

7-G-10-UR

From: Amy Stark <amystark@excellcommunications.com>
To: Tom Brechko <Tom.Brechko@knoxmpc.org>
Date: 8/5/2010 5:49:54 PM
Subject: Case # 7-G-10-UR Tolson Lane - Neighborhood Meetin

Mr. Brechko,

I wanted to send you an update regarding our neighborhood meeting yesterday evening. I met with the Easterly's, John Britton (the Easterly's attorney), and two members of the Easterly family. No other residents appeared at the meeting in opposition.

We discussed the alternative locations Larry Perry mentioned, the water tank location and the two properties behind it. KUB property - We spoke with Lynn Keck in Systems Operations, KUB is not interested in sharing the compound with T-Mobile. KUB would require T-Mobile to have their own access and would not be allowed to share the compound in any way. KUB will allow a monopole next to their tank, however, T-Mobile would have to have their own fenced compound inside of KUB's compound with their own gate and access. This particular compound is too small to allow for this plan and would not meet the tower height setbacks to the Easterly's house. In addition, the separate access around the KUB compound would require an easement from the Easterly's. The property behind the KUB property is very narrow and will not meet setbacks. The other property behind the water tank and to the East is 6.62 acres (Shagan). There is a location within this property. However, there is about a 100' elevation drop in order to meet setbacks. As a result, T-Mobile would need a 250' SST at that location which is discouraged in the Zoning Matrix.

We also discussed the four alternative tower locations mentioned in Ms. Easterly's email. We explained that T-Mobile is already located on two of those towers. We provided a propagation map to the Easterly's to show why the McKamey Road USC site did not meet the RF objectives for this area. We explained the legal issues involved with the Schaad Road USC tower. USC has ongoing issues with their landowner regarding maintenance of the access road and is not willing to authorize a tower extension due to their discrepancies. As stated in item 3 below, T-Mobile has no legal standing and will not get involved with this dispute between US Cellular and their landlord.

The Easterly's requested to speak with a T-Mobile RF engineer to answer additional technical questions they had. We agreed and held a conference call today at 12:30 EST with the T-Mobile RF engineer, T-Mobile Real Estate Manager, both attorneys, the Easterly's, and myself. Below is a summary of the additional questions they had and how they were answered.

1 Confirm elevation/location of the Quarry and why that location would not work -

The elevation of the quarry is too high and we would exceed our required height. Mr. Britton suggested placing the tower at the floor of the quarry. This would not work - it would not be economically feasible and was not researched any further. We don't feel the quarry would even allow a tower to be located in the center of a blasting area nor would T-Mobile find this to be a suitable location for a tower.

2. The Easterly's would like to know why T-Mobile could not co-locate at a higher c/l on the ATC towers to cover the 191 search area. In other words, they don't understand why you can't just be higher to cover a wider range.

RF explained to the Easterly's that this will not work and will be available at the hearing to explain to the Board if needed.

3. USC Schaad Road site - What c/l was needed here / what was the extension height of the tower - If the problem with the LL was repair of the road, why can't T-Mobile repair the road for her - even have a separate lease of the road so T-Mobile can work directly with her on the road issues - They also would like a propagation map for the Schaad Rd site

This tower is a 150' monopole and T-Mobile was proposing to extend it to 190'.

In regards to the driveway repair, T-Mobile cannot and will not get involved with a dispute between US Cellular and their LL. T-Mobile has no legal standing and will not get involved with this issue.

In regards to a propagation map, RF does not feel it necessary to provide a propagation map on a tower they cannot collocate on.

4. What are the tower hts of the ATC towers

KX0035 270' ATC tower # 9196 - T-Mobile is collocated at 155'

KX0036 189' ATC tower # 308913

KX0038 195' ATC tower # 308976

KX0305 190' ATC tower # 308912 - T-Mobile collocated at 170'

5 What software does T-Mobile use to run the propagation maps

Asset

6. Can Easterly's have a copy of the SARF (Search Ring Data)

We cannot release this info due to being proprietary business information.

Ms. Hobson (our Landowner) is going to speak with some of the neighbors who are in favor of the tower due to lack of service in their area. Hopefully she can bring some of these folks to the hearing.

Please feel free to call me if you need to discuss further. Otherwise, we will see you at the hearing next Thursday.

Amy Stark

Project Manager

6247 Amber Hills Road

Trussville, AL 35173

205.956.0198 ext. 216 (office)

205.907.8150 (mobile)

amystark@excellcommunications.com
<mailto:amystark@excellcommunications.com>

www.excellcommunications.com <<http://www.excellcommunications.com/>>