ORIGINAL

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In re Applications of	)	MM DOCKET NO. 93-126
EDUCATIONAL MEDIA FOUNDATION OF BRYAN/COLLEGE STATION (Channel 210A) Bryan, Texas	)	File No. BPED-910924MC
BRAZOS EDUCATIONAL RADIO Channel 209 College Station, Texas	)	File No. BPED-920413MF
For Construction Permit for a New Noncommercial Educational FM Station	)	

RECEIVED
JUN 16 1993
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

TO: The Honorable John M. Frysiak
Administrative Law Judge

PETITION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND, GRANT OF APPLICATIONS AND TERMINATION OF PROCEEDING

1. For the reasons stated below, Brazos Educational Radio ("Brazos") hereby requests leave to amend its application as set forth herein and in the accompanying materials. Further, since (also as explained below) amendment of Brazos' application as set forth herein will eliminate any mutual exclusivity between Brazos' application and that of Educational Media Foundation of Bryan/College Station ("EdMed"), acceptance of this amendment will permit the immediate grant of both the Brazos and the EdMed applications without further proceedings.

2. As indicated in the "Joint Motion for Suspension of Procedural Dates" submitted by Brazos and EdMed on May 21, 1993, Brazos' engineer had determined that, by amending one or both of the above-captioned applications, it might be possible to eliminate their mutual exclusivity and thus permit a grant of

both without the need for any hearing. Accordingly, representatives of Brazos and EdMed entered into discussions intended to lead to just such a result. [1/] Those discussions involved principals, engineering personnel/consultants and counsel for the two applicants. In the course of those discussions, both applicants agreed tentatively to amend their respective applications, Brazos to specify a different channel (Channel 210), while EdMed would amend its channel (to Channel 206) and would relocate its transmitter to the site specified in Brazos' application.

3. In order to implement this joint approach, the parties recognized that the consent would have to be secured from the owner of the tower to which EdMed would propose to move. Since Brazos already had reasonable assurance of the availability of that tower for <u>its</u> application, a representative of Brazos agreed to contact (and did in fact contact) the tower owner to determine its willingness to add the EdMed antenna to the tower.

4. Unfortunately, after several conversations between representatives of the tower owner and Brazos (and between Brazos' consulting engineer and representatives of at least one of the tower's existing tenants), Brazos determined that the tower owner was apparently not willing to permit EdMed to propose the use of the tower for its application.

5. Even more unfortunately, as Brazos pressed the issue

[1/] Factual representations in this pleading are supported by the Declaration of Eric Truax, a Director of Brazos, which is submitted herewith.

somewhat with the tower owner (with particular reference to the possible use of a common antenna, which would theoretically not be significantly more burdensome than the single antenna already being proposed by Brazos), Brazos also determined that Brazos might encounter serious resistance from the owner if Brazos' application as originally filed were to be granted. That is, the tower owner consistently acknowledged that it had given Brazos reasonable assurance of the availability of the tower for specification in Brazos' application. However, the tower owner also indicated that it would prefer not to add any more antennas

completed in less than three weeks, and the result is this amendment. [2/]

7. The instant Petition proposes a change in transmitter

8. Good cause exists for acceptance of this amendment. While Brazos continues to have reasonable assurance of the availability of its originally-proposed transmitter site, it was only in the course of its efforts to settle this proceeding during the last four-six weeks that Brazos determined that, as a practical matter, Brazos' ultimate ability to utilize its originally-proposed tower might be problematic. Accordingly, Brazos promptly undertook to identify an alternate site which would not present the same problems. It was able to find such a site, obtain reasonable assurance of its availability, and prepare the necessary application in less than 30 days. Accordingly, Brazos has acted with appropriate diligence.

9. Acceptance of the amendment would not prejudice any party hereto, nor would it require the addition of parties or issues or result in any delay. To the contrary, acceptance of this amendment would be to the benefit of <u>everyone</u>: obviously, Brazos and EdMed would both benefit from prompt grant of their applications, the Commission would benefit from conservation of its resources (including the time and effort of the Presiding Judge and Bureau counsel), and the public would benefit from expedited initiation of not one, but two new noncommercial radio services in the Bryan/College Station area. It is therefore clear that good cause exists for the proposed amendment.

10. As discussed above, acceptance of this amendment will

[3/] (...continued)
review and comment on Brazos' proposed amendment in connection with the instant petition.

eliminate any mutual exclusivity between the Brazos and EdMed applications. As a result, both applications may then be granted without the need for any comparative hearing. In the interest of reaching such a salutary conclusion at the earliest possible date, Brazos hereby requests that, upon acceptance of Brazos' amendment, both Brazos' amended application and the EdMed application be granted and this proceeding be terminated. [4/]

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated, Brazos Educational Radio requests that its application be amended as set forth in the accompanying materials, that that application, as amended, be granted, that the competing application of Educational Media Foundation of Bryan/College Station also be granted, and that this proceeding be terminated.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Harry F. Cole
Harry F. Cole

Bechtel & Cole, Chartered
1901 L Street, N.W. - Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-4190

Counsel for Brazos Educational Radio

July 16, 1993

[4/] Brazos wishes to note that it does not wish to amend its application if doing so would subject it to the possibility of additional competing applications. The purpose of the instant amendment is to make possible the grant of both the Brazos and the EdMed applications. Again, Brazos understands that this approach is not inconsistent with the Commission's rules or policies, and it further informally understands that the Bureau is not opposed in principle to such an approach. However, if Brazos' understandings in these regards prove erroneous, and if acceptance of the instant amendment would expose Brazos to the possibility of additional competing applications, Brazos will withdraw this amendment and continue to prosecute its application for Channel 209.

AMENDMENT

Brazos Educational Radio ("Brazos") hereby amends its application (File No. File No. BPED-920413MF) for a construction permit for a new noncommercial educational FM station in College Station, Texas as set forth in the accompanying materials, which are to be substituted for the corresponding portions of Brazos' application as originally filed. The amendment reflects changes in Brazos' proposed channel and technical facilities (including its transmitter site). Included as part of the amendment is a certification of reasonable assurance of the availability of the new site.

Good cause exists for acceptance of this amendment. As the Presiding Judge has previously been advised, Brazos and Educational Media Foundation of Bryan/College Station ("EdMed"), the other competing applicant in MM Docket No. 93-126, had tentatively agreed to resolve this proceeding through a mutually agreeable settlement. Originally, it was contemplated that both applicants would seek amendment of certain aspects of their technical proposals in order to eliminate their mutual exclusivity.

To that end, representatives of Brazos and EdMed discussed possible approaches for the resolution of their situation. Initially, both Brazos and EdMed were agreeable to an arrangement pursuant to which Brazos would amend to specify Channel 210 while EdMed amended to specify Channel 206, with EdMed relocating its antenna to co-locate with Brazos' antenna at the

site specified in Brazos' application as originally filed. The parties were both also generally agreeable to the possibility of operating with a common antenna from that common site, although no formal agreement had been reached on how that might be implemented.

Since the proposed solution entailed use of the transmitter site for the availability of which Brazos already had reasonable assurance, Brazos agreed to approach the tower owner to determine whether the parties' proposal to colocate would be acceptable to the tower owner. Unfortunately, after several

practical considerations might preclude Brazos' actual installation of its antenna there even if such installation were to be approved by the Commission.

All of the foregoing discussions between Brazos and EdMed, and then between Brazos and the tower owner, took approximately a month to complete. At that time, Brazos determined that, in the interest of bringing this matter to the quickest possible conclusion, Brazos should (a) locate an alternate transmitter site which would not entail the possibility of the practical (albeit unanticipated) problems which Brazos had just discovered in its original site, and (b) amend its application unilaterally in a way which would eliminate the mutual exclusivity. Brazos promptly began its search for alternate tower space, identified an acceptable alternative site, obtained reasonable assurance from the tower owner, and instructed Brazos' consulting engineer to prepare an appropriate amendment. That process, which was begun in mid-June, was completed in less than three weeks, and the result is this amendment.

Acceptance of this amendment will permit the prompt resolution of the Brazos/EdMed proceeding with a grant of both applications. It will therefore permit the conservation of the resources of both the Commission and the applicants, and it will lead to expedited initiation of not one, but two new noncommercial educational radio services in the College Station area.

CERTIFICATION OF SITE AVAILABILITY

The applicant hereby certifies that it has reasonable assurance, in good faith, that the site or proposed structure proposed in Section V of its application, as amended, as the location of it transmitting antenna will be available to the applicant for the applicant's intended purpose.

This reasonable assurance is not based on the applicant's ownership of the proposed site or structure. The applicant hereby certifies that it has obtained such reasonable assurance by contacting the owner, the owner's agent, or a person possessing control of the site or structure.

Name of person contacted: KEN DOBBS

Telephone number: (409) 775-4800

Owner Owner's Agent Other (specify)

By: (ERIC W. TRUAX)

Title: BOARD MEMBER, BRAZOS EDUCATIONAL RADIO

Date: 14 JULY, 1993

AMENDMENT

Brazos Educational Radio ("Brazos") hereby amends its application (File No. File No. BPED-920413MF) for a construction permit for a new noncommercial educational FM station in College Station, Texas as set forth in the accompanying materials, which are to be substituted for the corresponding portions of Brazos' application as originally filed. The amendment reflects changes in Brazos' proposed channel and technical facilities (including its transmitter site). Included as part of the amendment is a certification of reasonable assurance of the availability of the new site.

Good cause exists for acceptance of this amendment. As the Presiding Judge has previously been advised, Brazos and Educational Media Foundation of Bryan/College Station ("EdMed"), the other competing applicant in MM Docket No. 93-126, had tentatively agreed to resolve this proceeding through a mutually agreeable settlement. Originally, it was contemplated that both applicants would seek amendment of certain aspects of their technical proposals in order to eliminate their mutual exclusivity.

To that end, representatives of Brazos and EdMed discussed possible approaches for the resolution of their situation. Initially, both Brazos and EdMed were agreeable to an arrangement pursuant to which Brazos would amend to specify Channel 210 while EdMed amended to specify Channel 206, with EdMed relocating its antenna to co-locate with Brazos' antenna at the

site specified in Brazos' application as originally filed. The parties were both also generally agreeable to the possibility of operating with a common antenna from that common site, although no formal agreement had been reached on how that might be implemented.

Since the proposed solution entailed use of the transmitter site for the availability of which Brazos already had reasonable assurance, Brazos agreed to approach the tower owner to determine whether the parties' proposal to colocate would be acceptable to the tower owner. Unfortunately, after several conversations between representatives of the tower owner and Brazos (and between Brazos' consulting engineer and representatives of at least one of the tower's existing tenants), Brazos determined that the tower owner was apparently not willing to permit EdMed to propose the use of the tower for its application.

Even more unfortunately, as Brazos pressed the issue somewhat with the tower owner (with particular reference to the possible use of a common antenna, which would theoretically not be significantly more burdensome than the single antenna already being proposed by Brazos), Brazos also determined that Brazos might encounter serious resistance from the owner if Brazos' application as originally filed were to be granted. That is, the tower owner consistently acknowledged that it had given Brazos reasonable assurance of the availability of the tower for specification in Brazos' application. However, the tower owner also indicated that it would prefer not to add any more antennas to its tower, and that

practical considerations might preclude Brazos' actual installation of its antenna there even if such installation were to be approved by the Commission.

All of the foregoing discussions between Brazos and EdMed, and then between Brazos and the tower owner, took approximately a month to complete. At that time, Brazos determined that, in the interest of bringing this matter to the quickest possible conclusion, Brazos should (a) locate an alternate transmitter site which would not entail the possibility of the practical (albeit unanticipated) problems which Brazos had just discovered in its original site, and (b) amend its application unilaterally in a way which would eliminate the mutual exclusivity. Brazos promptly began its search for alternate tower space, identified an acceptable alternative site, obtained reasonable assurance from the tower owner, and instructed Brazos' consulting engineer to prepare an appropriate amendment. That process, which was begun in mid-June, was completed in less than three weeks, and the result is this amendment.

Acceptance of this amendment will permit the prompt resolution of the Brazos/EdMed proceeding with a grant of both applications. It will therefore permit the conservation of the resources of both the Commission and the applicants, and it will lead to expedited initiation of not one, but two new noncommercial educational radio services in the College Station area.

In light of all of the above, good cause exists for acceptance of the instant amendment.

BRAZOS EDUCATIONAL RADIO

By: E. W. T (ERIC W. TRUAX)

Its BOARD MEMBER

Date: 14 JULY, 1993

CERTIFICATION OF SITE AVAILABILITY

EXHIBIT E

Engineering Statement
on behalf of
Brazos Educational Radio
New Educational FM Station
Ch. 206-A 89.1 mhz. 0.100 kW 77.4 Meters
College Station, Texas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FCC Form 340 SECTION VB

EXHIBIT E

Engineering Statement
on behalf of
Brazos Educational Radio
New Educational FM Station
Ch. 206-A 89.1 mhz. 0.100 kW 77.4 Meters
College Station, Texas

FIGURES INDEX

Section V-B - FM BROADCAST ENGINEERING DATA	FOR COMMISSION USE ONLY File No. _____ ASB Referral Date _____ Referred by _____

Name of Applicant

Brazos Educational Radio

Call letters *(if issued)*	Is this application being filed in response to a window? ☐ Yes ☒ No
N/A	If Yes, specify closing date: _____

Purpose of Application: *(check appropriate box(es))*

*Modify Application for new Facility

- ☐ Construct a new (main) facility
- ☐ Construct a new auxiliary facility
- ☐ Modify existing construction permit for main facility
- ☐ Modify existing construction permit for auxiliary facility
- ☐ Modify licensed main facility
- ☐ Modify licensed auxiliary facility

If purpose is to modify, indicate below the nature of change(s) and specify the file number(s) of the authorizations affected.

- ☒ Antenna supporting-structure height
- ☒ Effective radiated power
- ☒ Antenna height above average terrain
- ☒ Frequency
- ☒ Antenna location
- ☐ Class
- ☐ Main Studio location
- ☐ Other *(Summarize briefly)*

File Number(s) BPED-920413MF

1. Allocation:

Channel No.	Principal community to be served: City	County	State
206	College Station	Brazos	TX

Class *(check only one box below)*

☒ A ☐ B1 ☐ B ☐ C3
☐ C2 ☐ C1 ☐ C ☐ D

2. Exact location of antenna.

(a) Specify address, city, county and state. If no address, specify distance and bearing relative to the nearest town or landmark.

3100 Leonard Road, Bryan, Brazos County, Texas

(b) Geographical coordinates (to nearest second). If mounted on element of an AM array, specify coordinates of center of array. Otherwise, specify tower location. Specify South Latitude or East Longitude where applicable; otherwise, North Latitude or West Longitude will be presumed.

Latitude	30 °	38 '	48 "	Longitude	96 °	23 '	14 "

3. Is the supporting structure the same as that of another station(s) or proposed in another pending application(s)? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, give call letter(s) or file number(s) or both.

KNES565 - KOR890
WHE470 - WNYU344

If proposal involves a change in height of an existing structure, specify existing height above ground level including antenna, all other appurtenances, and lighting, if any.

No Changes are Proposed

SECTION V-B – FM BROADCAST ENGINEERING DATA (Page 2)

4. Does the application propose to correct previous site coordinates? ☐ Yes ☒ No
   If Yes, list old coordinates.

Latitude ° ' "	Longitude ° ' "

5. Has the FAA been notified of the proposed construction? ☐ Yes ☒ No
   If Yes, give date and office where notice was filed and attach as an Exhibit a copy of FAA determination, if available. Exhibit No.

   Date _____ Office where filed _____

6. List all landing areas within 8 km of antenna site. Specify distance and bearing from structure to nearest point of the nearest runway.

	Landing Area	Distance (km)	Bearing (degrees True)
(a)	Easterwood	6.4 km	162 Degrees
(b)			

7. (a) Elevation: *(to the nearest meter)*

   (1) of site above mean sea level; 103 meters

   (2) of the top of supporting structure above ground (including antenna, all other appurtenances, and lighting, if any); and 74.6 meters

   (3) of the top of supporting structure above mean sea level [(aX1) + (aX2)] 177.6 meters

   (b) Height of radiation center: *(to the nearest meter)* H = Horizontal; V = Vertical

   (1) above ground 61 meters (H)
   61 meters (V)

   (2) above mean sea level [(aX1) + (bX1)] 164 meters (H)
   164 meters (V)

   (3) above average terrain 77.4 meters (H)
   77.4 meters (V)

8. Attach as an Exhibit sketch(es) of the supporting structure, labelling all elevations required in Question 7 above, except item 7(bX3). If mounted on an AM directional-array element, specify heights and orientations of all array towers, as well as location of FM radiator. Exhibit No. 3A

9. Effective Radiated Power:
   (a) ERP in the horizontal plane -0- kw (H*) 0.100 kw (V*)

   (b) Is beam tilt proposed? ☐ Yes ☒ No

   If Yes, specify maximum ERP in the plane of the tilted beam, and attach as an Exhibit a vertical elevational plot of radiated field. N/A _____ kw (H*) _____ kw (V*) Exhibit No.

   *Polarization

10. Is a directional antenna proposed? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, attach as an Exhibit a statement with all data specified in 47 C.F.R. Section 73.316, including plot(s) and tabulations of horizontally and vertically polarized radiated components in terms of relative field. Exhibit No.

11. Will the main studio be located within the 70 dBu or 3.16 mV/m contour? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If No, attach as an Exhibit justification pursuant to 47 C.F.R. Section 73.1125. Exhibit No.

Studio to be located within the City of License pursuant to 73.1125(a)(3) of FCC Rules

12. Are there: (a) within 60 meters of the proposed antenna, any proposed or authorized FM or TV transmitters, or any nonbroadcast *(except citizens band or amateur)* radio stations; or (b) within the blanketing contour, any established commercial or government receiving stations, cable head-end facilities, or populated areas; or (c) within ten (10) kilometers of the proposed antenna, any proposed or authorized FM or TV transmitters which may produce receiver-induced intermodulation interference? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, attach as an Exhibit a description of any expected, undesired effects of operations and remedial steps to be pursued if necessary, and a statement accepting full responsibility for the elimination of any objectionable interference (including that caused by receiver-induced or other types of modulation) to facilities in existence or authorized or to radio receivers in use prior to grant of this application. *(See 47 C.F.R. Sections 73.315(b), 73.316(d) and 73.318.)* See Exhibit E - Engineering Statement Exhibit No.

13. Attach as an Exhibit a 7.5 minute series U.S. Geological Survey topographic quadrangle map that shows clearly, legibly, and accurately, the location of the proposed transmitting antenna. This map must comply with the requirements set forth in Instruction D for Section V. Further, the map must clearly and legibly display the original printed contour lines and data as well as latitude and longitude markings, and must bear a scale of distance in kilometers. Exhibit No. Figure1

14. Attach as an Exhibit *(name the source)* a map which shows clearly, legibly, and accurately, and with the original printed latitude and longitude markings and a scale of distance in kilometers: Exhibit No. Figure4

(a) the proposed transmitter location, and the radials along with profile graphs have been prepared;

(b) the 1 mV/m predicted contour and, for noncommercial educational applicants applying on a commercial channel, the 3.16 mV/m contour; and

(c) the legal boundaries of the principal community to be served.

15. Specify area in square kilometers (1 sq. mi. = 2.59 sq. km.) and population (latest census) within the predicted 1 mV/m contour.

Area 258 sq. km. Population 37,246

16. Attach as an Exhibit a map *(Sectional Aeronautical charts where obtainable)* showing the present and proposed 1 mV/m (60 dbu) contours. Exhibit No. Figure4

Enter the following from Exhibit above: Gain Area 258 sq. ~~mi.~~ km
Loss Area -0- sq. mi.

Percent change (gain area plus loss area as percentage of present area) 100 %.
If 50% or more this constitutes a major change. Indicate in question 2(c), Section I, accordingly.

17. For an application involving an auxiliary facility only, attach as an Exhibit a map *(Sectional Aeronautical Chart or equivalent)* that shows clearly, legibly, and accurately, and with latitude and longitude markings and a scale of distance in kilometers: N/A

Exhibit No.

(a) the proposed auxiliary 1 mV/m contour; and

(b) the 1 mV/m contour of the licensed main facility for which the applied-for facility will be auxiliary. Also specify the file number of the license. See 47 C.F.R. Section 73.1675. (File No.:_____)

18. Terrain and coverage data *(to be calculated in accordance with 47 C.F.R. Section 73.313).*

Source of terrain data: *(check only one box below)*

[XX] Linearly interpolated 30-second database [ ] 7.5 minute topographic map

(Source: N.G.D.C.)

[ ] Other *(briefly summarize)*

Radial bearing (degrees True)	Height of radiation center above average elevation of radial from 3 to 16 km (meters)	Predicted Distances to the 1 mV/m contour (kilometers)
0	62.2	8.1
45	68.2	8.5
90	76.2	9.0
135	67.9	8.5
180	85.3	9.5
225	93.8	10.0
270	90.9	9.9
315	74.8	8.9

Allocation Studies

(See Subpart C of 47 C.F.R. Part 73)

19. Is the proposed antenna location within 320 kilometers (199 miles) of the common border between the United States and Mexico? [ ] Yes [X] No

If Yes, attach as an Exhibit a showing of compliance with all provisions of the Agreement between the United States of America and the United Mexican States concerning Frequency Modulation Broadcasting in the 88 to 108 MHz band.

Exhibit No. N/A

20. Is the proposed antenna location within 320 kilometers of the common border between the United States and Canada? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, attach as an Exhibit a showing of compliance with all provisions of the Working Agreement for Allocation of FM Broadcasting Stations on Channels 201-300 under The Canada-United States FM Agreement of 1947. Exhibit No. N/A

21. If the proposed operation is for a channel in the range from channel 201 through 220 (88.1 through 91.9 MHz), or if this proposed operation is for a class D station in the range from Channel 221 through 300 (92.1 through 107.9 MHz), attach as an Exhibit a complete allocation study to establish the lack of prohibited overlap of contours with other U.S. stations. The allocation study should include the following: Exhibit No. SEE EXHIBIT E FIGURE 3

(a) The normally protected interference-free and the interfering contours for the proposed operation along all azimuths.
(b) Complete normally protected interference-free contours of all other proposals and existing stations to which objectionable interference would be caused.
(c) Interfering contours over pertinent arcs of all other proposals and existing stations from which objectionable interference would be received.
(d) Normally protected and interfering contours over pertinent arcs, of all other proposals and existing stations, which require study to show the absence of objectionable interference.
(e) Plot of the transmitter location of each station or proposal requiring investigation, with identifying call letters, file numbers and operating or proposed facilities.
(f) When necessary to show more detail, an additional allocation study will be attached utilizing a map with a larger scale to clearly show interference or absence thereof.
(g) A scale of kilometers and properly labeled longitude and latitude lines, shown across the entire Exhibit(s). Sufficient lines should be shown so that the location of the sites may be verified.
(h) The name of the map(s) used in the Exhibit(s).

22. With regard to any stations separated by 53 or 54 channels (10.6 or 10.8 MHz) attach as an Exhibit information required in 1/ *(separation requirements involving intermediate frequency (i.f.) interference).* Exhibit No. E,Fig.3

23.(a) Is the proposed operation on Channel 218, 219, or 220? ☐ Yes ☒ No

(b) If the answer to (a) is yes, does the proposed operation satisfy the requirements of 47 C.F.R. Section 73.207? ☐ Yes ☐ No

(c) If the answer to (b) is yes, attach as an Exhibit information required in 1/ regarding separation requirements with respect to stations on Channels 221, 222 and 223. Exhibit No. N/A

(d) If the answer to (b) is no, attach as an Exhibit a statement describing the short spacing(s) and how it or they arose. Exhibit No. N/A

1/ A showing that the proposed operation meets the minimum distance separation requirements. Include existing stations, proposed stations, and cities which appear in the Table of Allotments; the location and geographic coordinates of each antenna, proposed antenna or reference point, as appropriate; and distance to each from proposed antenna location.

SECTION V-B – FM BROADCAST ENGINEERING DATA (Page 8)

(e) If authorization pursuant to 47 C.F.R. Section 73.215 is requested, attach as an Exhibit a complete engineering study to establish the lack of prohibited overlap of contours involving affected stations. The engineering study must include the following:

Exhibit No. N/A

(1) Protected and interfering contours, in all directions (360), for the proposed operation.
(2) Protected and interfering contours, over pertinent arcs, of all short-spaced assignments, applications and allotments, including a plot showing each transmitter location, with identifying call letters or file numbers, and indication of whether facility is operating or proposed. For vacant allotments, use the reference coordinates as transmitter location.
(3) When necessary to show more detail, an additional allocation study utilizing a map with a larger scale to clearly show prohibited overlap will not occur.
(4) A scale of kilometers and properly labeled longitude and latitude lines, shown across the entire exhibit(s). Sufficient lines should be shown so that the location of the sites may be verified.
(5) The official title(s) of the map(s) used in the exhibits(s).

24. Is the proposed station for a channel in the range from Channel 201 to 220 (88.1 through 91.9 MHz) and the proposed antenna location within the distance to an affected TV Channel 6 station(s) as defined in 47 C.F.R. Section 73.525? [XX] Yes [ ] No

If Yes, attach as an Exhibit either a TV Channel 6 agreement letter dated and signed by both parties or a map and an engineering statement with calculations demonstrating compliance with 47 C.F.R. Section 73.525 for each affected TV Channel 6 station.

Exhibit No. E,Fig.5,5A

25. Is the proposed station for a channel in the range from Channel 221 to 300 (92.1-107.9 MHz)? [ ] Yes [X] No

If Yes, attach as an Exhibit information required in 1/. *(Except for Class D (secondary) proposals.)*

Exhibit No. N/A

26. Environmental Statement *(See 47 C.F.R. Section 1.1301 et seq.)*

Would a Commission grant of this application come within Section 1.1307 of the FCC Rules, such that it may have a significant environmental impact? [ ] Yes [X] No

If you answer Yes, submit as an Exhibit an Environmental Assessment required by Section 1.1311.

Exhibit No. N/A

If No, explain briefly why not. Proposal is categorically excluded from environmental processing pursuant to Section 1.1306 of FCC Rules

CERTIFICATION

I certify that I have prepared this Section of this application on behalf of the applicant, and that after such preparation, I have examined the foregoing and found it to be accurate and true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Name *(Typed or Printed)* Donald E. Mussell Jr. NCE	Relationship to Applicant *(e.g., Consulting Engineer)* Consulting Engineer
Signature	Address *(Include ZIP Code)* Route 5 Box 307 Staunton, VA 24401
Date July 12, 1993	Telephone No. *(Include Area Code)* (703) 886-5162

ENGINEERING STATEMENT

Introduction

This engineering statement, together with Section V-B of FCC Form 340 to which it is attached as Exhibit E, furnishes technical data in support of an amendment to a pending application by Brazos Educational Radio for a new Educational FM broadcast facility licensed to College Station, Texas (BPED-920413MF). This amendment proposes to change tower location, power and operating frequency of the pending application of Brazos Educational Radio. This amendment will cure the conflict between the existing application of the applicant for Channel 209A and the application of Educational Media Foundation of Bryan/College Station, Texas for Channel 210A (BPED-910924MC).

All calculations, contours and other technical information contained in or attached to this statement have been determined in accordance with the existing rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC Rules).

Allocation Study

Figures 2 and 3 of this exhibit present the results of a detailed channel allocation and interference study. As shown in the above referenced figures, the use of channel 206 with the facilities proposed by this application meets all separation requirements with respect to all known existing and proposed stations.

As illustrated in Figure 3, the proposed location meets the commission's minimum distance requirements for stations 53 or 54 channels removed. The proposed facilities will not cause interference to, nor receive interference from any other known existing or proposed facility.