

Lincoln Radio Committee  
Draft minutes of Sept. 5, 2008 mtg.  
8:00 am.

Present: John LeGates, Paul Svetz

Also Present: Kevin Mooney, Artie Cotoni and Anita Scheipers

Not Present: John Caswell

#### Discussion Points:

1. The committee reviewed the draft radio signal study report from Broadcast Signal Labs. The report was agreed to be complete and providing adequate detail for the committee, with the exception of a small typo. The report confirms the previous informal findings of public safety relative to existing dead-spots within the town for both outgoing and incoming signals. The committee discussed the resulting computer models ability to predict affect on signal strength at different tower heights. Anita provided an email from David Maxson of Broadcast signal labs which stated:

It will not be terribly reliable to split the difference on tower heights using the model. To have a large 16 dB difference (average, but pretty consistent) across the range of only 30 feet height difference suggests there is a sudden and radical change in coverage due to foliage. Splitting the difference on tower heights with the computer analysis will requires assumptions:

1. Is the foliage loss linear with height change? (at 16 dB over 30 feet, should we assume that the change is about 1 dB per two feet? Or does it suddenly drop at some unknown height when the antenna drops below a certain foliage height?).
2. Is the representation of the coverage on the computer plot so accurate that estimating coverage halfway between the two heights will result in a reliable half-way estimate? Each computer plot has some amount of variance and standard deviation from the drive test data (by definition- we have not calculated it). That causes what appears to be a nice crisp plot to be a little "smeared" mathematically. I think there is enough smearing between the two plots that it is best to estimate by eye how an alternative height might work. One must be careful not to read any particular data point on a plot literally because of the variance between estimate and reality; instead, the difference between the two plots should be looked at from the perspective of where the generally sensitive areas are and the approximate difference in magnitude of the area where the signals go soft.

It was agreed a meeting should be set up with BSL to discuss the model.

2. The committee started discussing some potential prioritization of remaining issues such as: a) addressing the painting and lighting issue if the FAA denies the current waiver request, b) creating a plan to react to the FAA if the waiver is denied, c) reducing visibility of the tower to immediate abutters through plantings and other camouflage methods of the tower itself, and d) contacting abutters with tower sight issues again to determine their current level of concern over the tower.

It was agreed that the following items would be initiated:

- Public Safety will look to initiate some plantings at the tower site this fall, as well as look into conducting a trial camouflage of the tower using camo netting.
- Paul Svetz will contact abutters to check with them as to current concerns
- Public safety will meet with Hanscom reps to determine if they are willing to contact FAA on our behalf regarding approval of our waiver request
- Paul Svetz and Anita Scheipers will contact BSL regarding the model, setting up a meeting if necessary, and to ask their advise as to how to approach the FAA in a positive manner.
- Anita Scheipers will email Fred Hopengarten to see if he knows what our required response time would be if the FAA denies our waiver request.
- Anita Scheipers will draft a memo to the Selectmen and ZBA regarding needing additional time to prepare recommendations based on the lack of response from the FAA.

Date of next meeting was not decided.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 am.