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By the Commission:

# Introduction

1. We have before us an Application for Review (AFR) filed by Park Public Radio, Inc. (Park)[[1]](#footnote-3) and an Opposition thereto filed by Central Baptist Theological Seminary of Minneapolis (Central Baptist).[[2]](#footnote-4) In the AFR, Park seeks Commission review of a letter decision on reconsideration (*Reconsideration Letter*) issued by the Audio Division, Media Bureau (Bureau), on February 6, 2023. [[3]](#footnote-5) The *Reconsideration Letter* upheld a staff letter decision that: (1) dismissed the above-captioned application to modify the facilities of low power FM (LPFM) station KPPS-LP, St. Louis Park, Minnesota (KPPS-LP) filed by Park on March 31, 2021 (Park Modification Application); and (2) granted the above-captioned mutually-exclusive application to modify the facilities of FM translator station K250BY, Plymouth, Minnesota (K250BY), filed by Central Baptist Theological Seminary of Minneapolis (Central Baptist) on April 1, 2021 (Central Baptist Modification Application).[[4]](#footnote-6) For the reasons stated below, we grant the Application for Review, rescind the grant of the Central Baptist Modification Application, and leave the Park Modification Application in dismissed status but permit 30 days to allow Park to file a request for reinstatement *nunc pro tunc*.

# BACKGROUND

1. On March 31, 2021, Park filed the Park Modification Application, seeking approval for a new channel and transmitter site for KPPS-LP.[[5]](#footnote-7) In the Engineering Statement attached to the Park Modification Application, Park argued that it was not required to protect LPFM station KQEP-LP, St. Paul, Minnesota (KQEP-LP) because the KQEP-LP license “expires as of 3:00 am April 1, 2021 . . . No license renewal has been filed. No signal from KQEP-LP has been heard in well over a year, and no transmitting antenna could be found at or near the coordinates specified in its license.”[[6]](#footnote-8) The Park Modification Application also proposed to: (1) retain an existing two-kilometer short-spacing to FM translator station K250BY, Minneapolis, Minnesota (K250BY) while moving KPPS-LP from a second-adjacent to a first-adjacent channel;[[7]](#footnote-9) and (2) decrease existing short-spacing to FM translator station W248CU, Minneapolis, Minnesota (W248CU) while moving KPPS-LP from a first-adjacent to a second-adjacent channel.[[8]](#footnote-10) These short-spacings were originally created as a result of modifications to K250BY and W248CU.[[9]](#footnote-11) Under section 73.807(d), such involuntarily short-spaced LPFM stations may relocate provided that the existing distance separation is not reduced by the move.[[10]](#footnote-12) Park argued that, under section 73.807(d), it should be allowed to relocate and retain its existing “grandfathered” distance separations despite the channel change because it would still be short-spaced by two kilometers before and after the modification; however, it also requested a new waiver “if needed.”[[11]](#footnote-13) In a pleading filed in support of its proposal, Park noted that another LPFM applicant, Wimberley Valley Radio (Wimberley), had been previously authorized to retain its short-spacing while changing from a first-adjacent to a second-adjacent channel.[[12]](#footnote-14)
2. By its terms, the KQEP-LP license expired at 3:00 a.m. on April 1, 2021. At 9:46 am that same day, April 1, 2021, Central Baptist filed an application to modify the facilities of FM translator station K250BY (Central Baptist Modification Application).[[13]](#footnote-15) On April 2, 2021, the Bureau cancelled the KQEP-LP license and deleted its call sign for failure to file a renewal application. Public notice of the cancellation was published on April 7, 2021.[[14]](#footnote-16) On April 12, 2021, Central Baptist filed a petition to deny the Park Modification Application.[[15]](#footnote-17)
3. *Staff Letter.* On July 5, 2022, the Bureau issued the *Staff Letter*, dismissing the Park Modification Application and granting the Central Baptist Modification Application.[[16]](#footnote-18) Based on information that Park filed its Application approximately six hours before KQEP-LP’s license expired,[[17]](#footnote-19) the *Staff Letter*  determined that the Park Modification Application was “prematurely filed.” [[18]](#footnote-20) Park’s failure to protect the KQEP-LP license at the time of filing, the Bureau concluded, was an acceptability defect that should have resulted in the rejection of the Park Modification Application when it was filed.[[19]](#footnote-21) It explained that allowing such “prematurely filed applications . . . would be unfair to all other similarly-situated prospective applicants for the available spectrum.”[[20]](#footnote-22) The Bureau further stated that the Central Baptist Modification Application “did not suffer from the same flaw, as it was filed after the KQEP-LP license had expired.”[[21]](#footnote-23) The *Staff Letter* did not analyze whether the KQEP-LP license had expired under section 312(g) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Section 312(g)),[[22]](#footnote-24) prior to the filing of the Park Modification Application.
4. On alternative and independent grounds, the Bureau dismissed the Park Modification Application for presenting a “new and impermissible first-adjacent short-spacing to K250BY.”[[23]](#footnote-25) The Bureau held that the move was not authorized under section 73.807(d) of the Rules because “there is no grandfathering provision for maintaining an ‘existing’ short-spacing when changing channels.”[[24]](#footnote-26) The Bureau also rejected Park’s waiver request.[[25]](#footnote-27) Finally, the Bureau rejected Park’s comparison with the Wimberley Modification Application because: (1) the Wimberley decision was unpublished and thus lacked precedential value; and (2) the facts of the two cases are distinguishable—whereas Wimberley proposed to move to a further frequency (from a first-adjacent to second-adjacent channel), Park proposed to move to a closer frequency (from a second-adjacent to a first-adjacent channel).[[26]](#footnote-28) Therefore, in terms of interference, Wimberley “improved matters” whereas the Park proposal was “problematic.”[[27]](#footnote-29)
5. *Petition for Reconsideration.* On August 4, 2022, Park filed a petition for reconsideration of the *Staff Letter*, arguing that: (1) the Park and Central Baptist Modification Applications were similarly situated under *Melody Music* in that they were both premature and thus should have been treated similarly with respect to protecting KQEP-LP;[[28]](#footnote-30) (2) the Bureauerred by not considering whether the KQEP-LP license had automatically expired under Section 312(g) when Park raised this issue in the Park Modification Application by stating that KQEP-LP “no longer exists” because it “[has] not been heard for well over a year;”[[29]](#footnote-31) (3) the Bureau should have “analyzed the similarities and differences” between the Park and Wimberley Modification Applications as “materially analogous situations”;[[30]](#footnote-32) and (4) the Bureau incorrectly cited a rule provision applicable only to the Wireless Service.[[31]](#footnote-33) Park further argues that “citing to non-existent rules and/or ignoring the express terms of applicable rules, as well as due process inherent in *Melody Music*, the Letter Ruling violated the [Administrative Procedure Act (APA)]’s ban or adjudication that is arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion, or not in accord with rules or statutes.”[[32]](#footnote-34)
6. *Reconsideration Letter.* On February 6, 2023, the Bureau issued the *Reconsideration Letter*, dismissing in part and otherwise denying Park’s Petition.[[33]](#footnote-35) With regard to protecting KQEP-LP, the Bureau found that the Park and Central Baptist modification applications were not similarly situated because the former was filed before the KQEP-LP license expired at 3 a.m. on April 1, 2021, while the latter was filed afterward.[[34]](#footnote-36) In determining the relevant date upon which any conflicting application would have been acceptable for filing, the Bureau applied the policy—set out in the 2014 *Harrisonburg* decision—of accepting conflicting applications for one day after a construction permit has expired.[[35]](#footnote-37) Because the Central Baptist Modification Application was filed before a conflicting application would be acceptable under *Harrisonburg* (April 2, 2021), but after the KQEP-LP license expired by its own terms at 3 a.m. on April 1, 2021, the Bureau found that it was not filed prematurely.[[36]](#footnote-38) Conversely, the Bureau concluded, the Park Modification Application was filed prior to the KQEP-LP expiration and therefore “should not have been accepted at the time of filing.”[[37]](#footnote-39) The Bureau dismissed Park’s Section 312(g) argument for failure to raise the matter earlier “with sufficient clarity.”[[38]](#footnote-40) Even “assuming for the sake of argument” that the Section 312(g) claim had been timely raised, the Bureau found that the additional evidence submitted in Park’s petition for reconsideration did not establish that KQEP-LP had been silent for the requisite consecutive 12-month period prior to April 1, 2021, and that the information submitted by Park did not warrant further investigation into the matter.[[39]](#footnote-41)
7. Regarding Park’s request to remain short-spaced to K250BY and W248CU while changing channels, the Bureau found that it was not required to consider the unpublished Wimberley Modification Application as binding precedent, and, moreover, the two applications were not similarly situated under *Melody Music* because they proposed different channel relationships.[[40]](#footnote-42) The Bureau affirmed its denial of the Park waiver request.[[41]](#footnote-43) Finally, the Bureau explained that its dismissal of the Park Modification Application was not arbitrary or capricious under the APA because the *Staff Letter* thoroughly explained its reasoning and the public policy reasons behind its decision.[[42]](#footnote-44)
8. *Application for Review.* In the Application for Review, Park makes numerous arguments to challenge the Bureau’s dismissal of its Modification Application.[[43]](#footnote-45) Park challenges the Bureau’s “premature filing” rationale as a basis for dismissal, arguing that there is no rule that requires dismissal of Park’s Application as premature under the circumstances presented.[[44]](#footnote-46) Park argues that the Bureau erroneously cited section 1.934(f) of the Rules, which applies only to Wireless Radio Services,[[45]](#footnote-47) and did not provide any other rule, order, or precedent for dismissal in these circumstances “because such precedent does not exist.”[[46]](#footnote-48) Rather, according to Park, the Commission’s rules provide that a minor modification application may be filed at any time,[[47]](#footnote-49) and the Commission has said that it “will not take adverse action on [an application] based solely on its acceptability as filed, when subsequent events prior to staff review resulted in a fully acceptable application.”[[48]](#footnote-50) In these circumstances, Park concludes, the Bureau’s dismissal of its application was arbitrary and capricious because it was based on a policy that is not explicitly stated.[[49]](#footnote-51) Park also asserts that dismissal was improper because “applications that do not meet all acceptance requirements are normally issued a deficiency letter, and an opportunity to amend its application prior to dismissal.”[[50]](#footnote-52) Park further argues that *Harrisonburg* is inapplicable here because that decision related to the expiration of an unbuilt modification construction permit in the NCE service, while this proceeding implicates a license renewal for an existing full service station.[[51]](#footnote-53)
9. Park submits that although the Bureau concluded that the Park and Central Baptist Modification Applications were both filed prematurely, the Bureau failed to treat them similarly by dismissing Park’s and granting Central Baptist’s.[[52]](#footnote-54) Park points out that both Modification Applications were filed before the deadline for acceptance of a KQEP renewal application (i.e., April 2, 2021)[[53]](#footnote-55) Park contends that, from a public interest standpoint, both applications caused the harm that the Bureau ascribed to the Park Application alone—*i.e.*, precluding subsequent modification applications for the same spectrum and conflicting with any renewal application filed by the KQEP-LP licensee, requiring the comparison of the applications as mutually exclusive, or the dismissal of both.[[54]](#footnote-56)
10. Park argues that even if it did not specifically use the term “312(g)” in the Park Modification Application and related pleadings, it “should have been clear” that it was invoking Section 312(g) when it stated that KQEP-LP was not on the air and had not been for more than a year.[[55]](#footnote-57) Park also asserts that it subsequently submitted sufficient documentation to at least raise the issue that KQEP’s license had expired as a matter of law and that the Bureau erred in dismissing such documentation as improperly raised on reconsideration.[[56]](#footnote-58) Park argues that the Bureau should have taken steps to investigate the operating status of KQEP-LP before dismissing the Park Modification Application.[[57]](#footnote-59)
11. Regarding the short-spacing to the two translator stations, Park contends that: (1) section 73.807(d) is explicit with respect to allowable transmitter relocations but does not set out any guidance regarding channel changes for involuntarily short-spaced LPFM stations; (2) that policy considerations and fairness would indicate some flexibility be provided for such applicants; and (3) that the Bureau failed to treat Park similarly to the *Wimberley* applicant, who was permitted to maintain a grandfathered short-spacing while changing to a more “distant” channel.[[58]](#footnote-60) Park asserts that when an involuntarily short-spaced LPFM licensee seeks to change channels, the Commission “should carefully compare the proposal to determine if interference is improved over the licensed facility”[[59]](#footnote-61) and that “it is only fair that LPFM stations that face pre-existing short-spacing due to the later licensing of an FM translator station be allowed some flexibility in how they can protect those FM translator stations from interference.”[[60]](#footnote-62) Even if the Wimberley grant cannot be used as precedent, Park urges, it should be given the flexibility to “carry-over short-spacing of a particular station to an adjacent channel, particularly when there is no contour overlap on the new channel.”[[61]](#footnote-63)
12. Park states that, after receiving the *Staff Letter*, it obtained site assurance to relocate to a site that would eliminate the objectionable short-spacing to K250BY completely.[[62]](#footnote-64) However, when, within 30 days of the dismissal, it tried to file a request for reinstatement *nunc pro tunc* (that is, reinstatement in the processing line with the filing date of the original submission) accompanied by a curative amendment, “LMS would not accept an amendment to a dismissed application,” and Bureau staff advised that Park was not permitted to file a *nunc pro tunc* curative amendment because it had previously requested a waiver.[[63]](#footnote-65) Park believes that “it is still due the opportunity to file a minor curative amendment . . . [to] eliminate the 2 km short-spacing of the licensed K250BY from a new site, should the K250BY permit be rescinded.”[[64]](#footnote-66)
13. In the Opposition, Central Baptist reiterates the Bureau’s conclusions, contending that all salient issues were correctly decided in the *Reconsideration Letter* and should be affirmed on review.[[65]](#footnote-67) In particular, Central Baptist points out that the Bureau not only found that it did not have to consider the Wimberley Modification Application as binding precedent but also performed a *Melody Music* analysis and explained the key difference between the two applications with respect to the likelihood of interference.[[66]](#footnote-68) Central Baptist also urges that allowing a *nunc pro tunc* amendment to correct the spacing defect would be “highly inappropriate” because it would compromise the finality of the “full decision on the merits.”[[67]](#footnote-69) In sum, Central Baptist argues that the Bureau fully considered the facts before it, applied appropriate precedent, and correctly dismissed the Park Modification Application as procedurally and substantively deficient.[[68]](#footnote-70)
14. In its Reply, Park reiterates previous arguments, namely, that: (1) the Bureau misapplied existing rules and precedent when it dismissed the Park Modification Application (specifically contending that *Harrisonburg* is not applicable here but that *Wimberley* is); (2) involuntarily short-spaced LPFM stations should be afforded flexibility to change channels; and (3) there is Bureau-level precedent[[69]](#footnote-71) for allowing a *nunc pro tunc* amendment after a waiver request.[[70]](#footnote-72) Park also debates some factual points relating to its Section 312(g) claim, which we do not address further given that we uphold the staff’s procedural and administrative reasons for not instigating a factual investigation into Park’s Section 312(g) claim.

# DISCUSSION

1. We grant the Application for Review, rescind the grant of the Central Baptist Modification Application, and leave the Park Modification Application in dismissed status but permit 30 days to allow Park to file a curative amendment and request for reinstatement *nunc pro tunc*. An application for review of a final action taken on delegated authority will be granted when, *inter alia*, such action: conflicts with statute, regulation, precedent or established Commission policy; involves application of a precedent or policy that should be overturned; or makes an erroneous finding as to an important or material factual question.[[71]](#footnote-73) In this case, we find that the dismissal of the Park Modification Application conflicted with established Commission policy regarding the processing of defective minor modification applications.
2. *Protection of KQEP-LP.*  Section 73.870(e) references the first-come, first-served processing procedures, which our implementing order made clear applies to the low power radio service.[[72]](#footnote-74) Accordingly, consistent with the text of our rule and implementing order, we apply the Commission’s longstanding first-come, first-served processing procedures to minor modifications in the LPFM service.[[73]](#footnote-75) Under these procedures, the filing of the first modification application “cuts off” the filing rights of subsequent conflicting applications. At issue here is whether an LPFM modification application that contains a short-spacing defect when originally filed obtains cut-off priority over a later-filed FM translator application. For the reasons set out below, we hold that it does. As a threshold matter, we find that both the Park and Central Baptist Modification Applications were initially defective because neither protected KQEP-LP at the time of filing. When a conflicting application relies on the expiration of an existing station license, it must protect that station’s licensed facilities until the Bureau has issued a letter, public notice, or both, affirmatively stating that the license has been cancelled and such order has become final.[[74]](#footnote-76) Here, the Bureau issued a public notice on April 7, 2021, announcing that the KQEP-LP license had been cancelled and its call sign deleted (*Cancellation Notice*).[[75]](#footnote-77) The licensee did not seek reconsideration of or otherwise challenge the *Cancellation Notice* within 30 days after publication. Therefore, the *Cancellation Notice* became final after May 17, 2021, 40 days after publication.[[76]](#footnote-78)For the reasons set out in the *Reconsideration Letter*, we reject Park’s contention that the KQEP-LP license had already expired under Section 312(g), namely: (1) Park did not raise the Section 312(g) issue “with sufficient clarity” prior to the *Staff Letter*; (2) the Section 312(g) issue was untimely raised on reconsideration; and (3) the issuance of an LOI would not have been an efficient use of administrative resources, given the imminent license expiration.[[77]](#footnote-79)
3. Moreover, we find that the *Harrisonburg* policy is not applicable here. The one-day filing “window” for allowing mutually exclusive applications applies only to the expiration of construction permits, not licenses.[[78]](#footnote-80) These two situations are not analogous because license expirations do not implicate the policy concern in *Harrisonburg* that a permittee might attempt to warehouse unused spectrum by immediately filing a replacement construction permit application prior to permit expiration, thus precluding potentially competing applications while not using the spectrum itself. Licensed spectrum, on the other hand, is generally being put to active use serving the public and is thus statutorily protected from competing applications.[[79]](#footnote-81) In sum, we conclude that the KQEP-LP license was entitled to protection through and including May 17, 2021, after which the *Cancellation Notice* became final because the licensee did not seek reconsideration or otherwise challenge the cancellation. Both the Park and Central Baptist Modification Applications, filed on March 31 and April 1, 2021, respectively, were short-spaced to KQEP-LP at the time of filing and therefore technically deficient.
4. For FM services at issue here, a deficient application is subject to dismissal.[[80]](#footnote-82) A dismissed application may be reinstated *nunc pro tunc*—that is, as of its original filing date—if the applicant files a minor curative amendment within 30 days of the dismissal.[[81]](#footnote-83)Reinstatement *nunc pro tunc* subjects conflicting applications to the original filing (cut-off) date of the reinstated application.[[82]](#footnote-84) In both the NCE and commercial services, the Commission will not dismiss an application for a defect present at the time of filing if the defect is eliminated prior to staff action on the application—whether through an amendment to the application, a change in applicable law, or a change in circumstances.[[83]](#footnote-85) Not all initial defects are curable—the Commission has identified certain “fatal” defects that may not be subsequently cured, such as failure of an NCE applicant to obtain reasonable assurance of site availability.[[84]](#footnote-86) Here, by the time the staff processed the Park Modification Application on July 5, 2022, the cancellation of the KQEP-LP license was long final, so the short-spacing with respect to KQEP-LP was eliminated prior to staff action on the Applications. Therefore, the Park Modification Application was dismissed in error on this basis. Moreover, even if erroneously dismissed, Park was entitled to consideration *nunc pro tunc*, which was prevented by the newly-implemented LMS licensing database which at the time did not accept petitions for reconsideration or accompanying amendments to dismissed applications.
5. The Commission’s policy on defective applications represents a carefully considered balance between avoiding the harshness of strict review[[85]](#footnote-87) while retaining a sufficiently rigorous review process to encourage complete applications and weed out speculative filings.[[86]](#footnote-88) When the Commission modified its processing procedures in 1992 to eliminate the previous “hard look” processing standard and allow applicants limited opportunities to amend defective applications, it acknowledged that a consequence of the new procedure would be that“a previously filed defective modification application could, by corrective amendment, prevail over a later filed non-defective applications.”[[87]](#footnote-89) In general, the current approach to processing modification applications, as refined in *Semora*, has worked smoothly and well for many decades.[[88]](#footnote-90)
6. *Protection of K250BY.* For the reasons stated in the *Reconsideration Decision*, we affirm the Bureau’s determination that, absent grant of a waiver, an LPFM licensee may not change its channel to a first-adjacent channel while retaining its grandfathered short-spacing, even if it otherwise satisfies the requirements of section 73.807(d).[[89]](#footnote-91) We agree that this closer spectrum relationship is more likely to create listener interference, a fundamental licensing concern in the LPFM and other services.[[90]](#footnote-92) For the same reason, we conclude that waiver of the first-adjacent spacing requirements would be inappropriate based on the circumstances presented in this case.[[91]](#footnote-93) Deviation from the rule here is not in the public interest because a closer channel relationship is more likely to create listener interference even if the short-spaced distance does not change. Moreover, Park has not shown special circumstances that would justify waiver of the LPFM spacing requirements. In fact, Park argues that LPFM stations generally could benefit from allowing such channel changes.[[92]](#footnote-94) Therefore, we reject the argument that section 73.807(d) permits an LPFM station to retain grandfathered short-spacing when switching to a closer channel absent grant of a waiver. And, for the reasons set forth above, we deny the request for a waiver of the minimum distance separation requirements.
7. With respect to the Bureau’s grant of the Wimberley application, this staff action is not binding on the Commission.[[93]](#footnote-95) In addition, as a mere grant of an application without an accompanying explanation of the basis for the decision, the mere grant of the Wimberley application has no precedential value.[[94]](#footnote-96) On alternative and independent grounds, we agree with the Bureau that Park was not similarly situated to Wimberley with respect to section 73.807(d) because “[Wimberley] moved from a co-channel relationship . . . to a first-adjacent channel relationship (a better channel relationship, in terms of interference) . . . [Park], on the other hand, proposes to move KPPS-LP from a second-adjacent channel short-spacing (on channel 248, 97.5 MHZ, a better channel relationship in terms of potential interference between two nearby stations) to a first-adjacent channel short-spacing (on channel 249, 97.7, a worse channel relationship in terms of interference.).”[[95]](#footnote-97) The Bureau clearly explained the factual distinction between the two applications and articulated the underlying policy concern of increased likelihood of interference.[[96]](#footnote-98) We reject, on the basis that it would substantially undermine the minimum distance separation rule for LPFM stations, Park’s argument that a contour overlap showing is sufficient to demonstrate that interference is unlikely. When it created the LPFM service, the Commission considered and determined that the minimum distance separation methodology is the best means to prevent interference in the LPFM service.[[97]](#footnote-99) Allowing contour overlap showings as an alternative, in the absence of a waiver, would create a considerable and systematic exception to the LPFM spacing rules. For these reasons, we uphold the Bureau’s conclusions that the rules do not provide for an LPFM station to move to a new, closer channel while preserving its grandfathered short-spacing status absent grant of a waiver and that Park has not justified a waiver here.
8. However, as noted above, Park was entitled to consideration under our *nunc pro tunc* policy, which allows curative amendments within 30 days of the dismissal of a defective application.[[98]](#footnote-100) We reject Central Baptist’s argument that a *nunc pro tunc* amendment would compromise the finality of the staff’s decision because the decision granting Central Baptist’s application never became final due to the filing of the Petition for Reconsideration and Application for Review.[[99]](#footnote-101) Because Park attempted to amend to cure the K250BY short-spacing but was prevented from doing so by technical issues with the Commission’s filing system, we direct the Bureau to allow Park to file a single amendment to the Park Modification Application within 30 days of the issuance of this order. If, upon staff review, the Park Modification Application is rule-compliant and reinstated *nunc pro tunc*, it will be processed as though it were filed without defect on its original filing date of March 31, 2021. Grant of the Central Baptist Modification Application will be rescinded and returned to “pending” status, so that the two applications are restored to the “first-come, first-served” processing queue.[[100]](#footnote-102)
9. We note that applicants choosing to file in anticipation of a future action do so at their own risk. If the future action does not come to pass (due to, for example, a late-filed application to re- instate a license), or if staff reviews the prematurely filed application prior to the future action, then the applicant will be dismissed and, if not able to cure the defect *nunc pro tunc*, will lose their first-in-time filing priority and have to file a new application. For these reasons, we encourage applicants to carefully evaluate such risks prior to submitting applications that are defective at the time of filing.
10. *Conclusion.* For the foregoing reasons, we find that the Bureau, in the *Reconsideration Letter*,did not correctly apply established Commission policy regarding the filing of defective minor modification applications. Therefore, we grant the Application for Review, rescind the grant of the Central Baptist Modification Application, and leave the Park Modification Application in dismissed status but permit 30 days to allow Park to file a petition for reconsideration accompanied by an appropriate curative amendment.[[101]](#footnote-103)

# ORDERING CLAUSES

1. IT IS ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 5(c)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended,[[102]](#footnote-104) and Section 1.115(g) of the Commission’s Rules,[[103]](#footnote-105) the Application for Review filed by Park Public Radio, Inc. on March 10, 2023 (Pleading File No. 212376) IS GRANTED.
2. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 5(c)(6) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and Section 1.115(h)(1)(iii) of the Commission’s Rules, the application for a minor change to LPFM station KPPS-LP, St. Louis Park, Minnesota, filed by Park Public Radio, Inc. on March 31, 2021 (Application File No. 142335), may be amended in accordance with the Commission’s *nunc pro tunc* policy until September 5, 2024, at which time it will be assessed for compliance with the Commission’s rules and disposed of accordingly.
3. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to Section 5(c)(6) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended,[[104]](#footnote-106) and Section 1.115(h)(1)(i) of the Commission’s Rules,[[105]](#footnote-107) the grant of the application for a minor change to FM translator station K250BY, Plymouth, Minnesota, filed by Central Baptist Theological Seminary of Minneapolis on April 1, 2021, (Application File No. 142489) IS RESCINDED and the application RETURNED TO PENDING STATUS.
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