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By the Commission:

# INTRODUCTION

1. We have before us an Application for Review (AFR)[[1]](#footnote-3) filed by Florida Community Radio, Inc. (FCR), seeking Commission review of a Media Bureau (Bureau) decision[[2]](#footnote-4) that denied an extension of tolling of the construction period for FCR’s construction permit (Permit) for a proposed new noncommercial educational (NCE) FM station at Horseshoe Beach, Florida (Station). That denial was based on FCR’s failure to demonstrate that further tolling was appropriate under section 73.3598(d)[[3]](#footnote-5) of the Commission’s rules (Rules).[[4]](#footnote-6) We dismiss the AFR insofar as it raises new arguments that were not previously presented to the Bureau or it attempts to appeal a final order on an untimely basis, and otherwise deny the AFR.

# BACKGROUND

1. The Bureau issued the Permit on May 13, 2015, for a three-year term ending on May 13, 2018. On April 10, 2018, FCR requested tolling of the construction deadline based on (a) the effects of Hurricane Irma, which allegedly created a lack of commercial space in Horseshoe Beach, and (b) the Commission’s decision to eliminate the main studio rule for radio stations, which altered FCR’s plans for the Station and required further engineering analysis. By letter dated May 2, 2018, the Bureau found that FCR had not shown that the impact of Hurricane Irma on FCR’s plans supported tolling under the Tolling Rule, but that a waiver of the Tolling Rule was warranted based on the Commission’s elimination of the main studio rule late in the Permit’s term, resulting in changes in FCR’s construction plans.[[5]](#footnote-7) Accordingly, the Bureau granted a six-month extension of the Permit ending on November 13, 2018.[[6]](#footnote-8)
2. On September 26, 2018, FCR applied to modify the Permit by specifying operation from an existing tower owned by Alltel Corporation (Alltel Tower).[[7]](#footnote-9) FCR requested expedited processing, and the Bureau granted the Modification Application on September 28, 2018.[[8]](#footnote-10)
3. On October 11, 2018, Hurricane Michael reached land, causing extensive damage to the Florida panhandle (northwest of Horseshoe Beach – particularly Bay County and Gulf County), but also resulting in a storm surge and flooding in Horseshoe Beach and other parts of Dixie County.[[9]](#footnote-11) On November 14, 2018, FCR requested tolling based on the impact of the hurricane on its ability to construct the Station, and the Bureau granted that request on November 29, 2018, specifying a new construction deadline ending on May 15, 2019.[[10]](#footnote-12)
4. On April 16, 2019, FCR submitted another tolling request, seeking additional time so that it could perform an analysis of whether the Station’s power lines should be underground rather than placed on a power pole, as well as a structural analysis of the potential impact of a future Category 5 storm on the Station’s antenna.[[11]](#footnote-13) Bureau staff asked FCR to provide more specific information to show a direct nexus between Hurricane Michael and FCR’s inability to construct the Station within the deadline, but FCR did not provide such information.[[12]](#footnote-14) On June 14, 2019, the Bureau denied FCR’s request for further tolling, finding that FCR had not met the standard in the Tolling Rule and that the studies described by FCR were not matters beyond FCR’s control, but rather could have been done within the extended construction term.[[13]](#footnote-15) FCR filed a petition for reconsideration of this denial on July 15, 2019 (Petition), and on November 4, 2019, the Bureau released the *Staff Decision*, dismissing in part and otherwise denying the Petition.[[14]](#footnote-16)
5. In its AFR filed on December 4, 2019, FCR for the first time claims that further tolling is warranted because the Alltel Tower site is “located inside a FEMA designated floodplain area”[[15]](#footnote-17) and, pursuant to Executive Order 11988,[[16]](#footnote-18) “the FCC is required as a matter of law to encourage and provide appropriate guidance to a permittee, which includes evaluating the effects of the permittee proposals in floodplains, especially when such alternative steps being proposed by the permittee are meant to reduce or mitigate the risk of damage in anticipation of an act of God.”[[17]](#footnote-19) FCR also argues that the Bureau erred in the *2018 Staff Letter* when it denied tolling based on FCR’s claims involving Hurricane Irma.[[18]](#footnote-20) Finally, FCR argues that the Bureau interpreted the Tolling Rule too narrowly and requests that the Commission waive the Tolling Rule to allow FCR more time to plan how to “reduce or mitigate the risk of damage in a FEMA designated floodplain area in anticipation of an act of God,” consistent with Executive Order 11988.[[19]](#footnote-21)

# DISCUSSION

1. We reject the AFR’s attempt to raise new matters that the Bureau never had the opportunity to address – specifically, the claims that the Alltel Tower is in a floodplain and that Executive Order 11988 is therefore controlling.[[20]](#footnote-22) This includes FCR’s new request for a waiver set forth in its AFR, which differs from its prior waiver requests because it is based on the new argument involving the floodplain claim and Executive Order 11988.[[21]](#footnote-23) We dismiss this new argument as procedurally barred under section 5(c)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and section 1.115(c) of the Rules.[[22]](#footnote-24)
2. We also dismiss the AFR to the extent it attempts to re-introduce as an issue for Commission review the Bureau’s decision in the *2018 Staff Letter* to deny tolling for Hurricane Irma.[[23]](#footnote-25) As the *Staff Decision* noted, the *2018 Staff Letter* has been a final order since June of 2018.[[24]](#footnote-26) Thus, FCR’s attempt to address that order in its AFR is untimely.[[25]](#footnote-27)
3. We deny the remainder of the AFR, which claims that the Bureau erred in deciding that FCR failed to demonstrate that additional tolling was warranted under the Tolling Rule.[[26]](#footnote-28) FCR’s arguments about its plans to undertake studies about how best to proceed with construction do not satisfy section 73.3598(d) because they involve future potential acts of God, not an act of God that has impeded construction.[[27]](#footnote-29) Specifically, subsection (d) of the Tolling Rule, which applied to any potential extension of tolling beyond the original six months of tolling due to Hurricane Michael, required a showing by FCR detailing how the hurricane “continues to cause delays in construction, any construction progress, and the steps it has taken and proposes to take to resolve any remaining impediments.”[[28]](#footnote-30) FCR made no showing in its request for a tolling extension that Hurricane Michael continued to cause delays in construction,[[29]](#footnote-31) and in fact has never claimed that Hurricane Michael caused the Alltel Tower to lose power, be flooded, or sustain any type of damage. Also, as noted in the *Staff Decision*,FCR also has not shown that it ever made any construction progress.[[30]](#footnote-32) Finally, FCR has not shown any impediments caused by Hurricane Michael that need to be resolved, but instead now predicates its argument on potential future acts of God. For these reasons, we find that the Bureau properly interpreted and applied the Tolling Rule to FCR’s request for additional tolling.

# ORDERING CLAUSES

1. Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that the Application for Review filed on December 4, 2019, by Florida Community Radio, Inc.: (1) **IS DISMISSED**, pursuant to section 5(c)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and section 1.115(c) of the FCC’s Rules, to the extent that it relies on questions of fact or law not previously presented to the Media Bureau; (2) **IS DISMISSED**, pursuant to section 1.115(d) of the FCC’s Rules, to the extent it is untimely; and (3) otherwise **IS DENIED**, pursuant to section 5(c)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and section 1.115(g) of the FCC’s Rules.[[31]](#footnote-33)
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