

Federal Communications Commission

§ 101.51

§1.929 of this chapter), except under any of the following circumstances:

(1) The application has been designated for comparative hearing, or for comparative evaluation (pursuant to §101.51 of this part), and the Commission or the presiding officer accepts the amendment pursuant to §1.927 of this chapter;

(2) The amendment resolves frequency conflicts with authorized stations or other pending applications which would otherwise require resolution by hearing or by comparative evaluation pursuant to §101.51 provided that the amendment does not create new or additional frequency conflicts;

(3) The amendment reflects only a change in ownership or control found by the Commission to be in the public interest, and for which a requested exemption from the “cut-off” requirements of this section is granted;

(4) The amendment reflects only a change in ownership or control which results from an agreement under §1.935 of this chapter whereby two or more applicants entitled to comparative consideration of their applications join in one (or more) of the existing applications and request dismissal of their other application (or applications) to avoid the delay and cost of comparative consideration;

(5) The amendment corrects typographical, transcription, or similar clerical errors which are clearly demonstrated to be mistakes by reference to other parts of the application, and whose discovery does not create new or increased frequency conflicts; or

(6) The amendment does not create new or increased frequency conflicts, and is demonstrably necessitated by events which the applicant could not have reasonably foreseen at the time of filing, such as, for example:

(i) The loss of a transmitter or receiver site by condemnation, natural causes, or loss of lease or option;

(ii) Obstruction of a proposed transmission path caused by the erection of a new building or other structure; or

(iii) The discontinuance or substantial technological obsolescence of specified equipment, whenever the application has been pending before the Commission for two or more years from the date of its filing.

(g) Applicants for the 932.5–935/941.5–944 MHz bands shall select a frequency pair. Applicants for these bands may select an unpaired frequency only upon a showing that spectrum efficiency will not be impaired and that unpaired spectrum is not available in other bands. During the initial filing window, frequency coordination is not required, except that an application for a frequency in the 942–944 MHz band must be coordinated to ensure that it does not affect an existing broadcast auxiliary service licensee. After the initial filing window, an applicant must submit evidence that frequency coordination has been performed with all licensees affected by the application. All frequency coordination must be performed in accordance with §101.103. In the event of mutually exclusive applications occurring during the initial filing window for the 932.5–935/941.5–944 MHz bands, applicants shall be given the opportunity to resolve these situations by applying for an alternative frequency pair, if one is available. To the extent that there are no other available frequencies or to the extent that mutually exclusive applications remain after this process is concluded, lotteries shall be conducted for each frequency pair among all remaining mutually exclusive applications, assuming appropriate coordination with existing broadcast auxiliary stations can be concluded, where necessary. In the event of mutually exclusive applications being received for these bands on the same day after the initial filing window has closed and a subsequent filing window opened, lotteries shall be conducted for each frequency pair among all mutually exclusive applications.

[61 FR 26677, May 28, 1996, as amended at 62 FR 23164, Apr. 29, 1997; 62 FR 24582, May 6, 1997; 63 FR 6103, Feb. 6, 1998; 63 FR 68982, Dec. 14, 1998; 65 FR 59357, Oct. 5, 2000]

§ 101.51 Comparative evaluation of mutually exclusive applications.

(a) In order to expedite action on mutually exclusive applications in services under this rules part where neither competitive bidding nor the random selection processes apply, the applicants

§ 101.55

47 CFR Ch. I (10–1–20 Edition)

may request the Commission to consider their applications without a formal hearing in accordance with the summary procedure outlined in paragraph (b) in this section if:

(1) The applications are entitled to comparative consideration pursuant to §101.45;

(2) The applications have not been designated for formal evidentiary hearing; and

(3) The Commission determines, initially or at any time during the procedure outline in paragraph (b) of this section, that such procedure is appropriate, and that, from the information submitted and consideration of such other matters as may be officially noticed, there are no substantial and material questions of fact, presented (Other than those relating to the comparative merits of the applications) which would preclude a grant under §1.915 of this chapter.

(b) Provided that the conditions of paragraph (a) of this section are satisfied, applicants may request the Commission to act upon their mutually exclusive applications without a formal hearing pursuant to the summary procedure outlined below:

(1) To initiate the procedure, each applicant will submit to the Commission a written statement containing:

(i) A waiver of the applicant's right to a formal hearing;

(ii) A request and agreement that, in order to avoid the delay and expense of a comparative formal hearing, the Commission should exercise its judgment to select from among the mutually exclusive applications that proposal (or proposals) which would best serve the public interest; and

(iii) The signature of a principal (and the principal's attorney if represented).

(2) After receipt of the written requests of all of the applicants the Commission (if it deems this procedure appropriate) will issue a notice designating the comparative criteria upon which the applications are to be evaluated and will request each applicant to submit, within a specified period of time, additional information concerning the applicant's proposal relative to the comparative criteria.

(3) Within thirty (30) days following the due date for filing this information,

the Commission will accept concise and factual argument on the competing proposals from the rival applicants, potential customers, and other knowledgeable parties in interest.

(4) Within fifteen (15) days following the due date for the filing of comments, the Commission will accept concise and factual replies from the rival applicants.

(5) From time to time during the course of this procedure the Commission may request additional information from the applicants and hold informal conferences at which all competing applicants will have the right to be represented.

(6) Upon evaluation of the applications, the information submitted, and such other matters as may be officially noticed the Commission will issue a decision granting one (or more) of the proposals which it concludes would best serve the public interest, convenience and necessity. The decision will report briefly and concisely the reasons for the Commission's selection and will deny the other application(s). This decision will be considered final.

[61 FR 26677, May 28, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 6104, Feb. 6, 1998; 63 FR 68982, Dec. 14, 1998]

**LICENSE TRANSFERS, MODIFICATIONS,
CONDITIONS AND FORFEITURES**

**§ 101.55 Considerations involving
transfer or assignment applications.**

(a) Except as provided for in paragraph (d) of this section, licenses not authorized pursuant to competitive bidding procedures may not be assigned or transferred prior to the completion of construction of the facility.

(b) [Reserved]

(c) At its discretion, the Commission may require the submission of an affirmative, factual showing (supported by affidavits of a person or persons with personal knowledge thereof) to demonstrate that the proposed assignor or transferor has not acquired an authorization or operated a station for the principal purpose of profitable sale rather than public service. This showing may include, for example, a demonstration that the proposed assignment or transfer is due to changed