

Beloit, WTVO said, then ch. 13 should be moved to Aurora or Elgin, Ill., and ch. 51 should be added to Rockford.

Peoria is allocated chs. 8, 19, 37 and 43. Ch. 8 is in contest between WIRL and WMBD Peoria, with an initial decision outstanding in favor of WIRL.

Ch. 19 is held by WTVH-TV, the CBS and ABC affiliate. Ch. 43 is held by WEEK-TV, affiliated with NBC and DuMont.

The two uhf stations suggested last September that the educational reservation be switched from the uhf ch. 37 to ch. 8. In November last year the Commission denied this, and in December the uhf outlet filed for reconsideration. The two vhf applicants filed objections.

Latest de-intermixture petition was filed last week by WICS (TV) Springfield, Ill. Operating on ch. 20, NBC affiliated, the Springfield station suggested that the educational reservation be changed from a uhf channel to the sole vhf channel allocated there. Springfield is allocated chs. 2, 20 and 66, with the last reserved for educational use. Two competing applicants for Springfield's ch. 2 are Sangamon Valley TV Corp. and WMAV-TV Inc. The former was favored in an initial decision issued last December.

The move, WICS said, would make all of central Illinois uhf, tying in with the Peoria petition. If that cannot be done, WICS said, then ch. 2 should be added to St. Louis and ch. 41 should be used in Springfield.

## Roanoke Vhf Grant Finalized; Flint Stay Petitions Denied

FINAL decision to grant ch. 7 at Roanoke, Va., to Times-World Corp.'s WDBJ there, was announced by FCC last week, making it the second vhf station in that market. Already operating is ch. 10 WSLS-TV, ABC and NBC affiliate.

Grant of ch. 7 to WDBJ was made possible by the dismissal of a competitive application by WROV Roanoke. WDBJ bought the tv assets of defunct ch. 27 WROV-TV for \$245,000.

In other tv hearing actions, FCC turned down petitions by WFDF Flint, Mich., and W. S. Butterfield Theatres Inc. which requested reargument and stay of the Commission's final decision of May 14, 1954, granting ch. 12 at Flint to WJR Detroit.

Oral argument was scheduled for April 25 on an examiner's initial decision to grant ch. 29 at Canton, Ohio, to Tri-Cities Telecasting Inc. The examiner proposed denial of competitive bids by WHBC and WCMW there.

## COMMENTS SOUGHT ON FCC'S PROPOSAL TO PERMIT CO-CHANNEL UHF BOOSTERS

FCC plan is another move towards bolstering uhf development. May 20 has been set as deadline for comments.

MOVING in still another area to spur uhf development, FCC last week called for comments by May 20 on a new proposal to authorize co-channel uhf booster stations to fill in the shadow areas of the parent uhf station. FCC's term for a booster is "amplifying transmitter."

The Commission concurrently proposed de-intermixture of uhf and vhf channels in four principal markets in an effort to remedy uhf's ills (story, page 64). Last week it also was receiving comments on its proposal to allow low-power tv stations (both uhf and vhf) in small cities (story page 69).

Already in effect is FCC's policy to consider on a case-by-case basis applications for satellites. While a booster outlet would operate on the same channel as the parent station and is intended for uhf only, the satellite operates on a different channel, usually that already allocated to the area in which the satellite is located, and may be either uhf or vhf.

To help determine whether its rules should be amended to allow booster operation, FCC requested comments on booster equipment and costs, any effect on color or monochrome transmissions, minimum separations between boosters and parent or other transmitters, interference safeguards, plans of proponents, hours of operation, remote control operation and other technical considerations.

In its notice, FCC said it "has been concerned with how it can best insure the fullest development of the television industry's potentialities in line with the needs and desires of the American public and the abilities and ingenuity of the American broadcasters.

"The Commission has noted in this connection that there are substantial obstacles presently hindering the bringing of a first television service to many small communities as well as the expanding of multiple, competing services in larger economic and population centers. One of the major obstacles is the failure of uhf stations, thus far, to become fully integrated

with established vhf stations into an economically sound, nationwide television service."

The Commission cited its preliminary report on uhf to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee [B•T, March 21] concerning specific actions "calculated to enhance the potentialities for television's growth within the existing allocation system. The Commission expressed its view that the only practicable course of action lies in doing what is possible to promote the present allocation plan utilizing both vhf and uhf channels."

FCC explained that compared with vhf, "the signals from uhf transmitters have less tendency to fill in areas which are not in direct line of sight with the transmitting antenna. Consequently, there are areas which, although lying within the area that would normally be served by a uhf station, are effectively 'shadowed' by intervening terrain and are thereby deprived of service.

"One means of providing uhf television coverage in such shadow areas may be the use of amplifying transmitters operating on the same channel as the main transmitter and dependent upon the main transmitter for the generation of carrier frequencies and modulation."

The notice related successful booster experiments conducted at Vicksburg, Miss., by RCA in conjunction with ch. 25 WJTV (TV) Jackson, Miss. [B•T, Aug. 30, 2, 1954]; Adler Communications Labs., at Waterbury, Conn. [B•T, Dec. 20, 1954]; Sylvania Electric Products Inc. at Emporium, Pa. [B•T, Sept. 21, 1953], and WSM-TV Nashville at Lawrenceburg, Tenn. [B•T, June 7, 1954; Nov. 9, 1953].

FCC also observed that the Radio-Electronics-Television Mfrs. Assn., has established a committee to study the general problem and has submitted an interim report.

The Commission said it desires that the comments submitted in the proceeding present information and data with respect to the following aspects of amplifying transmitter operation:

(a) Complete technical data with respect to amplifying transmitters and associated equipment and operation, including full information as to the complexity and dependability of amplifiers, antennas, etc.

(b) Data with respect to the extent, if any, of the degradation caused by operation of amplifying transmitters on color or monochrome signals and what changes, additions or deletions would be required in the Commission's rules to establish minimum separations (1) between the amplifying transmitters and the main transmitters; (2) between amplifying transmitters of the same main station; (3) between amplifying transmitters of different main stations, both co-channel and adjacent channel; and (4) between amplifying transmitters of one station and the transmitters of a station not having amplifying transmitters.

(c) Data relating to the cost of equipment for such operation, including installation and maintenance.

(d) Information with respect to the technical specifications required to assure that only the authorized television channel would be amplified by the amplifying transmitters.

(e) Information as to the technical specifications required to assure linear rebroadcast of the signal and to protect against the radiation of spurious signals resulting from internal cross modulation or self oscillation.

(f) Information with respect to plans and proposals of interested persons who intend to engage in such operation.

(g) What hours of operation should be required of amplifying transmitters?

(h) Whether amplifying transmitters should be permitted to operate unattended; and if so, under what conditions.

(i) What is the maximum distance from the main transmitter that amplifying transmitters should be permitted?

(j) What minimum power and antenna height requirements should be established for amplifying transmitter operation?

(k) What requirements should be provided for

## Indians Had TeePee, Not TeeVee

NATIONAL parks may have fine tv sites, but raising towers there can wreck imagination of youngsters wanting to re-live cowboy-and-Indian days. That's how FCC explained it to young Wally Marcellus of Scottsbluff, Neb., who wrote President Eisenhower asking why new ch. 10 KSTF (TV) couldn't build atop The Bluffs.

FCC's explanation (written by an engineer, not a lawyer) said:

Actually, the television station has already been given a permit to build its tower at another location which should give good television reception to the people in Scottsbluff. But the station wanted to use The Bluffs because it would let them provide television to a lot of people outside of Scottsbluff. We would like to encourage them to do this, but unfortunately, The Bluffs cannot be used for this purpose.

As you know, The Bluffs were used by the early settlers to watch for Indians and were

very important to the early development of your part of the country. The land has been set aside as a National Monument to preserve it in its original state so that you and your friends can go up there and see the land just as the pioneers did. When you grow up and marry, you can take your little boy up there too, and tell him the story of the Indians and the pioneers and it will be just as it was when there were really wild Indians around.

If a television tower were built there, it would sort of spoil it a little because we know there were no television towers there when the settlers came. Then people might build electric lines and highways, and hot dog stands and pretty soon it would look just like any other part of the country, and you couldn't go to The Bluffs and imagine that you were living back in the days of the Indians.

When you grow up, you will appreciate more the importance of keeping some parts of your country as they were in early days, so that they will be a monument to the people that braved the dangers of the wilderness to settle this country of ours. Thank you for writing to the President.