

BEFORE THE  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Digital Television Distributed Transmission ) MB Docket No. 05-312  
System Technologies )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 )

To: The Secretary

**REPLY COMMENTS**

KJLA, LLC ("KJLA"), KVMD Licensee Co., LLC ("KVMD"), and Rancho Palos Verdes Broadcasters, Inc. ("RPVB") (KJLA, KVMD and RPVB collectively the "Joint Parties"), licensees of full-service television stations in the Los Angeles DMA, by their attorneys, hereby submit these Reply Comments in the above-referenced rule making proceeding concerning Digital Television Distributed Transmission System Technologies ("DTS"). *See Clarification Order and Notice of Proposed Rule Making*, FCC 05-192, released November 4, 2005 ("NPRM"). In support thereof, the Joint Parties state as follows.

The Joint Parties have reviewed the Comments filed in this proceeding. In general, the Comments of both the groups, associations, and individual station licensees are supportive of the adoption of the DTS proposal. Likewise, these parties, like the Joint Parties, have supported the "DMA approach" or "equal service area approach" to the extent of the coverage of a station signal that can be delivered using the DTS system. The Joint Parties continue to urge the adoption of such approaches that will allow for parity among market broadcasters and service throughout the DMA that television stations serve.

Despite the general uniformity of Comments, one party has submitted Comments that the Joint Parties believe is worth addressing in these Reply Comments. That party is The Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc. ("MSTV"). MSTV is recognized as a trade association whose membership is drawn from broadcast group owners operating in major markets. While the Joint Parties support much of what MSTV has to say, the Joint Parties feel that the MSTV arguments dealing with coverage incorrectly address the issues.

The Joint Parties are at a loss to understand the inconsistencies in MSTV's approach. On the one hand, in its Comments, MSTV announces that it supports a "DMA approach" and rejects the *NPRM's* proposed use of a "Table of Distances." In this regard, MSTV correctly notes that the DMA "provides the appropriate definition of a station's local market" (MSTV Comments at 10-11). This argument is premised on the FCC's use of DMAs for such purposes as cable carriage and DTV construction schedules. The Joint Parties submit that this correctly states why the "DMA approach" is one of the proper methodologies for the Commission to adopt.

Having established why a "DMA approach" is necessary and proper, MSTV cuts back on its own request. MSTV then argues that a "DMA approach" is only intended to allow market broadcasters to reach "underserved" areas and populations, not to allow all broadcasters to achieve DMA or parity coverage. The Joint Parties disagree.

MSTV's initial point, that the DMA has become the metric for coverage and carriage purposes, is the correct one and should not be disregarded or modified. A "DMA approach" should not be one that only benefits stations that have served the highly populated portions of their DMAs. It should be an approach that allows all stations to serve all of their DMAs.

MSTV's argument is that giving all stations full DMA coverage might allow some stations to shift their "primary focus" from their community of license. This is incorrect. In the

first place, the Commission's rules do not allow a licensee to do so no matter what its coverage is. While a broadcast television station has wide area coverage, it also has specific responsibilities to its community of license in serving its needs and interests. Further, the Joint Parties do not understand why a station that is enabled to serve underserved areas does not shift its focus while one that begins to serve already served areas does? The DTS rules, as proposed, do not come with any changes in the responsibilities of broadcasters to their communities of license and broadcasters will still be obligated to meet them. The DMA or parity approaches do not entail any changes in these policies and should not be dismissed because of unsubstantiated concerns on the part of MSTV or any other parties. Instead, they should be adopted so that all market broadcasters can compete against each other (both over-the-air and on MVPD services) and all parts of DMAs are served by as many DMA stations as possible, unless prevented by existing service interference rules.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Joint Parties generally support the DTS proposals set forth by the Commission in the *NPRM* and urge the Commission to consider a

DMA approach or an equal service area approach to DTS service areas.

Respectfully submitted,

**KJLA, LLC, KVMD LICENSEE CO.,  
LLC, and RANCHO PALOS VERDES  
BROADCASTERS, INC.**

/s/ Barry A. Friedman  
Barry A. Friedman  
Thompson Hine LLP  
1920 N Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20036-1600  
*Counsel for the Joint Parties*

March 7, 2006