DA 24-10

*In Reply Refer to:*

1800B3-CEG

Released: January 4, 2024

Michael Radio Company, LLC

Attn: Victor A. Michael, Jr.

1418 Bradley Ave.

Cheyenne, WY 82001

vicmichael@RF-Towers.com

White Park Broadcasting, Inc.

c/o Barry A. Friedman, Esq.

1919 M Street NW Ste. 700

Washington, DC 20036

barry.friedman@thompsonhine.com

In re: **KLLM(FM), Wheatland, Wyoming**

Facility ID No. 762455

Application File No. 205045

**Informal Objection**

Dear Applicant and Objector:

We have before us the above-referenced application (Modification Application) for a minor modification to KLLM(FM), Wheatland, Wyoming, (KLLM or Station) filed on December 12, 2022, by Michael Radio Company, LLC (Michael).[[1]](#footnote-3) Michael seeks to relocate the KLLM transmitter to a new site and change its community of license from Wheatland, Wyoming, to Horse Creek, Wyoming.[[2]](#footnote-4) We also have an informal objection (Objection) to the Modification Application filed by White Park Broadcasting, Inc. (White Park) on September 12, 2023.[[3]](#footnote-5) For the reasons stated below, we grant the Objection and dismiss the Modification Application for failure to specify a licensable community, with no further opportunity for corrective amendment.

**Background.** When Michael originally filed the Modification Application on December 12, 2022, it proposed West Laramie, Wyoming, as the Station’s community of license. On May 2, 2023, Bureau staff sent a deficiency letter providing Michael 30 days to demonstrate that West Laramie was a community for allotment purposes.[[4]](#footnote-6) In the *Deficiency Letter*, the Bureau warned that failure to correct all defects within the given time period would result in the dismissal of the Modification Application with no further opportunity for corrective amendment.[[5]](#footnote-7) On May 11, 2023, Michael amended the Modification Application to change the proposed community of license to Laramie, Wyoming. On August 17, 2023, the Bureau notified Michael that its proposal was not a preferential arrangement of allotments, as retaining a fourth local service at Wheatland would be preferred over an eleventh local service for Laramie.[[6]](#footnote-8) On August 20, 2023, Michael again amended the Modification Application, this time to specify Horse Creek, Wyoming, as the proposed community of license.

Michael claims that the Horse Creek is a licensable community and that its proposed allotment would be a preferential arrangement of allotments because it will provide a first local service to Horse Creek.[[7]](#footnote-9) Michael provides the following materials in support of its claim: (1) a screenshot of the Wikipedia web page for Horse Creek; (2) an uncredited topographical map marked “Horse Creek”; (3) a photo of Clawson Elementary School and screenshot of the school’s website;[[8]](#footnote-10) (4) several screenshots of unidentified websites containing demographic information for Horse Creek zip code 82061; (5) screenshots of an unidentified website setting out the location and hours of the Horse Creek Post Office;[[9]](#footnote-11) (7) an uncredited, undated photo titled “Horse Creek Post Office and Store”;[[10]](#footnote-12) (8) several screenshots of a Facebook page titled “Horse Creek, Wyoming;” (9) a Google Maps photo of the Horse Creek Fire Station; (10) an uncredited, undated photo of a sign for the Horse Creek Campground (part of Shoshone National Forest); (11) a screenshot of a Facebook page for Horse Creek Honey (a food stand located in Cheyenne, Wyoming); and (12) Facebook and Google Maps photos of Horse Creek Cattle Company Stone House and Ranch (described as a rental venue for weddings, business retreats, and family vacations).

In the Objection, White Park argues that Horse Creek does not constitute a community for allotment purposes. Specifically, it alleges that Clawson Elementary School is not operated by the Horse Creek community per se but is part of a regional school system serving all of Laramie County,[[11]](#footnote-13) that the Horse Creek fire station is not a local organization but a station operated by the Laramie County Fire Authority,[[12]](#footnote-14) and that the businesses bearing the “Horse Creek” name do not have physical locations in Horse Creek. White Park also compares Horse Creek to West Laramie which, in 2010, the Bureau found not to be a licensable community.[[13]](#footnote-15) According to White Park, “there are absolutely no civic, cultural, religious, social or commercial entities in Horse Creek that serve to create any form of community”[[14]](#footnote-16) and that if Horse Creek is granted status as a community then “the Commission will have eviscerated the allotment standards of Section 307(b) and opened itself up to an unlimited number of allotment modification submissions.”[[15]](#footnote-17)

In the Opposition, Michael reiterates that incorporation is not a prerequisite for community status, that Horse Creek is a geographic location used by various mapping, weather, and real estate services, and that although Horse Creek provides no government services, the fire station and school are “located within the community of Horse Creek, WY, they are intended for use by the residents and businesses of Horse Creek, and both have Horse Creek, WY, addresses.”[[16]](#footnote-18)

**Discussion.** We find that Horse Creek is not a licensable community for allotment purposes. If a locale is not either incorporated or listed in the U.S. Census, the proponent of an allotment must show that it is a “geographically identifiable population grouping.”[[17]](#footnote-19) The principal test for this is whether the location's “residents function as and conceive of themselves as a community around which their interests coalesce.”[[18]](#footnote-20) This may be proven by direct testimony of residents of the locality and/or other “indicia of community”—i.e., objective circumstances giving indication of a common perception that a locality's populace constitutes a distinct “population grouping,”[[19]](#footnote-21) such as political, social, economic, commercial, cultural, public service, or religious organizations and services in the community.[[20]](#footnote-22) Potentially relevant circumstances are many and various.[[21]](#footnote-23) Frequently considered factors are whether the community is marked on a published map,[[22]](#footnote-24) whether it has a United States Postal Service (USPS) post office that offers residential service to the community,[[23]](#footnote-25) whether it provides municipal services such as education, police, and fire protection,[[24]](#footnote-26) whether it would more logically be considered part of another, more established, community,[[25]](#footnote-27) whether it supports commercial activity,[[26]](#footnote-28) and whether its name is used on businesses and other organizations. [[27]](#footnote-29) The test to determine whether a specific location qualifies as a community under Section 307(b) is a liberal one and takes into account the totality of the circumstances.[[28]](#footnote-30)

In this case, Horse Creek is neither incorporated nor listed with the U.S. Census. Michael has not provided any statements from residents that they “conceive of themselves as a community around which their interests coalesce.”[[29]](#footnote-31) Therefore, we must consider objective indicia of community status to determine whether Horse Creek is a “geographically identifiable population grouping” for Section 307(b) purposes. In this case, we examine map data, post office and zip code information, governmental services and functions, alternative/competing community identities, and commercial activity.

*Map data.*Horse Creek is marked as a location on Google Maps, Wikipedia, United States Geological Survey maps, and the Laramie County Fire Authority website.[[30]](#footnote-32) Moreover, it is the name of a river, a road, and a campground. Therefore, Horse Creek satisfies the threshold test of being a physical place. As such, it may be used by location-based services such as weather and real estate listings. Nonetheless, it is well established that a mere geographic location is insufficient to establish community status.[[31]](#footnote-33) Therefore, we must examine additional factors to determine whether there is a population grouping at that geographic location that conceive of themselves as a community.

*Post office and/or zip code***.** In its 307(b) Statement, Michael claims that there is a federal post office serving Horse Creek.[[32]](#footnote-34) This is not the case—the USPS website states that the Horse Creek Post Office closed on September 12, 2017,[[33]](#footnote-35) and, in response to a telephone inquiry, USPS staff confirmed that residents of Horse Creek do not have a dedicated post office but receive their mail at a cluster box unit serviced daily by vehicle from Cheyenne. Although the 82061 zip code area is designated as “Horse Creek,” this fact is of minimal value as an indicator of community status. As a routing tool used by the federal mail delivery system, a zip code area may straddle towns, counties, and even states. It is well established that the existence of a zip code area, without more, does not establish a geographically identifiable population grouping for allotment purposes.[[34]](#footnote-36)

*Governmental services and functions.* The elementary school and fire protection services in Horse Creek are not provided by the community but by Laramie County, to a service area much larger than the area marked as “Horse Creek” on the map. Specifically, the Horse Creek Fire Department is part of Laramie County Fire Protection District 2 (Station 3), and Clawson Elementary is part of Laramie County School District #1. Although the Commission “does not require a municipality to provide every public service on its own in order to merit community status,”[[35]](#footnote-37) here it appears that Horse Creek provides no governmental services at all. Therefore, this factor weighs against a finding of community status.

*Alternative/competing identities.* The Commission has found that a named neighborhood, precinct, village, or other area may not have community status if it is wholly located within a more identifiable community, such as a city or town.[[36]](#footnote-38) Here, Horse Creek is not encompassed or intersected by an alternative community with a more dominant identification. Therefore, this factor does not weigh against a finding of community status.

*Commercial activity*. The Commission has never established a minimum amount of commercial activity necessary to qualify an area as a community.[[37]](#footnote-39) Here, Michael identifies only one business that operates at the geographic location of Horse Creek—namely, Horse Creek Cattle Company Stone House and Ranch. We conclude that this minimal level of commercial activity does not support a finding of community status.[[38]](#footnote-40)

Taking all of the above factors into consideration, we conclude that Horse Creek does not constitute a licensable community for Section 307(b) allotment purposes. Michael has neither submitted the testimony of residents nor established the existence of a population grouping evidenced by political, social, economic, commercial, cultural, public service, or religious organizations and services in the community. Because the Application is dismissed on this basis, we need not conduct any further Section 307(b) analysis of the allotment priority of Horse Creek.

However, we take this opportunity to caution applicants regarding the use of materials obtained exclusively from online sources. If an applicant wishes to use a website or information obtained online (such as photographs), it should make every reasonable effort to verify or authenticate the information provided, including, for example, making a site visit to the community it proposes to serve, obtaining a statement from an individual with personal knowledge of the facts alleged, or at the very least corroborating the information using another reliable online source. Importantly, any website used to support an application must be clearly identified with the site owner or publisher, title of the page, URL address, last date visited, and any other relevant information. If reviewing staff cannot identify or verify a submission, it will be excluded from our community status determination.

We also remind applicants that effective April 1, 2023, petitioners and applicants submitting filings to the Audio Division must employ the most recent 2020 U.S. Census data available when determining a particular community’s population in addition to the population served and overlap of service areas to communities and Urbanized Areas.[[39]](#footnote-41)

**Conclusion/Actions.**  For the reasons set forth above, IT IS ORDERED that the informal objection filed by White Park, Inc. on September 12, 2023, IS GRANTED and the modification application for KLLM(FM), Wheatland, Wyoming, Application File No. 205045, IS DISMISSED for failure to specify a licensable community, with no further opportunity for corrective amendment.[[40]](#footnote-42)

Sincerely,

Albert Shuldiner

Chief, Audio Division

Media Bureau
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