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By the Deputy Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau:

# introduction

1. We have before us applications filed by Skybridge Spectrum Foundation (Skybridge) to renew sixteen geographic Automated Maritime Telecommunications System (AMTS) licenses. Skybridge submitted a request for extension or waiver of the substantial service deadline for all sixteen licenses, and it submitted a substantial service showing for eleven of the licenses.[[1]](#footnote-3) After reviewing the record, we conclude that Skybridge has not demonstrated substantial service for the entirety of any of the licenses. We further conclude that Skybridge has failed to establish that an extension or waiver of the construction deadline is warranted for any of the 16 licenses. With respect to the licenses for stations WQID629 and WQJW652, however, the vital use of spectrum under these licenses for Congressionally-mandated Positive Train Control (PTC) warrants waiver relief that will permit continuation of those PTC operations.[[2]](#footnote-4) Accordingly, as explained below, we grant a limited waiver of section 80.49(a) of the Commission’s rules to allow separate assessments of substantial service for the areas of PTC use and for the areas where there are no PTC operations, and we find that Skybridge has demonstrated substantial service only for the areas of PTC operations. Consequently, we will accept the substantial service showings and grant the renewal applications for stations WQID629 and WQJW652 for the areas where substantial service was demonstrated. The remainder of the license areas for stations WQID629 and WQJW652 are terminated and revert to the Commission. In addition, the licenses for stations WQWJ650, WQJW651, WQJW653, WQJW655, WQJW656, WQJW657, WQNY434, WQOC595, WQON774, WQON775, WQUW780, WQUW781, WQVI210, and WQVR515 are terminated and revert to the Commission, and the renewal applications for those licenses will be dismissed as moot.

# background

1. The Commission auctioned AMTS geographic licenses in 2004 (Auction 57) and 2005 (Auction 61), and granted the licenses in 2005 and 2006.[[3]](#footnote-5) Each AMTS geographic area licensee must notify the Commission within ten years of the license grant, *i.e.*, by the end of its initial license term, that it is providing substantial service within its region or service area.[[4]](#footnote-6)
2. Skybridge, which at the time was controlled by Warren Havens (Havens), obtained the licenses now at issue between 2008 and 2015 by partitioning and disaggregation from other Havens-controlled entities.[[5]](#footnote-7) Havens, on behalf of Skybridge, filed timely renewal applications, construction notifications, and contingent requests for extension or waiver of the substantial service deadline for Skybridge’s 11 Auction 57 licenses.[[6]](#footnote-8) Skybridge primarily argues that its own activities warrant a finding of substantial service, but as further support, it also includes usage information from lessees of some of the licenses. It also makes a contingent request for an extension or waiver of the substantial service deadline, should the Commission find that Skybridge has not demonstrated substantial service.
3. In 2015, Susan L. Uecker was appointed as Receiver to assume control of Skybridge and other Havens-controlled entities.[[7]](#footnote-9) In February 2016, the Commission accepted an application filed by the Receiver for the involuntary transfer of control of Skybridge’s licenses to her.[[8]](#footnote-10) The Receiver, on behalf of Skybridge, filed timely renewal applications for the five Auction 61 licenses at issue here with requests for waiver or extension of the substantial service deadline.[[9]](#footnote-11) The Receiver later filed a supplement to all of the Auction 57 and Auction 61 extension/waiver requests.[[10]](#footnote-12)

# discussion

## Substantial Service Showings

1. “Substantial service” is defined as “service which is sound, favorable, and substantially above a level of mediocre service which just might minimally warrant renewal.”[[11]](#footnote-13) A substantial service standard allows the Commission to take into consideration service to rural areas or discrete populations, and the provision of niche services.[[12]](#footnote-14) A “licensee may attribute to itself the build-out or performance activities of its spectrum lessee(s) for purposes of complying with any applicable build-out or performance requirement.”[[13]](#footnote-15)

### Use of Spectrum by Skybridge

1. Skybridge argues that it is providing substantial service with its Auction 57 licenses. It says that it has acquired a unique collection of licenses across a number of different frequency bands that are “ideal for smart transport, energy and environment-protection systems.”[[14]](#footnote-16) It cites its efforts to clear site-based incumbents from areas in which it holds the geographic overlay licenses[[15]](#footnote-17) and its funding of test and demonstration facilities.[[16]](#footnote-18) It also provides exhibits that discuss, *inter alia*, its plans to extend “private commons arrangement[s for a] nationwide environment wireless program” and its “years of research in Meteor Burst Communications.”[[17]](#footnote-19) Skybridge does not claim to use any of the Auction 57 licenses to provide any actual service, however.
2. As we previously noted, “a finding of substantial service must be based on actual service.”[[18]](#footnote-20) Preliminary efforts to put spectrum to use do not constitute substantial service if the licensee has failed to use the spectrum for actual service providing operational communications either to third parties or to meet its own private, internal communications needs.[[19]](#footnote-21) Testing, research and development, and other activities preparatory to implementation of a functioning communications system are not sufficient, nor are promises or predictions of future service. Indeed, we previously rejected the same claim by Skybridge that such activities constituted substantial service with respect to other licenses.[[20]](#footnote-22) We therefore conclude that, with regard to the Auction 57 licenses for which Skybridge depends solely on Skybridge’s own activities (but no actual service) to establish substantial service, without any showing of service by lessees, Skybridge has not satisfied the substantial service requirement.[[21]](#footnote-23)

### Use of Spectrum by Lessees

1. Skybridge provides information on the use of spectrum authorized under the licenses for stations WQID629, WQJW652, and WQUW780 by lessees for PTC.[[22]](#footnote-24) Under four leases of spectrum from the licenses for stations WQID629 and WQJW652, the National Passenger Railroad Corporation d/b/a/Amtrak (Amtrak) has deployed PTC on five of its Northeast Corridor lines.[[23]](#footnote-25) In addition, GE Transportation Intelligent Control Systems (GE Transportation) leased spectrum from the license for station WQUW780 to facilitate construction of a PTC system for Amtrak in Michigan and Indiana.[[24]](#footnote-26)
2. Skybridge’s licenses for stations WQID629 and WQJW652 together cover territory from the New York-New Jersey line to northern South Carolina. Amtrak entered into two leases of WQID629 spectrum,[[25]](#footnote-27) one for 25 kilohertz (217.0-217.0125 and 217.0875-217.1 MHz) covering the Amtrak rail line and the area three miles immediately adjacent on either side of that rail line,[[26]](#footnote-28) and the other for 100 kilohertz (217.0-217.1 MHz) within a geographic corridor that extends on both sides of the Amtrak rail line beginning three miles outside the rail line and extending to nine miles outside the line, *i.e.*, covering six miles on either side of the six-mile interior corridor.[[27]](#footnote-29) In addition, Amtrak has two leases of WQJW652 spectrum, one for the same 25 kilohertz covering the Amtrak rail lines and the area three miles immediately adjacent to those lines on either side,[[28]](#footnote-30) and the other for the same 100 kilohertz within a geographic corridor that extends on both sides of the Amtrak rail lines beginning three miles outside the rail line and extending to nine miles outside the line, *i.e.*, covering six miles on either side of the six-mile interior corridor.[[29]](#footnote-31) Skybridge provides a report by Amtrak detailing its use of the leased spectrum.[[30]](#footnote-32) Skybridge and Amtrak subsequently filed an application to partition to Amtrak the spectrum leased under both licenses.[[31]](#footnote-33)
3. Skybridge’s license for station WQUW780 covers territory along the Great Lakes, from New York to Minnesota. Skybridge leased spectrum to GE Transportation,[[32]](#footnote-34) which used it to facilitate construction and testing of a PTC system for Amtrak along a rail corridor from Detroit to Kalamazoo, Michigan, and to upgrade an existing radio network from Kalamazoo to Gary, Indiana.[[33]](#footnote-35)
4. We are unable, on this record, to find that the PTC operations on these ribbons running through parts of the three license areas constitute substantial service for the entire license area. The record shows that Amtrak is providing service on the spectrum that it leased from Skybridge,[[34]](#footnote-36) but there is no indication that service of any kind has been provided outside the corridors surrounding Amtrak’s rail lines. Skybridge has not even attempted to calculate what portion of the licensed area, either by geographic size or population, is covered by the service provided by Amtrak. The record shows that the licensed spectrum is not being used in the vast majority of the three authorized service areas.
5. Although we have not been presented with a substantial service showing sufficient to establish that the licenses for stations WQID629, WQJW652, and WQUW780 should be renewed, we find that it would serve the public interest to permit Amtrak to continue to use the spectrum from the WQID629 and WQJW652 licenses. The record indicates that Amtrak has made intensive use of the spectrum in implementing PTC, a service that will improve the safety of rail crew and passengers, as well as persons who live in communities that might be affected by a derailment or other railway accident, such as a hazardous materials release. The Commission has repeatedly recognized the vital public interest in facilitating the rail industry’s acquisition of spectrum to implement PTC.[[35]](#footnote-37) Amtrak will continue to need to rely on the spectrum in question, as reflected in its application to acquire the spectrum through license assignment. We also recognize that PTC service necessarily will be provided only in relatively narrow geographic corridors in large geographic service areas, as PTC equipment must be located near rail lines.
6. On our own motion, therefore, we grant a waiver of section 80.49(a) of the rules to permit two independent assessments of substantial service under the licenses for stations WQID629 and WQJW652, one for the area of each license that was leased to Amtrak, and one for the remainder of each license area. Section 1.925(b)(3)(i) of the rules provides that we may grant a rule waiver if it is shown that “[t]he underlying purpose of the rule(s) would not be served or would be frustrated by application to the instant case, and that a grant of the requested waiver would be in the public interest….”[[36]](#footnote-38) Granting a waiver to permit bifurcation of the substantial service showings for these two licenses, and thereby reducing the denominator in the substantial service calculation such that Amtrak’s usage of the spectrum is measured by reference to the limited geographic areas appropriate for PTC operations rather than the entire service area, satisfies this standard. The underlying purpose of substantial service requirements, which is to ensure that licensed spectrum is used efficiently and effectively rather than warehoused or underutilized, would not be served by removing Amtrak’s access to spectrum that it is using to implement PTC[[37]](#footnote-39) in advance of the approaching December 31, 2018, statutory implementation deadline. Nor would it serve the public interest to disrupt or delay the implementation and maintenance of a service widely recognized to be vital to rail safety. In these circumstances, we find that the limited relief we are granting is warranted under our waiver standard.
7. The *sua sponte* waiver permits us to find that substantial service was provided in the areas leased to Amtrak from the licenses for stations WQID629 and WQJW652. We therefore will accept the substantial service showings and grant in part the renewal applications for stations WQID629 and WQJW652, only with respect to those leased areas. As noted, the assignment to Amtrak of the spectrum in the leased areas has already been consented to and consummated.[[38]](#footnote-40) With this resolution, there is no longer any regulatory impediment to our grant to Amtrak of its own license for continued use of the spectrum to implement PTC. Because the waiver of section 80.49 was granted in order to facilitate PTC operations rather than to renew the licenses for any future operations of the licensee’s choosing, we will expressly condition the license renewals and the new Amtrak licenses on the spectrum being used only for PTC. The licenses assigned to Amtrak will terminate automatically if they cease to be used for PTC purposes or are used for non-PTC communications.
8. In contrast to the evidence of Amtrak’s continued reliance on spectrum authorized under the WQID629 and WQJW652 licenses, it appears that Amtrak has no expectation that it will need spectrum authorized under the WQUW780 license, as neither Amtrak nor GE Transportation seeks an assignment of (or a new lease for) the spectrum.[[39]](#footnote-41) We therefore limit the relief we are granting to only the WQID629 and WQJW652 licenses, and we deny renewal of the WQUW780 license in its entirety, as with the licenses other than WQID629 and WQJW652.

## Extension and Waiver Requests

1. If a licensee fails to meet its substantial service obligation, its authorization terminates automatically, without specific Commission action, on the date the construction or coverage period expires.[[40]](#footnote-42) A licensee may request an extension of a substantial service deadline, but it is settled policy that an extension “is not justified when the licensee’s failure to construct is due solely to circumstances wholly within the licensee’s control.”[[41]](#footnote-43) Section 1.946(e) of the Commission’s rules provides that an extension may be granted “if the licensee shows that failure to meet the construction or coverage deadline is due to involuntary loss of site or other causes beyond its control,”[[42]](#footnote-44) but states that an extension will not be granted “due to delays caused by a failure to obtain financing, to obtain an antenna site, or to order equipment in a timely manner.”[[43]](#footnote-45) It also says that extensions will not be granted “because the licensee undergoes a transfer of control or because the licensee intends to assign the authorization … [or] solely to allow a transferee or assignee to complete facilities that the transferor or assignor failed to construct.”[[44]](#footnote-46) Separately, under section 1.925(b), the Commission may waive a substantial service rule if, as noted above, it is shown that the underlying purpose of the rule(s) would not be served or would be frustrated by application to the instant case, and that a grant of the requested waiver would be in the public interest; or, alternatively, in view of unique or unusual circumstances, application of the rule(s) would be inequitable, unduly burdensome or contrary to the public interest, or the applicant has no reasonable alternative.[[45]](#footnote-47)
2. The Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Bureau) last year reaffirmed that extensions and waivers of construction obligations will not be routinely granted.[[46]](#footnote-48) It stated that, “[a]s the Bureau has previously made clear, it is a licensee’s responsibility to conduct its due diligence, to assure that it can construct and meet service requirements, and to confirm that the spectrum is suitable for the licensee’s business plans and needs.”[[47]](#footnote-49) It added that “the Commission’s rules do not contemplate extensions of construction deadlines for licensees that fail to meet construction obligations because of miscalculations or erroneous predictions about such factors as costs, demand, developments in the market, or timing and success in obtaining permissions that may be necessary for construction.”[[48]](#footnote-50)

### Auction 57 Licenses

1. We deny Skybridge’s contingent request for an extension or waiver of the substantial service deadline for the eight Auction 57 licenses under which no actual service was provided, as well as for WQUW780 and the portions of the WQID629 and WQJW652 where no actual service was provided.[[49]](#footnote-51) Skybridge has not established that its failure to initiate service within the license term was due to circumstances beyond its control. Instead, its failure to initiate service was due to voluntary business decisions.[[50]](#footnote-52) In requesting relief from the substantial service requirement, Skybridge emphasizes the efforts of Havens-controlled entities to clear site-based incumbents from its geographic service areas.[[51]](#footnote-53) Havens, like other AMTS auction participants, was aware of the existence of those incumbents and the need to protect them from interference.[[52]](#footnote-54) Acquiring licenses that Skybridge knew to be encumbered with incumbent operations was its own choice, as is a determination to seek to clear incumbents before initiating service.[[53]](#footnote-55) We previously have denied extension requests by Skybridge and its commonly owned affiliates based on similar showings.[[54]](#footnote-56) In sum, Skybridge’s failure to provide any service of its own is ascribable to its own business decisions, rather than circumstances beyond its control, and Skybridge therefore is not eligible for an extension under section 1.946(e).
2. For similar reasons, we see no justification to waive the substantial service deadline for the Auction 57 licenses for which no actual service has been demonstrated.[[55]](#footnote-57) Skybridge has failed to establish that the underlying purpose of the rule imposing a substantial service requirement and deadline for AMTS licensees would not be served or would be frustrated by application to the subject licenses.[[56]](#footnote-58) To the contrary, we find that granting waiver relief in these circumstances would undermine the rule by permitting a licensee to leave spectrum unused for the entire ten-year license term, for reasons within the licensee’s control. Substantial service requirements “serve the important purpose of ensuring that scarce spectrum resources are put to use and deployed to serve all communities.”[[57]](#footnote-59) It would defeat the purpose of the rule to permit a licensee that has failed to provide substantial service after ten years, based on voluntary business decisions, to continue to hold the spectrum for an additional period.[[58]](#footnote-60)
3. Nor do we find that Skybridge has demonstrated the existence of unique or unusual circumstances such that application of the substantial service deadline to it would be inequitable, unduly burdensome, or contrary to the public interest, or that Skybridge has no reasonable alternative to requesting a waiver. Skybridge’s accumulation of what it deems a unique aggregation of spectrum resources does not justify its failure to put its AMTS licenses to actual use.[[59]](#footnote-61) Nor do we see anything inequitable or unduly burdensome in applying the substantial service deadline to Skybridge’s Auction 57 licenses, and nothing in the record suggests that Skybridge had no alternative to seeking waiver relief for these licenses.[[60]](#footnote-62) Accordingly, we deny the requests for an extension or waiver of the substantial service deadline for the Auction 57 licenses. We consequently find that the licenses for stations WQJW653, WQJW655, WQJW656, WQJW657, WQNY434, WQOC595, WQUW780, WQVI210, and WQVR515, as well as the licenses for those portions of stations WQID629 and WQJW652 where no service was provided, have terminated automatically, and we dismiss as moot the applications seeking renewal of those licenses.

### Auction 61 Licenses

1. We deny Skybridge’s request for an extension or waiver of the substantial service deadline for the five Auction 61 licenses at issue. Skybridge argues that an extension is warranted because the inability of the Receiver to achieve substantial service with the Auction 61 licenses was caused by circumstances beyond the licensee’s control.[[61]](#footnote-63) It explains that, “[i]nstead of being able to devote her time to negotiating leases or sales of the licenses, the Receiver has been fully occupied with resolving the Receivership Entities’ existing disputes and defending the existence of the Receivership itself against Warren Havens.”[[62]](#footnote-64) It cites an “unrelenting stream of litigation [that] left the Receiver with little time and few resources to effectively market the licenses, despite her best efforts,” and it argues that a “short extension of the deadline to show substantial service on the Skybridge AMTS licenses would . . . allow her to complete her negotiations with potential buyers or lessees of the spectrum.”[[63]](#footnote-65)
2. We conclude that an extension is foreclosed by section 1.946(e)(3), which, as noted, specifies that “[e]xtension requests will not be granted for failure to meet a construction or coverage deadline because the licensee undergoes a transfer of control or because the licensee intends to assign the authorization [or] solely to allow a transferee or assignee to complete facilities that the transferor or assignor failed to construct.”[[64]](#footnote-66) These reasons are precisely why Skybridge seeks an extension. In addition, we are not persuaded that an extension is warranted based on circumstances beyond the licensee’s control. The Bureau’s Mobility Division (Division) previously considered and rejected the argument that ongoing litigation and related hindrances to the Receiver’s discharge of her responsibilities constitute unique and challenging circumstances beyond the Receiver’s control that justify granting either an extension of the construction deadline or a waiver of the automatic termination provision where a licensee fails to meet coverage requirements with respect to other licenses formerly controlled by Havens.[[65]](#footnote-67) We adopt by reference that analysis here.
3. Skybridge also argues that permitting the Receiver’s marketing plan to go forward would better serve the public interest and the rule’s purpose by putting the spectrum to use sooner than terminating the licenses and having the spectrum revert to the Commission for re-auction, which, it says, will be a time- and resource-consuming process.[[66]](#footnote-68) Even if we were to accept the argument that grant of a waiver here would allow the Auction 61 licenses to be put to good use sooner than would a waiver denial, that, by itself, does not outweigh broader public interest considerations. Such an argument could be made by almost any licensee that failed to timely meet the substantial service requirement but claims that it (or an assignee or lessee) could meet the construction requirement with some additional time, so long as that additional time is less than the time that the Commission’s recovery and re-auctioning of the spectrum might take.[[67]](#footnote-69) Granting a waiver on such grounds would undermine the substantial service requirement’s incentive for licensees to use their spectrum efficiently and effectively within a reasonable period of time after licensing, an outcome that would neither promote the purpose of the rule nor serve the public interest.[[68]](#footnote-70)
4. Finally, we are not persuaded that the Division’s 2017 decision[[69]](#footnote-71) granting Maritime Communication/Land Mobile, LLC, Debtor-in-Possession (MCLM), a waiver of the AMTS substantial service deadline supports relief in this case.[[70]](#footnote-72) The Commission designated MCLM for hearing on its basic character qualifications to be a Commission licensee in 2011,[[71]](#footnote-73) so the Commission’s *Jefferson Radio* policy, which prohibits the processing of assignment or transfer of control applications filed by a licensee whose basic qualifications are in question,[[72]](#footnote-74) applied to MCLM. MCLM declared bankruptcy, and the Bankruptcy Court approved a plan for MCLM to assign its licenses to a third party that would seek to sell MCLM’s spectrum assets with the proceeds going to MCLM’s creditors.
5. In December 2016, the Commission terminated the hearing proceeding,[[73]](#footnote-75) whereupon MCLM filed renewal applications and extension/waiver requests for its Auction 61 licenses. The Division waived the substantial service deadline for MCLM largely because of legal constraints on MCLM’s ability to provide substantial service itself or to assign spectrum to third parties.[[74]](#footnote-76) The Division noted that MCLM was in bankruptcy (and therefore likely needed the approval of the Bankruptcy Court to invest further in its licensed stations to meet its substantial service obligations, and that such approval might not be forthcoming given that the underlying licenses were potentially subject to revocation upon a finding that MCLM was disqualified to be a licensee), and was subject to *Jefferson Radio* (which prevented MCLM from conveying responsibility for meeting the substantial service standard to parties willing to undertake it) for most of the license term.[[75]](#footnote-77)
6. We do not find that Skybridge’s situation is sufficiently analogous to that of MCLM such that Skybridge should also be deemed to be subject to “unusual circumstances that render a strict application of the substantial service deadline . . . contrary to the public interest.”[[76]](#footnote-78) First, the Division already has found “unpersuasive the Receiver’s argument that her efforts to pursue transactions for the sale of the licenses were impeded by . . . the receivership limitations on her authority to market and sell the licenses.”[[77]](#footnote-79) Moreover, even if we were to accept the asserted equivalency of the state court’s oversight of the Skybridge receivership with the bankruptcy court’s oversight of MCLM’s expenditures in terms of the constraint it places on finalizing transactions with third parties, the situations are distinguishable, for the Receivership was a factor only for the last thirteen months of Skybridge’s Auction 61 licenses’ term (and for no part of its Auction 57 licenses’ term), while MCLM faced an absolute legal bar to the assignment of its licenses for most of the license term. We conclude that the MCLM decision does not provide a basis for granting similar relief to Skybridge. We therefore deny the Auction 61 extension requests, both as requests for an extension under section 1.946 and as requests for waiver under either prong of section 1.925(b)(3).

# conclusion and ordering clauses

1. Skybridge has not demonstrated that substantial service has been provided under any of the 16 AMTS licenses for which it seeks renewal. In addition, we find no basis to extend or waive the substantial service requirement for those licenses, except to the limited extent of waiving section 80.49(a) to permit a separate substantial service assessment for Amtrak’s PTC operations using spectrum leased and later assigned from the WQID629 and WQJW652 licenses, rather than making a single substantial service assessment for the entirety of those stations’ service areas. As a consequence of that waiver relief, we find that substantial service has been demonstrated in the areas of the Amtrak PTC operations, permitting renewal of those portions of the licenses, but that there has been no demonstration of substantial service for the remaining portions of those licenses. Based on today’s decision, we no longer defer action on the previously granted and consummated transaction between Skybridge and Amtrak, and we will issue Amtrak new licenses to cover areas with demonstrated PTC operations, on the condition that the spectrum be used only for PTC. We conclude, however, that Skybridge’s licenses for WQID629 and WQJW652, as configured following implementation of the Amtrak assignment, as well as the other 14 Skybridge AMTS licenses under review here, have terminated automatically. The renewal applications for stations WQID629 and WQJW652 are granted in part, and the other renewal applications are dismissed as moot.
2. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT, pursuant to sections 4(i) and 309(j) of the Communications Act of 934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 154(i), 309(j), and sections 1.925, 1.955 and 80.49 of the Commission’s Rules, 47 CFR §§ 1.925, 1.955, 80.49, construction notifications FCC File Nos. 0006799303 and 0006799304 SHALL BE ACCEPTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART to the extent set forth herein, extension requests FCC File Nos. 0006778612 and 0006778613 SHALL BE DISMISSED AS MOOT IN PART and DENIED IN PART to the extent set forth herein, and applications 0006778588 and 0006778595 SHALL BE GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART to the extent set forth herein, ON THE CONDITION THAT the spectrum be used only for Positive Train Control.
3. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT new licenses will be issued to the National Passenger Railroad Corporation d/b/a/Amtrak of new licenses pursuant to assignment application FCC File No. 0007940888 ON THE CONDITION THAT the spectrum be used only for Positive Train Control; and after such issuance, the licenses for AMTS stations WQID629 and WQJW652 SHALL BE TERMINATED.
4. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT construction notifications FCC File Nos. 0006799305-13, and extension requests FCC File Nos. 0006778614-22, 0007605851, 0007605919, and 0007605921-23 SHALL BE DENIED; renewal applications FCC File Nos. 0006778589-94, 0006778596-98, 0007605644, and 0007605646-49 SHALL BE DISMISSED AS MOOT; and the licenses for AMTS stations WQJW650, WQJW651, WQJW653, WQJW655, WQJW656, WQJW657, WQNY434, WQOC595, WQON774, WQON775, WQUW780, WQUW781, WQVI210, and WQVR515 ARE TERMINATED.
5. This action is taken under delegated authority pursuant to sections 0.131 and 0.331 of the Commission’s Rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.131, 0.331.

 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

 Scot Stone

 Deputy Chief, Mobility Division

 Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

1. Specifically, Skybridge filed only a request for waiver or extension of the substantial service deadline for five licenses (WQJW650, WQJW651, WQON774, WQON775, and WQUW781), and both a substantial service showing and a contingent request for extension or waiver of the substantial service deadline for 11 licenses (WQID629, WQJW652, WQJW653, WQJW655, WQJW656, WQJW657, WQNY434, WQOC595, WQUW780, WQVI210, and WQVR515). A seventeenth Skybridge geographic AMTS license, for station WQJW654, was renewed earlier, because Skybridge demonstrated that substantial service was provided under that license. *See* FCC File No. 0007605645 (filed Dec. 29, 2016, granted June 6, 2018). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
2. Congress adopted the PTC mandate in the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008. *See* Pub. L. No. 110-432, § 104, 122 Stat. 4848, 4857 (2008), amended by the Positive Train Control Enforcement and Implementation Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-73, § 1302, 129 Stat. 568, 576 (2015) (PTC Enforcement Act). PTC systems are intended to reduce the risk of human-error rail accidents, by “prevent[ing] train-to-train collisions, over-speed derailments, incursions into established work zone limits, and the movement of a train through a switch left in the wrong position.” 49 U.S.C. § 20157(i)(5). In October 2015, Congress extended the PTC implementation deadline from December 31, 2015, to December 31, 2018. See PTC Enforcement Act. Railroads may request up to a 24-month extension of the December 31, 2018, deadline in limited circumstances. See 49 U.S.C. § 20157(a)(2)(B). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
3. The AMTS service was created as an alternative to traditional VHF Public Coast station service. *See Amendment of Parts 2, 81 and 83 of the Commission’s Rules to Allocate Spectrum for an Automated Inland Waterways Communications System (IWCS) along the Mississippi River and Connecting Waterways and, Maritime Mobile Radio services; Improvement in Service Through Provision for Automated VHF Common Carrier Systems and, VHF Frequency Assignments to the Maritime Radio Services In the New Orleans and Lower Mississippi Rivers Areas and on the coastlines of the contiguous states*, Report and Order, 84 FCC 2d 875, *on recon.*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 88 FCC 2d 678 (1981), *aff’d sub nom. WJG Tel. Co. v. FCC*, 675 F.2d 386 (D.C. Cir. 1982). The Commission later amended the rules to permit public correspondence service and private mobile radio service to fixed and mobile units on land. *See* 47 CFR § 80.123; *see also Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Concerning Maritime Communications,* Second Report and Order and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 12 FCC Rcd 16949, 16964, para. 24 (1997) (*Maritime Second Report and Order*); *MariTEL, Inc. and Mobex Network Services, LLC*, Report and Order, 22 FCC Rcd 8971, 8976-77, para. 8 (2007) (*Coast Station Flexibility Report and Order*). The Commission established geographic licensing for AMTS stations in 2002. *See Amendment of the Commission’s Rules Concerning Maritime Communications,* Second Memorandum Opinion and Order and Fifth Report and Order, 17 FCC Rcd 6685, 6696, para. 24 (2002), *recon. granted in part, denied in part*, Third Memorandum Opinion and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 24391 (2003). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
4. *See* 47 CFR § 80.49(a)(3). The Commission recently adopted a new unified renewal standard for most Wireless Radio Service licenses, but that standard does not apply retroactively, so we are reviewing the instant showings under the prior standard *See Amendment of Parts 1, 22, 24, 27, 74, 80, 90, 95, and 101 To Establish Uniform License Renewal, Discontinuance of Operation, and Geographic Partitioning and Spectrum Disaggregation Rules and Policies for Certain Wireless Radio Services*, Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 32 FCC Rcd 8874, 8899-8900, paras. 35-37 (2017), *recon. pending*. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
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