

omni-directional. Assume that the elevation patterns were the same as the proposed patterns. I got the present elevation pattern information from Dr. Musselman as provided by LCG so I can truly say I compared the patterns. These patterns don't necessarily mean they are exactly like they were theoretically when you put an antenna on a tower it changes the electro magnetic characteristics a bit. I don't know how much, how far. It takes about, it took me with the data base that I used for before and after which I think I presented to you last time there are about 20 stations now and there are about 26 stations for the future it took about four hours per run. So using, I had to use the detailed antenna patterns for each one of these locations to figure out what the field factors were which we discussed at the last meeting. Generally, I agree with Mr. Hislop. All these places that were south, to the north and to the east increased differentially. Again we're only looking at, I am only looking at eight sites and I think Mr. Hislop has 16 sites he looked at. He looked at , eight of which are these or pretty close to these. I think one isn't. And it went down and back on directly west on Colorow Road. However it went up slightly in all the other areas. So my conclusion is there will be a slight increase in the electromagnetic fields at locations that are north, south and east which are directly in line of site with the antennas. There also will be some increase of those that are defracted over the hills there. And I used line of site calculations. I did not do profiles or take into consideration the losses by going over a hill. Okay the other point I want to make involves adjacent channel and my comment I agree with the applicant that no question about it you can't have adjacent