

Kim Gorman

From: David Maxson [david@isotrope.im]
Sent: Thursday, January 09, 2014 11:55 AM
To: Sousa, Ricardo M.
Cc: Kim Gorman
Subject: Re: Application of SBA and AT&T Wireless, 5 Craig Road, Acton, MA
Attachments: Pop Count Request.pdf

Rick,

Attached is a memo commemorating deliverables covered in our telephone discussion yesterday.

Regards,

David

--

David Maxson, WCP
Isotrope, LLC
503 Main Street
Medfield, MA 02052
508 359 8833 o
617 448 8570 m

David is a certified wireless communications engineering technologies professional.
<http://www.ieee-wcet.org/employers.html>

Sousa, Ricardo M.

Wednesday, January 08, 2014 16:17

David:

As a follow-up to our Planning Board hearing last night, attached please find the core drive data file that was compiled by C Squared for purposes of AT&T's drive test maps as submitted to the Planning Board.

Please note Amjad's comments below regarding the Ec column.

As was requested by the Planning Board last night, we are submitting the attached drive test data for your analysis and for your report to the Planning Board, relative to the above-captioned application.

The attached information is proprietary to AT&T Wireless and is sent to you solely for the purposes of analyzing the data for the submission of your report to the Planning Board, relative to the pending application before the Acton Planning Board and shall not be shared with third parties other than in the context of the Planning Board application.

After you have an opportunity to review the attached data, please do not hesitate to contact me and I will reach out to AT&T's RF Engineers to address your questions.

Thanks,

Rick

Ricardo ("Rick") M Sousa
rsousa@princelobel.com
617 456 8123 direct
617 794 8998 mobile



Prince Lobel Tye LLP
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 2200 617 456 8000 main
Boston, Massachusetts 02114 617 456 8100 fax



From: MD, AMJAD [<mailto:am727v@att.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 08, 2014 3:20 PM
To: Sousa, Ricardo M.; Sean Gormley (SGormley@sbsite.com)
Cc: RATHORE, DEEPAK
Subject: RE: Acton

Hi Rick

Please see the drive data file for the site MA1037_Acton Craig road attached in the email. Please advise Mr. Maxson to consider first column of Ec (signal strength) parameters and when propagation plots are created the computer model take in account minimum of 6Db loss associated with the clutter so please advice to consider the loss to have apple to apple comparison.

Thanks & Regards
Amjad Md
(o) : 508 271 8329
(M) : 609 433 8136

This email is intended for the confidential use of the addressees only. Because the information is subject to the attorney-client privilege and may be attorney work product, you should not file copies of this email with publicly accessible records. If you are not an addressee on this email or an addressee's authorized agent, you have received this email in error; please notify us immediately at 617 456 8000 and do not further review, disseminate or copy this email. Thank you.

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: Any federal tax advice or information included in this message or any attachment is not intended to be, and may not be, used to avoid tax penalties or to promote, market, or recommend any transaction, matter, entity, or investment plan discussed herein. Prince Lobel Tye LLP does not otherwise by this disclaimer limit you from disclosing the tax structure of any transaction addressed herein.



Thinking outside the sphere

Memorandum

To Ricardo Sousa
From David Maxson
Re Acton Deliverables

January 9, 2014

Thanks for the call yesterday, and for the email with the first data file of C-Squared Systems drive test data. Please forward the other three. As agreed, I also await the LTE cell site data table for use in our propagation modeling.

With respect to the population count deliverable as discussed with you, Deepak and Amjad, here is a list of the population counts that I recommend will be informative to the Board.

1. Standalone population count of the ≥ -74 dBm coverage of the proposed facility @ 100 ft height (with no other sites).
2. Standalone population count of the ≥ -74 dBm coverage of the proposed facility @ 80 ft height (with no other sites).
3. Population count of the ≥ -92 dBm coverage that is existing coverage with no proposed facility*
4. Population count of the ≥ -92 dBm coverage that includes existing coverage plus proposed at 100 feet.*
5. Population count of the ≥ -92 dBm coverage that includes existing coverage plus proposed at 80 feet.*
6. Population count of the ≥ -74 dBm coverage of the hypothetical alternative facility at 100 feet at 70 Hosmer Street.**
7. Population count of the ≥ -92 dBm coverage that includes existing coverage plus 70 Hosmer St 100 ft hypothetical coverage.*

I would appreciate rapid turnaround on this information so that I may have time to prepare my analysis and report well in advance of the continued hearing on the 21st.

*Note: #3 is a baseline value that is to be used for reference for the counts of #4, #5, & #7. The population count does not need to go beyond the extent of the maps presented by AT&T, but it does need to include a total area that is greater than the -92 dBm coverage of the proposed facility. The same area of reference must be used in Pop counts #3, 4, 5 & 7.

**Note: You have indicated that SBA believes this location is not a viable alternative. I have suggested that the Board has not ruled on SBA's assertion so the information is still germane, and moreover that even if the site were determined to not be available for the purposes of this application, a comparative population count from this location will be informative to the Board in developing an understanding of the degree of change to population counts when a proposed facility is relocated a half mile from the proposed location.