

FCC Received August 27, 1993 @ 4:15 p.m.  
Donna A. Bradshaw

ORIGINAL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

MM DOCKET NO. 93-89

AURIO A. MATOS

LLOYD SANTIAGO-SANTOS and  
LOURDES RODRIGUEZ BONET

Culebra, Puerto Rico

RECEIVED  
SEP - 8 1993  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DATE OF SESSION: August 18, 1993

VOLUME: 2

PLACE OF SESSION: Washington, D.C.

PAGES: 8-29

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.  
Court Reporting Depositions  
D.C. Area (301) 261-1902  
Balt. & Annap. (410) 974-0947

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

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

|                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| -----)                    |   |
| In the matter of:         | ) |
| AURIO A. MATOS            | ) |
| LLOYD SANTIAGO-SANTOS and | ) |
| LOURDES RODRIGUEZ BONET   | ) |
| Culebra, Puerto Rico      | ) |
| -----)                    | ) |

MM DOCKET NO. 93-89

The above-entitled matter come on for admissions session pursuant to Notice before Judge Joseph P. Gonzalez, Administrative Law Judge, at 2000 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., in Courtroom No. 4, on Wednesday, August 18, 1993, at 9:30 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of Aurio A. Matos:

SCOTT C. CINNAMON, Esquire  
1901 L Street, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 659-4401

On behalf of Lloyd Santiago-Santos and Lourdes Rodriguez Bonet:

DAVID HILL, Esquire  
AUDREY P. RASMUSSEN, Esquire  
O'Connor & Hannan  
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite #800  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 887-1400



## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 JUDGE GONZALEZ: The date is August 18th, 1993, and  
3 it is 9:31 in the morning. And this is an admissions session  
4 regarding the matter of the mutually exclusive applications of  
5 Aurio A. Matos and Lloyd Santiago-Santos and Lourdes Rodriguez  
6 Bonet for a construction permit for a new FM station to  
7 operate on channel 293-A in Culebra, Puerto Rico.

8 Would the parties please enter their appearance  
9 beginning on my left.

10 MR. HILL: Your Honor, on behalf of Santos and  
11 Bonet, David Hill and Audrey Rasmussen.

12 MR. CINNAMON: Your Honor, on behalf of Aurio Matos,  
13 I'm Scott Cinnamon.

14 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Thank you. I guess the first order  
15 of business should be the receipt of the exhibits. And Mr.  
16 Matos, counsel Mr. Matos, please proceed.

17 MR. CINNAMON: Your Honor, I'd like to hand to the  
18 court reporter the original copy of Exhibit 1 for Aurio Matos.  
19 It contains a title page, two pages in English with an  
20 unsigned declaration in English and then two pages of Spanish  
21 translation. Actually, I'm sorry, three pages of Spanish  
22 translation with a declaration in Spanish that has been  
23 executed by Senor Matos. And I offer it into evidence.

24 JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. It's identified,  
25 described by counsel for Mr. Matos and is marked as Exhibit 1.

1 (Whereupon, the document referred to  
2 as Matos Exhibit No. 1 was marked for  
3 identification and introduced into  
4 evidence.)

5 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Are there any objections to the  
6 receipt of any portion of the exhibit?

7 MR. HILL: Yes, Your Honor. May I proceed? On --  
8 as a preliminary matter, I would ask that Your Honor direct  
9 that counsel for Mr. Matos provide for the record the date of  
10 birth of Mr. Matos. And I think that can be important in  
11 proposed findings when we try to evaluate some of his  
12 experience.

13 MR. CINNAMON: Your Honor, I, I don't see the  
14 relevance of his date of birth. But I also don't, don't  
15 believe that I have a problem providing it if I, if it's --

16 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Well, I'm not sure I see the  
17 relevance either quite frankly. But if you don't mind  
18 providing it. There is a request that it be provided. Would  
19 you agree to do that, sir?

20 MR. CINNAMON: Yes, I would.

21 MR. HILL: Thank you. And on page 2 of Exhibit No.  
22 1 -- one, two, three, the fourth paragraph that starts, "In  
23 addition to his broadcast experience at WCXQ (AM)," would move  
24 to strike that phrase. And if I may continue since it all  
25 relates. Several more paragraphs down it starts, "Since

1 August 1, 1992, he has been the station manager of WCXQ (AM),  
2 Boca, Puerto Rico," would move to strike that sentence also,  
3 since past broadcast experience beyond the November 1991 date  
4 of the application and accordingly I think would be  
5 impermissible comparative upgrading.

6 MR. CINNAMON: Your Honor, I would --

7 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Mr. Cinnamon.

8 MR. CINNAMON: -- I'm sorry, Your Honor. I would  
9 argue that it's merely a reflection of his continuing  
10 involvement in, in the broadcast industry and a reflection of  
11 his present employment.

12 JUDGE GONZALEZ: I would agree. The request is  
13 denied. Any further objections?

14 MR. HILL: I have no further objections to Exhibit  
15 No. 1.

16 JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. That, that exhibit is  
17 received on this date. Mr. Cinnamon, continue.

18 (Whereupon, the document referred to  
19 as Matos Exhibit No. 1 was received  
20 into evidence.)

21 MR. CINNAMON: Oh. I would offer now into evidence  
22 as Exhibit 2 Aurio Matos's exhibit on auxiliary power. It  
23 contains a title page, a one-page, one page in English of  
24 exhibit and then a one-page English declaration that is  
25 unexecuted followed by one page of exhibit in Spanish and a



1 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Are there any objections to receipt  
2 of that --

3 MR. HILL: No objections, Your Honor.

4 JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. Then that document is  
5 received as well as Matos Exhibit No. 2. All right. And I  
6 think that concludes the exhibit presentation.

7 (Whereupon, the document referred to  
8 as Matos Exhibit No. 2 was received  
9 into evidence.)

10 MR. CINNAMON: Yes, it does, Your Honor.

11 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Okay. And I think now we can go on  
12 to Santiago-Santos and Rodriguez.

13 MR. HILL: Thank you. Your Honor, I would ask that  
14 a four-page exhibit with a declaration identified as the  
15 statement of Lourdes Rodriguez Bonet be identified as the  
16 Santos and Bonet Exhibit No. 1.

17 JUDGE GONZALEZ: You mean four pages --

18 MR. HILL: That's, that's correct. Four pages of  
19 text plus a declaration. If I may identify Exhibit 2 at the  
20 same time --

21 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Go ahead.

22 MR. HILL: And I would ask that a statement of Lloyd  
23 Santiago-Santos consisting of three pages of text and a  
24 declaration be identified as the Santos and Bonet Exhibit  
25 No. 2.

1 JUDGE GONZALEZ: It's identified.

2 MR. HILL: And at this time, I am giving the court  
3 reporter an original and one copy of Exhibits 1 and 2. And if  
4 I may, Your Honor, I apologize, but on Exhibit No. 1 would ask  
5 that in the first line that "current" be changed to  
6 "currently". That's -- I accept responsibility for that  
7 grammatical mistake.

8 (Whereupon, the documents referred to  
9 as Santos/Bonet Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2  
10 were marked for identification.)

11 JUDGE GONZALEZ: That change is noted.

12 MR. HILL: Your Honor, at this time I would move the  
13 introduction of Exhibit No. 1.

14 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Are there any objections to the  
15 receipt of this document identified as Exhibit, Exhibit 1?

16 MR. CINNAMON: Yes, Your Honor. If, if I might  
17 refer to page 3 beginning on the second line from the word  
18 "it", those two sentences that describe I, I guess it's the  
19 plan that Ms. Rodriguez Bonet plans to use to divest her  
20 interest, it's a deviation from what was, from what was  
21 contained in integration and diversification statement.

22 In that statement, the only statement made is that  
23 the two, the two applicant principals would divest their  
24 interests. So I -- the steps taken I, I believe would reflect  
25 an upgrade.

1 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Mr. Hill.

2 MR. HILL: First, clearly it's not at variance with  
3 the integration statement in the applications. It's perhaps  
4 an expansion but not, not in variance. I think that the brief  
5 explanation of the present plans is relevant. However, I am  
6 quite willing to rely merely on the statement that they will  
7 divest this interest.

8 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Well, that certainly is sufficient  
9 I would think. And since you have no objection --

10 MR. CINNAMON: That's right.

11 JUDGE GONZALEZ: -- and you continue to oppose that  
12 sentence, we'll strike it.

13 MR. HILL: Yes.

14 MR. CINNAMON: Okay. In the --

15 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Any further objections to that  
16 document?

17 MR. CINNAMON: Yes, Your Honor. In the next  
18 paragraph under past broadcast experience, it refers to Ms.  
19 Rodriguez Bonet in saying under past broadcast experience that  
20 "in addition to my general business background" I would move  
21 that, that that phrase be struck at the beginning of past  
22 broadcast experience, because I don't see under the policy  
23 statement how a general business background is relevant to a  
24 claim of past broadcast experience.

25 MR. HILL: I, I concede that past general business

1 experience is not relevant to a past broadcast claim. But  
2 there has to be some context in these things. It was merely  
3 an introductory phrase just to set the predicate --

4 JUDGE GONZALEZ: No, I agree here. I mean no, no  
5 comparative weight will be given to that portion. But I --

6 MR. CINNAMON: Okay.

7 JUDGE GONZALEZ: -- it's, it's just a lead in  
8 sentence. I, I really don't have a problem with that. That  
9 will remain a part of the exhibit -- of the document -- of  
10 both exhibits.

11 MR. CINNAMON: Okay. I have only one more, one more  
12 concern in, under past broadcast experience again. Same  
13 statement, the continuation, it says that Ms. Rodriguez Bonet  
14 worked at WQBS from 1980 to late 1981 --

15 JUDGE GONZALEZ: I'm sorry. Where is that now?

16 MR. CINNAMON: Under past broadcast experience. The  
17 same location. "In addition to my" -- it's the first  
18 sentence. "In addition --

19 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Oh, I see.

20 MR. CINNAMON: -- to my general business background.  
21 From 1980 to late 1981." And then it goes on to describe that  
22 she worked in the accounting business office and contains a  
23 description of her duties. In the integration and  
24 diversification statement it refers to her title as  
25 accountant. And I would, I would ask that after the, the

1 words "late 1981", the words "as an accountant" be inserted.

2           And as a further objection, I would ask that the  
3 description be deleted. Because that's at variance with the  
4 original application as it was filed which only described her  
5 as an accountant and did not go into great detail as to what  
6 her duties were. So I would venture to say that a -- if, if  
7 you go from the application date, the description of the  
8 duties as they seem to involve slightly more than what a  
9 standard accountant would be could be seen as an upgrade.

10           So there, there are two separate objections. I, I  
11 definitely would like to see the word accountant inserted,  
12 since that was indeed her title. And if, if you start from  
13 the time that the application was filed, the application  
14 contained no description of what her duties were at the  
15 station. So I, I would, I would ask that it be considered an  
16 upgrade from what was in the application and be struck.

17           JUDGE GONZALEZ: Well, I'm, I'm a little puzzled as  
18 to what portion of it you feel constitutes an upgrade. Is it  
19 the reference to accountant/business office? Is that what  
20 you're objecting to?

21           MR. CINNAMON: Well, I --

22           JUDGE GONZALEZ: If one was identified as an  
23 accountant apparently, it would seem to me an accountant would  
24 be involved in the station's financial operations at least to  
25 some extent. But is it the business, business reference that

1 | you object to? I'm not really too sure what you consider to  
2 | be an upgrade here. I guess I'm just trying to make that a  
3 | little clearer to me.

4 |           MR. CINNAMON: The -- since the description wasn't  
5 | contained in the application, I, I thought that containing the  
6 | description now to evidence the job, what the job actually  
7 | entailed might be an upgrade.

8 |           JUDGE GONZALEZ: Mr. Hill?

9 |           MR. HILL: I'm looking at the Exhibit No. 3  
10 | identified as the integration statement to the original  
11 | Santiago -- or Santos/Bonet application, and she was  
12 | identified as Mr. Cinnamon indicated as an accountant at the  
13 | San Juan, Puerto Rico radio station. In the standard  
14 | integration statement filed pursuant to your order early in  
15 | this proceeding, some detail was added concerning the, her  
16 | activities as an accountant at the radio station.

17 |           And I submit that that was part of the Santos/Bonet  
18 | standardized integration statement dated May 5, 1993. And I  
19 | would submit that, that there's nothing here at variance.  
20 | Perhaps an expansion. But that's the purpose of the written  
21 | direct case is to provide details that aren't inconsistent  
22 | with or an upgrade over the, over the earlier representations.  
23 | And there's nothing here that's an upgrade. She's still  
24 | saying she was an accountant --

25 |           JUDGE GONZALEZ: Yeah, I agree. Having, having just

1 read again, I, I don't see an upgrade there, Mr. Cinnamon. So  
2 the objection will be overruled. Any further objections to  
3 this portion?

4 MR. CINNAMON: I -- does that include the -- well,  
5 the other objection is there's no, there's no indication of,  
6 of what her title is. It merely says that she worked in the  
7 accounting business office.

8 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Well --

9 MR. CINNAMON: Which could make her, which could  
10 make her anything --

11 JUDGE GONZALEZ: -- I don't see why Mr. Hill would  
12 object to adding late 1981 as an accountant since she's --

13 MR. CINNAMON: Okay.

14 JUDGE GONZALEZ: -- identified as an accountant.

15 MR. HILL: I have no objection.

16 JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. We'll put that in after  
17 late 1981 as an accountant. That's added to that sentence.

18 MR. CINNAMON: I, I have no further objections.

19 JUDGE GONZALEZ: With respect to that particular  
20 document, that is document 1. All right. All right, then  
21 that, that document is received as Santiago-Santos/Rodriguez  
22 Bonet Exhibit No. 1.

23 (Whereupon, the document referred to  
24 as Santos/Bonet Exhibit No. 1 was  
25 received into evidence.)

1 MR. HILL: At this time, Your Honor, I would ask  
2 that the Santos/Bonet Exhibit No. 2 be introduced into  
3 evidence.

4 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Are there any objections to the  
5 receipt of that particular document?

6 MR. CINNAMON: Only a few, Your Honor. If we could  
7 go to page 3 of that document, past broadcast experience, the  
8 second paragraph "from 1982 to 1991 I worked as general  
9 manager for station WMSW (AM)". The integration and  
10 diversification statement has listed for 1982 to 1991 that Mr.  
11 Santiago-Santos worked as, as both general manager and sales  
12 manager. So I'm unclear as to which jobs he held at which  
13 times.

14 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Mr. Hill?

15 MR. HILL: I'm looking at the integration statement.  
16 It does identify as general manager, sales manager. And let  
17 me see in our standardized integration statement if that sheds  
18 any light on it. No, it's the same language, sales manager  
19 and -- general manager and sales manager. And there, here  
20 obviously have picked the general manager as the position that  
21 is all encompassing and indicated that he had the day-to-day  
22 responsibilities for all facets of the radio station  
23 operations. I, I don't know what the objection is that we  
24 didn't --

25 MR. CINNAMON: Right.

1 MR. HILL: -- include sales manager --

2 JUDGE GONZALEZ: I'm not sure what the objection --

3 MR. CINNAMON: It's not. It's a, it's a request for  
4 clarification I guess. I'm wondering whether he held both  
5 positions simultaneously or whether he held one position for a  
6 period and then graduated to the other.

7 MR. HILL: All right. It's our understanding that  
8 he held both simultaneously.

9 MR. CINNAMON: Then I, I would pose no objection  
10 if --

11 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Would you desire --

12 MR. CINNAMON: -- that be the case.

13 JUDGE GONZALEZ: -- that we add that as sales  
14 manager as well?

15 MR. HILL: I have no objection if he wants to add  
16 it.

17 JUDGE GONZALEZ: I mean Mr. Cinnamon --

18 MR. CINNAMON: I have -- no. We -- that's fine.

19 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Any further objections to any  
20 portion of that document?

21 MR. CINNAMON: Again on page 2 under  
22 diversification, it's basically the same objection as was with  
23 Ms. Rodriguez Bonet that there was a claim of divestiture and  
24 I don't, I don't see why it's necessary to add to the record  
25 exactly how they're going to do it.

1 JUDGE GONZALEZ: So your objection then is to  
2 that --

3 MR. CINNAMON: From the very last word on page 2.

4 JUDGE GONZALEZ: -- fees and interest will be  
5 offered?

6 MR. CINNAMON: Right. To the sentence ending with  
7 "they will be offered to other interested parties".

8 MR. HILL: No objection, Your Honor, based on our  
9 earlier response with respect to Exhibit 1.

10 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Well, I think we'd have to, you  
11 would object to the following sentences as well since they  
12 relate to that first sentence. The last two sentences.

13 MR. CINNAMON: Right. Up, up until the, the  
14 sentence that ends with "they will be offered to other  
15 interested parties".

16 JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. Mr. Hill, do you have  
17 any --

18 MR. HILL: No, no objection, Your Honor.

19 JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. Well then that portion  
20 of that paragraph we've just identified is stricken. Any  
21 further objections?

22 MR. CINNAMON: No, Your Honor. That's --

23 JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. Well, then --

24 MR. CINNAMON: Thank you very much.

25 JUDGE GONZALEZ: That, that document is received as

1 well as Santiago-Santos/Rodriguez Bonet Exhibit No. 2 this  
2 date.

3 (Whereupon, the document referred to  
4 as Santos/Bonet Exhibit No. 2 was  
5 received into evidence.)

6 JUDGE GONZALEZ: I believe, Mr. Hill, that's the  
7 extent of your exhibits?

8 MR. HILL: That is our -- with the, the only  
9 exception and that relates to both of us is an engineering  
10 exhibit will be --

11 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Well, that was what I was going to  
12 raise next.

13 MR. HILL: Right.

14 JUDGE GONZALEZ: I, I spoke with the Mass Media  
15 Bureau representative and asked me whether I felt it was  
16 necessary that he be here today. And I, I said I -- the  
17 only -- my only concern was the areas and pops. issue. And  
18 that he indicated that he had spoken with both of you I  
19 believe or one of you. And there's going to be an independent  
20 statement submitted by a third engineer. Is that correct?

21 MR. HILL: That is correct.

22 MR. CINNAMON: Yes, Your Honor.

23 JUDGE GONZALEZ: And what is the substance of that  
24 statement?

25 MR. HILL: The substance I -- the -- I don't know

1 | whether it will be actually included in as part of this  
2 | engineering statement. But the substance of the package that  
3 | will be presented will be a stipulation indicating there are  
4 | no unserved areas and two, the engineer then will provide an  
5 | exhibit showing the area and population for the Matos  
6 | application and areas and pops. for the Santos-Bonet  
7 | application. And then we will make our arguments in the  
8 | proposed findings on what those areas and pops. may mean.

9 | JUDGE GONZALEZ: I see. Now when will that be  
10 | tendered? What is the date --

11 | MR. HILL: The 20th. You've indicated in a --

12 | JUDGE GONZALEZ: It's the 20th.

13 | MR. HILL: -- in a earlier order that it's to be in  
14 | by --

15 | JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. Well, obviously I can't  
16 | receive it today. So it will be, it will be received -- when?  
17 | When will it be received?

18 | MR. HILL: On, on Friday the, the 20th.

19 | JUDGE GONZALEZ: Friday the 20th. All right.

20 | MR. HILL: And then that with that engineering  
21 | stipulation/exhibit that would be our direct presentation.

22 | MR. CINNAMON: It was my understanding in my  
23 | conversation with counsel for Mass Media yesterday that he  
24 | doesn't see a problem with us handling the engineering matter  
25 | this way. So I --

1 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Well, offhand I don't either.  
2 There is one as I indicated before we went on the record,  
3 there is one petition to enlarge issues that was filed by Mr.  
4 Matos on July 12th, 1993 which I have -- to which opposition  
5 statement was filed as well as a subsequent reply. And I've  
6 considered the pleadings. And I will deny the petition.

7 As far as I'm concerned the, the arguments fail to  
8 raise material questions of fact with respect to the financial  
9 qualifications of the two individuals or the truthfulness of  
10 their representations at the time they filed their  
11 applications. Or that -- or there's certainly no doubt  
12 occurred in my mind that they don't have sufficient funds  
13 currently available to meet the cost of their proposal.

14 There was some question in my mind as well as to  
15 whether the petition was timely filed. However, I, I went  
16 ahead and considered the, the pleadings on the merits. And  
17 I've come to the conclusion that the petition should be  
18 denied.

19 I note that there is also a further petition to  
20 enlarge issues which was filed recently, August 9th, which  
21 obviously is not ripe yet. And I will have to wait until it,  
22 it becomes so before I, I indicate that the parties have  
23 decided rule on that.

24 The -- I believe that's the only or those are the  
25 only pleadings which are still outstanding other than the

1 objection I believe to a witness notification which I, I think  
2 we should address now.

3 (Pause.)

4 JUDGE GONZALEZ: I believe that's Mr. -- your  
5 client, Mr. Cinnamon, who desires to cross-examine Mr.  
6 Santiago-Santos as well as Ms. Rodriguez Bonet. I've read  
7 through the notification of witness as well as the opposition.  
8 And before I indicate how I, what my feelings are with respect  
9 to the arguments contained therein I'll give you the, the  
10 opportunity if you so desire, Mr. Cinnamon, to make additional  
11 argument as to why these, these individuals should be  
12 presented.

13 MR. CINNAMON: I have no further argument, Your  
14 Honor.

15 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Well, my feeling is that need has  
16 not been shown. And I will not require that these individuals  
17 be made available for cross-examination. I, I make the  
18 decision aware that the, the Commission has placed a rather  
19 high standard for the, the trier of fact to, before  
20 authorizing cross-examination. And I don't believe that in  
21 this instance that has, has been done.

22 So as far as I'm concerned, we'll be -- or my  
23 position certainly is that we will be handling this as a  
24 written, a written case rather than one with oral testimony.

25 So I believe now we should set a date for the filing

1 of findings of fact and conclusions of law assuming that no  
2 additional issues are designated. In the event that one is,  
3 of course, then we will have to come together again and, and  
4 set further procedural dates.

5 I -- we'll go off the record, and I'm opened to  
6 suggestions as to when these findings should be filed and when  
7 we should file the replies.

8 (Off the record. Back on the record.)

9 JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. We've -- while off the  
10 record, we have agreed on the following dates. Monday,  
11 October 4th, 1993 will be the date for the filing of findings  
12 of fact and conclusions of law by both parties. And the  
13 replies thereto will be due on Monday, October 18th, 1993.

14 MR. HILL: And Your Honor, could I ask that we hand  
15 serve the proposed findings on each other on the afternoon of  
16 the, you know, by close of business on the 4th so we'll have  
17 the full time to --

18 JUDGE GONZALEZ: That's normally done. I, I don't  
19 know whether Mr. Cinnamon has any objection.

20 MR. CINNAMON: That would be fine, Your Honor.

21 MR. HILL: That's fine. Thank you.

22 JUDGE GONZALEZ: All right. Then I guess the final  
23 order of business today is to close the record with the  
24 understanding that when the joint engineering statement is  
25 received by me I will reopen the record and receive the joint

1 engineering statement and close the record again.

2 All right. Well then if there's nothing further  
3 then we'll adjourn as of 10 o'clock.

4 MR. HILL: Thank you.

5 JUDGE GONZALEZ: Thank you.

6 MR. CINNAMON: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 (Whereupon, at 10:00 a.m., the hearing was  
8 adjourned.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER**

IN THE MATTER OF CULEBRA, PUERTO RICO

Name

MM DOCKET NO. 93-89

Docket No.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Place

AUGUST 18, 1993

Date

We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 8 through 29, inclusive, are the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared from the reporting by CINDI McCANN in attendance at the above identified proceeding, in accordance with applicable provisions of the current Federal Communications Commission's professional verbatim reporting and transcription Statement of Work and have verified the accuracy of the transcript by (1) comparing the typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the proceeding and (2) comparing the final proofed typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the proceeding.

August 26, 1993

Date

Karen Ehatt  
Karen Ehatt, Transcriber  
Free State Reporting, Inc.

August 27, 1993

Date

Diane S. Windell  
Diane S. Windell, Proofreader  
Free State Reporting, Inc.

August 27, 1993

Date

Cynthia McCann  
Cindi McCann, Reporter  
Free State Reporting, Inc.

**FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.**

Court Reporting Depositions

D.C. Area (301) 261-1902

Balt. & Annap. (410) 974-0947