

Exhibit 41 - Statement A  
**ALLOCATION CONSIDERATIONS**  
**INTERFERENCE ANALYSIS**  
prepared for  
**KSWO Television Company, Inc.**  
KSWO-DT Lawton, Oklahoma  
Facility ID 35645  
Ch. 23 950 kW 300 m

*KSWO Television Company, Inc.*, licensee of analog station KSWO-TV Channel 7 has an application pending to construct KSWO-DT (file number BPCDT-19991029AHI). The pending application proposes a non-directional antenna system, an effective radiated power (ERP) of 1000 kW and an antenna height above average terrain (HAAT) of 300 meters. The purpose of the instant amendment is to specify a decrease in ERP to 950 kW. No other changes to the pending application are sought.

The DTV reference ERP and antenna HAAT of 605.3 kW and 320 meters, respectively, for KSWO-DT have been established under **Appendix B** of the Second Memorandum Opinion and Order on Reconsideration of the Fifth and Sixth Report and Orders in MM Docket 87-268, FCC 98-315, released December 18, 1998, per §73.622(f)(1) of the Commission's rules. The proposed KSWO-DT facility will operate with 950 kW ERP at 300 meters HAAT; the proposed ERP thus exceeds the reference ERP (even when the ERP adjustment provided in §73.622(f)(4) for reduced antenna HAAT is considered). Accordingly, as required by §73.622(f)(5), a study was conducted to evaluate interference to analog and DTV facilities that may be attributed to the proposed KSWO-DT facility.

A detailed interference study was conducted in accordance with the terrain dependent Longley-Rice point-to-point propagation model, per the Commission's Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin number 69, *Longley-Rice Methodology for Evaluating TV Coverage and Interference*, July

Exhibit 41 - Statement A  
**ALLOCATION CONSIDERATIONS**  
**INTERFERENCE ANALYSIS**  
(page 2 of 3)

2, 1997 (“OET-69”).<sup>1</sup> The interference study examined the net change in interference as experienced by other stations that would result from the proposed facility (in lieu of the reference KSWO-DT).

All stations considered in this study are listed in **Table 1**. The results of the interference study, also summarized in **Table 1**, indicate that any additional interference to these stations meets the Commission’s 2% / 10% interference limits regarding DTV proposals. No interference is predicted to any other station or DTV allotment. Thus, this proposal is believed to be in compliance with the provisions of §73.623(c)(2) of the Commission’s rules.

With respect to television stations that have been granted a Class A License or hold a Class A Construction Permit, or are existing Low Power Television (LPTV) stations that are eligible for Class A status,<sup>2</sup> it is noted that the pending application for KSWO-DT was filed prior to December 31, 1999. This was before the November 29, 1999 enactment of the *Community Broadcasters Protection Act of 1999*. The pending application was not required to provide protection to any station eligible for Class A status.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The implementation of OET-69 for this study followed the guidelines of OET-69 as specified therein. A standard cell size of 2 km was used. The Longley-Rice computer program input data, following the guidelines established under OET-69, includes a location variability of 50%, a time availability of 10%, a situation variability of 50%, horizontal polarization, 0.005 S/m conductivity, a climate constant of 15, an assumption of a continental temperate climate zone, and a receive antenna height of 10 meters. The service area for each DTV facility under study is that area predicted to receive signal levels of at least 41 dBμ using the Longley-Rice methodology, and within the DTV F(50,90) service contour distance as determined per §73.625(b). In instances where the DTV reference ERP is 50 kW or 1,000 kW, the Grade B contour of the associated analog station (authorized as of April 3, 1997) is used to determine the extent of the DTV station’s service area. The F(50,90) DTV service contour level is established by the formula  $41 - 20\log[615/(\text{channel mid-frequency})]$  dBμ. The service area for each NTSC facility under study is that area predicted to receive signal levels of at least 64 dBμ using the Longley-Rice methodology, and within the NTSC F(50,50) service contour distance as determined per §73.684(c). The F(50,50) NTSC service contour level is established by the formula  $64 - 20\log[615/(\text{channel mid-frequency})]$  dBμ. Comparisons of various results of this computer program to the Commission’s implementation of OET-69 show good correlation.

<sup>2</sup>See June 2, 2000 Public Notice *Certificates of Eligibility for Class A Television Station Status*, DA 00-1224.

<sup>3</sup>See December 7, 1999 Public Notice “*Community Broadcasters Protection Act of 1999*” Sets Deadline of December 31, 1999 for Full Service TV Stations to File Letters of Intent to Maximize their DTV Facilities, DA 99-2739.

Exhibit 41 - Statement A  
**ALLOCATION CONSIDERATIONS**  
**INTERFERENCE ANALYSIS**  
(page 3 of 3)

The pending application proposes a non-directional facility of 1000 kW at an antenna HAAT of 300 meters. The instant amendment specifies a reduction in ERP to 950 kW. No change in antenna HAAT or site is proposed. The resulting sets of interfering contours that may impact Class A facilities from the proposal will be contained within those of the pending application (i.e.: the distance to the KSWO-DT interfering contours will be reduced as a result of the instant amendment). Thus, any predicted interference to a Class A facility resulting from the proposal (950 kW / 300 meters) will be reduced from that which would result from the original application (1000 kW / 300 meters), as determined by §73.623(c)(5)(i). Based on the foregoing, the proposal complies with the Commission's requirements with respect to the protection of Class A stations.

Thus, it is believed that the instant proposal complies with the Commission's allocation Rules and policies regarding NTSC, DTV, and Class A stations.

Exhibit 41 - Table 1  
**INTERFERENCE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY**

prepared for  
**KSWO Television Company, Inc.**  
 KSWO-DT Lawton, Oklahoma  
 Facility ID 35645  
 Ch. 23 950 kW 300 m

**DTV Facilities**

<u>DTV Facilities</u>							Percentage Reduction of Baseline Population (“10 percent” test)
Stations <u>Considered</u>	City, State <u>Channel</u>	Distance <u>(km)</u>	Baseline <u>Population</u> (1)	Calculated “Before” Service <u>Population</u> (2)	Calculated “After” Service <u>Population</u> (3)	--- Net “New” Interference --- ( “2 percent” test)	
						<u>Population</u> (4)	<u>Percentage</u> (5)
KAUZ-DT (Ref 1000 kW)	Wichita Falls, TX 22 DTV	38.7	367,000	368,128	363,700	4,428	1.21
KAUZ-DT (CP 200 kW)	Wichita Falls, TX 22 DTV	38.7				----- checklist facility, evaluation not required -----	
KVII-DT (Ref 631.8 kW)	Amarillo, TX 23 DTV	316.7	316,000	316,175	314,537	1,638	0.52
KVII-DT (CP 658 kW)	Amarillo, TX 23 DTV	316.7				----- checklist facility, evaluation not required -----	
KAKW-DT <sup>1</sup> (Ref 50 kW)	Killeen, TX 23 DTV	347.2	540,000	538,059	538,059	0	-- no change in interference --
KPEJ-DT (Ref 99.8 kW)	Odessa, TX 23 DTV	407.4				----- no interference predicted from proposal -----	

---

<sup>1</sup>KAKW-DT’s channel assignment has been changed to Channel 13, under MM Docket 00-103, released October 2, 2000. A construction permit authorizing KAKW-DT to operate on Channel 13 was granted on March 7, 2001. Protection of KAKW-DT’s former DTV Channel 23 is not believed to be required. Nonetheless, the interference study showed that the proposed KSWO-DT facility will not cause any new interference to the former DTV Channel 23 assignment for KAKW-DT.

Exhibit 41 - Table 1  
**INTERFERENCE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY**  
(page 2 of 3)

**DTV Facilities**

<u>Stations Considered</u>	<u>City, State Channel</u>	<u>Distance (km)</u>	<u>Baseline Population (1)</u>	<u>Calculated “Before” Service Population (2)</u>	<u>Calculated “After” Service Population (3)</u>	<u>--- Net “New” Interference --- ( “2 percent” test)</u>		<u>Percentage Reduction of Baseline Population (“10 percent” test) (6)</u>	
						<u>Population (4)</u>	<u>Percentage (5)</u>		
KPEJ-DT (APP 600 kW)	Odessa, TX 23 DTV	407.4				----- no interference predicted from proposal -----			
KOKH-DT (Ref 130.8 kW)	Oklahoma City, OK 24 DTV	186.0				----- no interference predicted from proposal -----			
KOKH-DT (CP 1000 kW)	Oklahoma City, OK 24 DTV	186.0				----- no interference predicted from proposal -----			

**NTSC Facilities**

<u>Stations Considered</u>	<u>City, State Channel</u>	<u>Distance (km)</u>	<u>Baseline Population (1)</u>	<u>Calculated “Before” Service Population (2)</u>	<u>Calculated “After” Service Population (3)</u>	<u>--- Net “New” Interference --- ( “2 percent” test)</u>		<u>---Total Interference--- from DTV only (“10 percent” test)</u>	
						<u>Population (4)</u>	<u>Percentage (5)</u>	<u>Population (7)</u>	<u>Percentage (8)</u>
KUVN (TV) (Lic)	Garland, TX 23 NTSC	238.5	3,695,989	3,552,349	3,540,221	12,128	0.33	36,646	0.99
KUVN (TV) (APP)	Garland, TX 23 NTSC	243.5	4,160,481	4,129,739	4,123,241	6,498	0.16	32,081	0.77

Exhibit 41 - Table 1  
**INTERFERENCE ANALYSIS RESULTS SUMMARY**  
(page 3 of 3)

**NTSC Facilities**

<u>Stations Considered</u>	<u>City, State Channel</u>	<u>Distance (km)</u>	<u>Baseline Population (1)</u>	<u>Calculated “Before” Service Population (2)</u>	<u>Calculated “After” Service Population (3)</u>	<u>--- Net “New” Interference --- ( “2 percent” test)</u>		<u>---Total Interference--- from DTV only (“10 percent” test)</u>	
						<u>Population (4)</u>	<u>Percentage (5)</u>	<u>Population (7)</u>	<u>Percentage (8)</u>
KOKI-TV (Lic)	Tulsa, OK 23 NTSC	342.4	993,618	981,272	980,948	324	0.03	6,056	0.61

- Notes:
- (1) For DTV stations, greater of NTSC or DTV Service Population, from FCC Table  
For NTSC stations, total population within noise-limited contour
  - (2) Service population after reduction from terrain and interference losses, before consideration of proposal
  - (3) Service population after reduction from terrain and interference losses, considering proposal
  - (4) Net change in population receiving interference resulting from proposal, equals (2) minus (3). A number in parenthesis indicates a *reduction* in interference.
  - (5) Proposal’s impact in terms of percentage, equals (4)/(1) times 100 percent: not to exceed *de minimis* limit of 2.0 percent
  - (6) Total interference to DTV stations: equals 100 percent minus [(3)/(1) X 100%]; proposal may not add interference above 10% total. Zero total interference is indicated if (3) is greater than (1).
  - (7) NTSC station total population subject to interference from DTV only sources (considering proposal)
  - (8) Proposal’s impact to NTSC station in terms of percentage, equals (7)/(1) times 100 percent; proposal may not add interference above 10% total

The determination of stations for consideration and the determination of baseline population and interference percentages were made as described in the Commission’s August 10, 1998 Public Notice “*Additional Application Processing Guidelines for Digital Television*”