

**SOUND SYSTEM COMMITTEE – MEETING MINUTES**  
**May 5, 2009**

Members in attendance: Gil Coan, Sr., Chuck Gilmore, Hal Martin, Don Myracle, Sarah Lee Myracle, Gene Stewart.

Committee Chair Gene Stewart called the meeting to order at 9:37 AM.  
Member Gil Coan, Sr. led the committee in prayer.

**Minutes of February 17, 2009 meeting:**

The final sentence of Item 8 shall be revised to read, *“It was suggested that the Operations Manager and Trustees discuss this potential with a device manufacturer before investing in more of the current models.”*

The minutes were approved as amended.

**Committee Communiqués with Lee Sound Design:**

During the intervening time since our last meeting communication of some questions and requests for clarifications concerning the Lee Sound Design report had taken place with Wayne Lee outside of the committee structure. It was recognized by the chair that he was aware of the communication and that circumstances of timing and days off led to the situation. Charles Gilmore suggested that for purposes of respecting the consultant’s time, and likely subsequent billing to the church’s account, that future communications with the consultant only proceed through the Operations Manager with the full knowledge and acceptance by the committee. He also stated that he felt for purposes of congregational perception on this sensitive issue it is important that the committee be seen to be acting as a whole in conveying questions and concerns to the consultant.

Those present agreed with these comments and the suggestion was accepted by consensus.

**On Going Committee Business:**

Don reported that Wayne Lee visited our church and attended both the 8:30 AM and 10:55 AM services on February 2, 2009. The afternoon was devoted to performing the acoustic and sound system measurements that lead to the report issued on April 16, 2009. As soon as possible after receipt the report was distributed to all committee members for their review and discussion at today’s meeting.

Gene suggested that we proceed around the table to hear the comments and any questions that may be brought forth by each committee member. The following is summary of those comments.

Chuck Gilmore – Feels the report is a comprehensive, professionally produced, document with quite detailed analysis and good preliminary recommendations. He also was “heartened” that Lee believes we can achieve the desired sound system improvement for hearing the spoken word and not alter the existing acoustics for our various music and organ presentations. Such a resolution would give us the best of both and satisfy the needs and desires of the greatest number of our congregants.

Gil Coan, Sr. – Likes the evaluation and conclusions. The report answered his questions and he believes we should follow the recommendations of the professional we hired. He would like to move forward.

Hal Martin – Professionally done; good methodology to divorce hall reverberations from the voice fix. However, this level of report lacks definition on how each alternative would resolve the issue. Hal is bothered by the reported inaccessibility of the equalizer to Lee. Gene commented at this juncture that computer modeling of the room would allow Lee to assess each alternative (this would be the next level of work should we choose to move forward with it).

Sarah Lee Myracle – Very good report, written in language that she could understand. She appreciated the opinions given by Lee. She stated that Lee’s recognition of better hearing toward the front of the sanctuary confirms her experience. She suggested that a written report be prepared for the congregation condensed from Wayne Lee’s Summary and Recommendations section of the report, using Wayne’s own wording.

Don Myracle – An important part of the overall effort to improve the spoken word is the computer modeling of the room to understand whatever modifications need be made to the sound system, or room, to produce the best sound available for the money we can afford to spend. Equalization (see Hal’s comments) is a computer controlled aspect of our current sound system that requires software accessibility to see how it performs. That access can be provided to Lee by Real World Audio.

There have been comments from our services that it seems the senior pastor is kicking something on the pulpit during his sermons. The noise produced comes across the sound system as “hollow sounding pops.” Don said that Wayne Lee examined the headset microphone we use after the services and could find no visual problem with it. He theorized that it may be worn too close to the mouth and we are hearing voice air pressure from consonants such as “p”. Lee suggested that the microphone may need adjustment on the head and included an attachment to the report on the use of our ISOMAX E6 Omnidirectional microphone.

Lee was critical of the installation locations and alignment of our present speakers and has offered a method of adjustment of both if we elect to re-use instead of replacing them.

Gene Stewart – His interpretation of the report is that the room acoustics are good for our use but the problem is with the sound system (speakers, microphones and equalizer). The problem is exacerbated by the way we currently use the equipment. Gene also noted that Mr. Lee has reviewed and commented on the Hames Pro proposal offered last year. We have since received an amendment to that proposal that substituted Tannoy speakers for the EWA speakers offered there. Gene requested that Don forward this latest Hames Pro proposal to Mr. Lee.

Erwin Hittel was unavoidably absent from the meeting. He has submitted the following comments he wishes to be entered in the minutes:

“I am disappointed with the Sanctuary Acoustical and Sound System Evaluation Report for several reasons.

Most prominent in the criteria for determining the recommendation is organ acoustics.

Never mentioned or implied is the function of the church: "to make disciples of Jesus Christ," and the role the sanctuary and the spoken word plays in that overarching effort.

Subjective comments concerning the ability of the congregation to understand a speaker are based on the speaker's voice and do not adequately take into consideration that we intentionally involve lay speakers, youth and children without consideration for their untrained voices in our services.

There is no mention of the age of our congregation, and the inevitable impact that has on the need for acoustics that favor intelligibility of the spoken word.

There is no doubt that the ideal acoustics for organ music and voice are significantly different, possibly diametrically so. With two requirements, organ music and the spoken word requiring different acoustics, compromise is required. The report makes no compromise impacting organ music, but makes several, all considered minor, adversely affecting the spoken word.

There is no justification for providing less than the best possible acoustics for the spoken voice. The issue is how this can be done with the least negative impact to organ, choir and acoustical music.”

**Committee Consensus Opinion:** The committee recognized that the consultant’s opinion of equipment and installation costs for the four suggested options in the report ranged from \$8,000 to \$42,000. It also recognized that the computer modeling of the room would give us the best available information for determining the voice quality improvement to be gained from all four alternates. In other words the level of improvement versus the cost of improvement could be logically assessed. The cost of the modeling is expected to run around \$1,500. It is our understanding that the majority of that cost is in development of the model and, once development is complete, the cost of checking additional alternates is relatively small. There were some suggestions that, perhaps, two additional alternates could also be studied.

Sound Committee Meeting Minutes

May 5, 2009

Page 4 of 4

It was the consensus opinion of the committee for Don to discuss with the consultant his opinion of the most logical modeling needs and costs for this project, and potential costs if we were to add other alternates. Once that information is obtained, the chairman will poll the committee to see if we can move forward without an additional meeting until modeling results are available.

Report availability – The committee feels that the current document should be made available to any member of the congregation who wishes to review it and offer an opinion on it. In consideration of its size, and the number of congregants who are likely to want to review it in detail, it was decided to place two copies in the church library. A short summary article would be written for The Tie and the announcement of the report availability would be made there. If the requests for reviewing the document exceed this system of availability an alternate system will be devised.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charles Gilmore,  
Committee Recording Secretary