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Re: **Tahoma Preservation**

New LPFM, Tacoma, Washington

Facility ID No. 787979

Application File No. 0000231404

**Petition for Reconsideration**

Dear Applicant:

We have before us a Petition for Reconsideration (Petition)[[1]](#footnote-3) filed by Tahoma Preservation (Petitioner), seeking reconsideration of the Media Bureau’s (Bureau) dismissal of Petitioner’s application (Application) for a construction permit for a new low power FM (LPFM) station at Tacoma, Washington.[[2]](#footnote-4) For the reasons set forth below, we deny the Petition.

**Background**. Petitioner filed the Application during the 2023 LPFM Filing Window.[[3]](#footnote-5) On January 19, 2024, Bureau staff dismissed the Application for failure to meet the minimum distance spacing requirements enumerated in section 73.807(a)[[4]](#footnote-6) of the Commission’s rules (Rules), with respect to the second-adjacent channel licenses of stations KQMV(FM), Belleview, Washington, and KJR-FM, Seattle, Washington, and noted that an amendment was not permitted under section 73.870(c) of the Rules.[[5]](#footnote-7)

In the Petition, Petitioner seeks reinstatement of the Application and claims that, relying on FCC staff, it thought that the Commission’s Licensing and Management System (LMS) would automatically take into account second-adjacent stations when determining the power of the proposed station and LMS would automatically adjust the proposed station’s parameters based on those second-adjacent stations. Petitioner thus assumed no second-adjacent channel waiver request was needed.[[6]](#footnote-8)

**Discussion**. The Commission will consider a petition for reconsideration only when the petitioner shows either a material error in the Commission’s original determination, or raises additional facts not known or existing at the time of the petitioner’s last opportunity to present such matters.[[7]](#footnote-9)  Petitioner has not demonstrated any legal error in the Bureau’s dismissal of the Application, nor has it cited any precedent that warrants reinstatement.

*Section 73.807 Violation.*  Bureau staff correctly dismissed the Application for failure to meet the second-adjacent channel spacing requirements, as outlined in section 73.807(a).[[8]](#footnote-10) Specifically, LPFM applicants must protect authorized FM stations, pending applications for new and existing FM stations filed prior to the release of the *Procedures Public Notice*, authorized LPFM stations, and vacant FM allotments, by meeting the minimum distance separation requirements specified in section 73.807 of the Commission’s rules.[[9]](#footnote-11) Pursuant to section 73.870(c), any application submitted during an LPFM filing window that fails to meet the spacing requirements of section 73.807 will be dismissed without opportunity to amend.[[10]](#footnote-12) Moreover, the *Procedures Public Notice* warned LPFM applicants that, “[c]onsistent with established processing rules, an LPFM application that fails to protect these authorizations, applications, and vacant FM allotments will be *dismissed with no opportunity to correct the deficiency*.”[[11]](#footnote-13)

Although section 3(b)(2)(A) of the Local Community Radio Act of 2010 (LCRA) authorizes the Commission to waive second-adjacent channel spacing requirements, an LPFM applicant must specifically request the waiver and demonstrate that its proposed LPFM facilities “will not result in interference to any authorized radio service.”[[12]](#footnote-14) The Bureau explicitly cautioned LPFM applicants that it will dismiss any application that fails to comply with the second-adjacent channel spacing requirements without requesting a waiver, supported by the requisite engineering exhibit, and that a dismissed applicant will *not* be permitted to seek *nunc pro tunc* reinstatement of its application.[[13]](#footnote-15)

Here, the Bureau correctly dismissed the Application because Petitioner failed to meet the minimum distance spacing requirements of section 73.807(a)(1) with respect to second-adjacent channel stations KQMV(FM) and KJR(FM), and failed to submit a second-adjacent channel waiver request and supporting exhibit. The Commission has previously held that the Bureau may properly prohibit dismissed LPFM applicants that did not comply with the second-adjacent channel spacing rules in the filing window from filing amendments to correct violations of section 73.807.[[14]](#footnote-16) Moreover, permitting applicants to file application amendments to resolve section 73.807 minimum distance separation requirements after the close of the filing window and the Commission’s dismissal of their applications would frustrate the processing efficiencies which sections 73.807 and 73.870(c) were designed to promote and be unfair to the many applicants who fully complied with the rules and filing requirements. It is, therefore, contrary to the public interest.[[15]](#footnote-17) Petitioner has not demonstrated any basis to contravene the rules and established precedent and reinstate the Application.

*Reliance on Staff Advice*.Finally, we reject Petitioner’s claim that its failure to file the required request for a second-adjacent channel waiver is due to FCC staff advice. The Petition simply states, “IT WAS OUR UNDERSTANDING FROM THE FCC STAFF”, but provides no names of FCC staff involved, no dates for conversations with FCC staff or copies of emails with FCC’s staff. Thus, the Petition’s claims of advice from FCC staff are not credible. Moreover, the Commission has consistently held that parties relying on staff advice do so at their own risk.[[16]](#footnote-18) Applicants are required to comply with the Commission’s rules and procedures, which were clearly outlined by the *Procedures Public Notice*.[[17]](#footnote-19)

**Conclusion**. For the reasons set forth above, **IT IS ORDERED** thatthe Petition for Reconsideration filed by Tahoma Preservation, on February 12, 2024 (Pleading File No. 0000238844) **IS DENIED**.

Sincerely,

Albert Shuldiner

Chief, Audio Division

Media Bureau
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