: Population data obtained from Appendix B, Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of the Sixth Report and Order, MM Docket No. 87-268, 13 FCC Rcd 7418 (1998).

**ENGINEERING EXHIBIT
MEDIA BUREAU DOCKET NO. 02-277
COX BROADCASTING**

**VHF-UHF INTERFERENCE-FREE GRADE B SIGNAL STRENGTH
COMPARISON OF POPULATION SERVED**

FOX SAME-MARKET STATIONS

<u>Market</u>	<u>VHF Station/ Channel</u>	<u>NTSC Current Service Population</u>	<u>UHF Station/ Channel</u>	<u>NTSC Current Service Population</u>	<u>UHF Pop./ VHF Pop.</u>
Minneapolis	KMSP/9	2,798,000	WFTC/29	2,662,000	95.1%
Washington. DC	WTTG/5	6,533,000	WDCA/20	5,746,000	88.0%
Phoenix	KSAZ/10	2,216,000	KUTP/45	2,202,000	99.4%
Dallas	KDFW/4	4,278,000	KDFI/27	4,058,000	94.9%
TOTAL		15,825,000		14,668,000	92.7%
AVERAGE		3,956,250		3,667,000	92.7%

Note: Population data obtained from Appendix B, Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of the Sixth Report and Order, MM Docket No. 87-268, 13 FCC Rcd 7418 (1998).

**ENGINEERING EXHIBIT
MEDIA BUREAU DOCKET NO. 02-277
COX BROADCASTING**

**VHF-UHF INTERFERENCE-FREE GRADE B SIGNAL STRENGTH
COMPARISON OF POPULATION SERVED**

**ABC O&O STATIONS
TO COMPARABLE UHF STATIONS IN MARKET**

Market	VHF Station/ Channel	NTSC Current Service Population	UHF Station/ Channel	NTSC Current Service Population	UHF Pop./ VHF Pop.
Los Angeles	KABC/7	13,555,000	KMEX/34	12,247,000	83.0%
Fresno	No VHF in Market	NA	KFSN/30	1,130,000**	NA
San Francisco	KGO/7	5,866,000	KDTV/14	5,313,000	90.6%
Houston	KTRK/13	3,870,000	KTBU/55	3,838,000	99.2%
New York	WABC/7	17,189,000	WPXN/31	16,434,000	95.6%
Flint	WJRT/12	1,807,000	WEYI/25	1,838,000	101.7%
Chicago	WLS/7	8,361,000	WFLD/32	8,322,000	99.5%
Philadelphia	WPVI/6	7,747,000	WTFX/29	7,499,000	97.8%
Raleigh/ Durham	WTVD/11	2,109,000	WKFT/40	2,229,000	105.7%
Toledo	WTVG/13	2,293,000	WNWO/24	2,257,000	98.4%
TOTAL		62,797,000		59,977,000	95.5%
AVERAGE		6,977,444		6,664,111	95.5%

**Not included in total or average because there is no VHF station in the market.

Note: Population data obtained from Appendix B, Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of the Sixth Report and Order, MM Docket No. 87-268, 13 FCC Rcd 7418 (1998).

COMPARISON OF POPULATIONS WITHIN
VHF AND UHF TELEVISION SERVICE AREAS
COX BROADCASTING MARKETS

<u>Market (Rank)</u>	Population ⁱ
Call sign, City, State Channel, ERP ⁱⁱ , HAAT ⁱⁱⁱ	
<u>San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, California (5)</u>	
KTVU(TV), Oakland, CA Ch. 2+, 100 kW, 479 m.	5,970,000
KICU-TV, San Jose, California Ch. 36z, 4070 kW (Max-DA, BT) ^{iv} , 686 m.	5,063,000 (84.8 % of KTVU)
<u>Atlanta, Georgia (9)</u>	
WSB-TV, Atlanta, Georgia Ch. 2z, 100 kW, 316 m.	3,391,000
WATL(TV), Atlanta, Georgia Ch. 36z, 2690 kW (Max-BT), 313 m.	3,076,000 (90.7% of WSB-TV)
<u>Seattle-Tacoma, Washington (12)</u>	
KIRO-TV, Seattle, Washington Ch. 7z, 316 kW, 250 m.	3,015,000
KWOG(TV), Bellevue, Washington Ch. 51+, 3800 kW (Max-DA, BT), 719 m.	2,949,000 (97.8% of KIRO-TV)

Comparison of Populations Within
VHF and UHF Television Service Areas
Cox Broadcasting Markets

Page 2

Orlando-Daytona Beach-Melbourne, Florida (20)

WFTV(TV), Orlando, Florida Ch. 9z, 316 kW (Max-BT), 479 m.	2,183,000
WRDQ(TV), Orlando, Florida Ch. 27z, 5000 kW (Max-DA, BT), 569 m.	3,043,000 (139% of WFTV)
WKCF(TV), Clermont, Florida Ch. 18-, 5000 kW (Max-DA, BT), 513 m.	2,101,000 (96.2% of WFTV)

Pittsburg, Pennsylvania (21)

WPXI(TV), Pittsburg, Pennsylvania Ch. 11z, 316 kW (Max-BT), 305 m.	3,090,000
WPGH-TV, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Ch. 53+, 2340 kW (Max-BT), 308 m.	2,729,000 (88.3% of WPXI)

Charlotte, North Carolina (27)

WSOC-TV, Charlotte, North Carolina Ch. 9+, 316 kW (Max-BT), 364 m.	1,859,000
WCNC-TV, Charlotte, North Carolina Ch. 36z, 5000 kW (Max-BT), 595 m.	2,289,000 (123% of WSOC-TV)

Dayton, Ohio (60)

WHIO-TV, Dayton, Ohio Ch. 7+, 200 kW (Max-BT), 348 m.	3,069,000
WKEF(TV), Dayton, OH Ch. 22+, 2340 kW (Max-BT), 351 m.	2,774,000 (90.4% of WHIO-TV)

Johnstown-Altoona, Pennsylvania (96)

WJAC-TV, Johnstown, Pennsylvania Ch. 6z, 70.8 kW, 341 m.	2,648,000
WKBS-TV, Altoona, Pennsylvania Ch. 47z, 1510 kW (Max-BT), 308 m.	530,000 (20.0% of WJAC-TV)

Comparison of Populations Within
VHF and UHF Television Service Areas
Cox Broadcasting Markets

Page 3

El Paso, Texas (101)

KFOX-TV, El Paso, Texas 720,000
Ch. 14z, 398 kW, 604 m. (99.7% of KDBC-TV)

KDBC-TV, El Paso, Texas 722,000
Ch. 4z, 100 kW, 475 m.

Reno, Nevada (110)

KRXI-TV, Reno, Nevada 392,000
Ch. 11z, 178 kW (Max-BT), 854 m.

KREN-TV, Reno, Nevada 387,000
Ch. 27+, 1820 kW (Max-DA, BT), 891 m. (98.7% of KRXI-TV)

Wheeling, West Virginia-Steubenville, Ohio (150)

WTOV-TV, Steubenville, Ohio 2,862,000
Ch. 9+, 316 kW, 290 m.

No commercial UHF TV station in market

¹ Population data obtained from Appendix B, DTV Table of Allotments, *Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of the Sixth Report and Order*, in MM Docket No. 87-268 for existing NTSC current service.

² Effective radiated power (ERP).

³ Antenna radiation center height above average terrain (HAAT).

⁴ The abbreviation "DA" indicates that a directional antenna is used and that the specified ERP is the maximum achieved in any direction (Max-DA). The abbreviation "BT" indicates that beam tilt is incorporated into the antenna design so that maximum power may be radiated at some angle below or above the horizontal plane of the antenna centerline (Max-BT) rather than solely at the horizontal plane. A directional antenna with beam tilt would be designated "Max-DA, BT."