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Baker Art Guild

c/o Ms. Jess Campbell

PO Box 342

Baker City, OR 97814

(sent by electronic mail to: [jess@rop.org](mailto:jess@rop.org))

Albert Adam David

2632 Kenilworth Ave.

Berwyn, IL 60402

(sent by electronic mail to: [albert.a.david@hotmail.com](mailto:albert.a.david@hotmail.com))

First Baptist Church of Riverview

c/o Martin Gibbs

PO Box 2734

Pasco, WA 99302

(sent by electronic mail to: [kolu@kolu.com](mailto:kolu@kolu.com))

Idaho Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, Inc.

c/o Brian Yeager

16115 South Montana Ave.

Caldwell, ID 83607

(sent by electronic mail to: [brian@barefootmm.org](mailto:brian@barefootmm.org))

In re: **NCE MX Group 184**

**Baker Art Guild**

New NCE FM, Baker City, Oregon

Facility ID No. 765135

Application File No. 0000166621

**First Baptist Church of Riverview**

New NCE FM, Baker City, Oregon

Facility ID No. 762640

Application File No. 0000167571

**Idaho Conference of Seventh-Day**

**Adventists, Inc.**

New NCE FM, Baker City, Oregon

Facility ID No. 765560

Application File No. 0000167277

**Informal Objection**

Dear Applicants and Objector,

We have before us three mutually exclusive (MX) applications filed by Baker Art Guilt (BAG), First Baptist Church of Riverview (FBCR), and Idaho Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, Inc. (ICSA), for construction permits for new noncommercial educational (NCE) FM stations in Baker City, Oregon, which the Media Bureau (Bureau) designated as NCE MX Group 184.[[1]](#footnote-2) The Commission identified the BAG Application as the tentative selectee of the group.[[2]](#footnote-3) We also have before us the Informal Objection (Objection) to the BAG Application, filed by Albert Adam David (David).[[3]](#footnote-4) For the reasons set forth below, we dismiss the Objection as moot, grant the BAG Application, and dismiss the FBCR Application and the ICSA Application.[[4]](#footnote-5)

*Background*. The subject applications were filed during the November 2021 NCE FM filing window.[[5]](#footnote-6) Because the three applications proposed service to the same community, in the *Third Comparative Order*, the Commission conducted a point system analysis in which it awarded BAG and ICSA three points each under the established local applicant criterion, FBCR and BAG two points each under the diversity of ownership criterion, and BAG one point under the best technical proposal criterion because its proposal would serve at least 10% more area and population than ICSA’s next best proposal.[[6]](#footnote-7) Thus, BAG was credited a total of six points, ICSA was credited with three points, and FBCR was credited with two points. The Commission, therefore, identified BAG as the tentative selectee of NCE MX Group 184.[[7]](#footnote-8)

In the Objection, David argues that the BAG Application should be dismissed because its proposed antenna radiation pattern varies more than 2 dB per 10 degrees of azimuth, between the 40 and 50 degree radials, in violation of section 73.316(b)(2) of the Commission’s rules (rules).[[8]](#footnote-9)

On February 22, 2023, BAG filed a technical amendment to its application, which revised the antenna pattern.[[9]](#footnote-10) BAG also revised the area size and population that its proposed facility would serve.[[10]](#footnote-11) BAG further disclosed that, as a result of this amendment, it was no longer eligible for a point under the best technical proposal criterion because it would no longer provide service to at least 10% greater population than the ICSA Application. BAG argues that it nonetheless remains the tentative selectee of NCE MX Group 184 because it still has more points than FBCR and ICSA.[[11]](#footnote-12)

*Discussion*.Pursuant to section 309(d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended,[[12]](#footnote-13) petitions to deny and informal objections must provide properly supported allegations of fact that, if true, would establish a substantial and material question of fact that grant of the application would be *prima* *facie* inconsistent with the public interest.[[13]](#footnote-14)

Section 73.316(b)(2) of the rules specifies that directional antennas used to protect short-spaced stations with a radiation pattern which varies more than 2 dB per 10 degrees of azimuth will not be authorized.[[14]](#footnote-15) The staff has independently reviewed the Amended BAG Application and determined that the proposed directional antenna pattern complies with section 73.316(b)(2).[[15]](#footnote-16) David cites to no authority that the failure to adhere to antenna radiation pattern requirements is a non-curable defect,[[16]](#footnote-17) and thus we need not address whether the original BAG Application violated section 73.316(b)(2). Accordingly, we find that dismissal of the BAG Application is not warranted since the proposed antenna radiation pattern in the Amended BAG Application complies with section 73.316(b)(2). We, therefore, dismiss the Objection as moot.

BAG correctly notes that it is no longer eligible for a point under the best technical proposal criterion as a result of its revised antenna pattern.[[17]](#footnote-18) However, the exclusion of this point does not affect the outcome of NCE MX Group 184 because, without the best technical proposal point, BAG has a total of five points, ICSA three points, and FBCR two points. Accordingly, because BAG still has the highest point total and remains the tentative selectee, we need not refer this group to the Commission to conduct a new point system analysis.[[18]](#footnote-19) We thus dismiss the Objection as moot, grant the BAG Application, and dismiss the mutually exclusive FBCR Application and the ICSA Application.

**Conclusion/Action.** For the reasons set forth above, **IT IS ORDERED** that the Informal Objection, filed by Albert Adam David on February 21, 2023 (Pleading File No. 0000211155), **IS DISMISSED AS MOOT.**

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Application filed by Baker Art Guild (Application File No. 0000166621), as amended on February 22, 2023, for a construction permit for a new NCE FM station in Baker City, Oregon **IS GRANTED CONDITIONED UPON** that selectee’s compliance with section 73.7005 of the Commission’s rules, 47 CFR § 73.7005, which sets forth a four-year period in which an applicant, that is awarded a permit by use of the point system, must maintain the comparative qualifications for which it received points, and must comply with the restrictions on station modifications and acquisitions.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the mutually exclusive application of First Baptist Church of Riverview(Application File No. 0000167571) **IS DISMISSED.**

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the mutually exclusive application of Idaho Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, Inc.(Application File No. 0000167277) **IS DISMISSED**.

Sincerely,

Albert Shuldiner

Chief, Audio Division

Media Bureau

cc (via electronic mail):

Michael D. Brown. ([mike@brownbroadcast.com](mailto:mike@brownbroadcast.com))

(Technical Representative for Baker Art Guild)

Michael Couzens, Esq. ([cuz@well.com](mailto:cuz@well.com))

(Legal Representative for Baker Art Guild)

A. Wray Fitch, III, Esq. ([doneil@rinioneil.com](mailto:doneil@rinioneil.com))

(Legal Representative for First Baptist Church of Riverview)

Don Martin, Esq. ([dempc@prodigy.net](mailto:dempc@prodigy.net))

(Legal Representative for Idaho Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, Inc.)
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