HARDING TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES REGULAR MEETING FEBRUARY 17, 2022 7:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

The Board Chair, Mr. Flanagan called the regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment to order at 7:00 and announced that adequate notice of the meeting had been made in accordance with the New Jersey State Open Public Meetings Act and State Executive Order 103.

REGULAR MEETING

<u>ROLL</u>

Ms. Taglairino called the roll. It went as follows:

Mr. Cammarata	Present	Mr. Newlin	Present	Mr. Maselli	Present
Mr. Addonizio	Present	Ms. Sovolos	Excused	Mr. Boyan	Present
Mr. Rosenbaum	Present	Mr. Symonds	Present	Mr. Flanagan	Present

Board Attorney, Mr. Hall, was on the phone for the memorialization of a resolution. Board Engineer, Mr. Fox and Board Planner, Ms. Mertz and Ms. Taglairino were also present. Attorney, Mr. Mlenak was present for the Verizon application.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Flanagan announced the following scheduling & procedural matters:

Application BOA# 14-20	Donald & Eliza Murphy
	49 Meyersville Road, B55/L5
	Status update: (Pending completeness)
Application BOA# 16-21	Ronald & Judith Preiss
	110 Village Road, B15/L10.03, R-1 Zone
	(Pending Completeness)
Application BOA #18-21	529 Waterfront Properties, LLC
	595 Van Beuren Road, B5/L8
	Appeal of Tree Officer Decision (Pending Completeness)
Application BOA# 02-21	Dr. James Wittig
	34 Kitchell Road B1/L5 R-1 Zone
	(Adjourned to the March 17, 2022 meeting).
Application BOA# 19-21	Andreas & Wendy Kertesz

19 Wildlife Run, B15/L22.04 (Adjourned to the March 17, 2022 meeting).

Mr. Flanagan reported on an administrative change in the municipal staff. He noted that zoning and land use will now report to Mr. DeNave, the Assistant Administrator.

<u>RESOLUTIONS</u>—Mr. Flanagan

Resolution BOA# 17-21	Timothy and Rebecca Daniels
	10 St. Clair Road, B 26.01/L33, R-1 Zone

Mr. Rosenbaum made a motion to approve_Resolution BOA# 17-2021 Daniels. It was seconded by Mr. Newlin. On a voice vote all were in favor of approving the resolution.

MINUTES

January 20, 2022 Minutes

Mr. Rosenbaum made a motion to approve the January 20, 2022 minutes as written. It was seconded by Mr. Flanagan. On a voice vote all were in favor of approving the minutes.

OLD BUSINESS

Application BOA# 17-18	New York SMSA Limited Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
	8 Millbrook Road, B17/L1, PL Zone Applicant requesting variance relief for use, per N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d) for a cell tower.

Presenting: Richard Schneider, Attorney Mr. Mlenak, Acting Board Attorney for this application. Robert Simon, Objecting attorney for this application. Dr. Bruce Eisenstein, RFP Specialist Ms. Boshulte, RF Specialist for Verizon

The applicant re-presented a proposal for a reduced tower of 80 feet in height.

Discussion ensued.

The application is carried until to a March 31, 2022 meeting with no further notice and an extension of the FCC Shot Clock.

A transcript of the testimony is appended to the minutes.

OTHER BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Flanagan adjourned the meeting at 9:30

Respectfully submitted by Lori Taglairino, Board of Adjustment Secretary

HARDING TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT RESOLUTION Timothy & Rebecca Daniels - Application No. BOA 017-21 10 St. Clair Road - Block 26.01, Lot 33 Adopted February 17, 2022

WHEREAS, Timothy and Rebecca Daniels applied to the Harding Township Board of Adjustment for variances from Section 225-115(B) of the Land Use and Development Ordinance, which prohibits the enlargement of certain nonconforming structures, and Section 225-122(F), which requires 100' side setbacks, to permit construction of a rear deck addition to the residence on property located at 10 St. Clair Road and designated on the Township Tax Map as Block 26.01, Lot 33; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment conducted a public hearing on the application at a meeting on January 20, 2022 at the Harding Township Municipal Building, for which public notice and notice by applicants were given as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment determined that a site inspection was not necessary due to the characteristics of this property and proposal; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment considered the testimony and exhibits presented during the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, at the meeting on January 20, 2022, the Board of Adjustment adopted an oral resolution approving the variance application, subject to certain conditions and based on findings and conclusions as memorialized herein;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Harding Township Board of Adjustment, this 17th day of February 2022, that approval of the variance application of Timothy and Rebecca Daniels is hereby memorialized as follows:

Findings of Fact and Statement of Reasons

1. The applicants' property is located in a R-1 Zone at 10 St. Clair Road. It is improved with a single-family residence, swimming pool and related residential improvements.

2. It has a lot size of 3.326 acres that exceeds the 3 acre minimum. The lot fronts on the cul-de-sac bulb at the end of St. Clair Road. The lot frontage of 81.7' is nonconforming relative to the 300' minimum.

3. The residential improvements are nonconforming as to setbacks from the right side lot line for the residence (82.5' vs. 100' minimum) and the pool deck (53.4' vs. 100' minimum). A nonconforming shed that straddles the right side lot line would be removed from the property or moved to a conforming location.

4. The applicant proposed to construct an elevated deck addition to the rear of the residence, with a stairway to the rear going down to grade level. Due to the downward sloping topography, the elevated deck would be accessed from the first floor of the residence containing the primary common living areas. An existing stairway to the right side of the residence would be removed.

5. The existing and proposed improvements were shown on plans prepared by John Ferrante, P.E., dated September 23, 2021.

6. The deck addition would have a minimum setback from the right side lot line of 77.7', requiring a variance from the 100' minimum setback requirement in Section 225-122(F).

7. Variance relief is also required from Section 225-115(B) to permit enlargement of the nonconforming residence.

8. The applicant was represented in proceedings before the Board of Adjustment by David Scalera, Esq.

9. Testimony in support of the application was provided by the applicants, who explained the proposal.

10. The present low profile appearance for the front of the residence would not be altered, since all improvements would be to the rear. Even though a side setback variance was requested, the deck would mainly expand the residence to the rear, with only a modest increase of about 4' in the side setback relative to the building façade for the residence. Any potential impact would be offset by elimination of a stairway along the side of the residence with a similar nonconforming setback.

11. There was a discussion of the proposed elevated rear stairway that would project into the rear yard. The applicants agreed to reconfigure the stairway so that it would run parallel to and abutting the deck.

12. The applicants also agreed to move the nonconforming shed to a conforming location on the property or remove

it.

13. No neighbor or member of the public objected to the application.

14. The need for setback variance relief for the proposed deck is due to the nonconforming location of the residence and the interior layout of existing improvements. The proposed deck and patio are modest in size, and it would not be practical to site them at a more conforming location on the property.

15. Reconfiguration of the proposed rear stairway, relocation of the shed, and removal of the existing stairway at the side of the residence would mitigate any potential adverse impact of the requested variance relief.

16. The proposed improvements will not result in any adverse impacts on adjacent property, particularly since all improvements will be to the rear and there will be no change to the low level front appearance of the residence.

17. In the case of this specific property and the location of the existing and proposed improvements, strict application of the zoning requirements would impose peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties on the applicants by precluding the

proposed rear deck, thus making variance relief appropriate pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(1).

18. The variance relief requested by the applicants can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance of the Township of Harding.

Description of Variances

1. A variance is hereby granted from Section 225-115(B) of the Land Use and Development Ordinance to allow enlargement of the applicants' nonconforming residence by construction of a rear deck addition, as shown on plans prepared by John Ferrante, P.E., last dated September 23, 2021, and required to be revised as a condition of this approval.

2. A variance is hereby granted from the 100' minimum setback requirement in Section 225-122(F) of the Ordinance to authorize construction of a rear deck addition with a minimum setback from the right side lot line of 77.7', as shown on the plans as required to be revised.

Variance Conditions

1. The applicants shall obtain any other necessary approvals, including but not limited to a building permit and tree removal permit (if applicable).

2. Any outstanding technical review fees shall be paid prior to issuance of a building permit and certificate of occupancy.

3. These variances are based on and authorize only the specific proposed improvements as set forth in the testimony, application and plans. New or amended variance approval may be required for any materially different improvements.

4. The applicants' plans shall be revised to: (a) show modification of proposed elevated rear stairway to show it running parallel and immediately adjacent to the deck; (2) revise the plan note to state that the nonconforming shed will be relocated to a conforming location on the property; (3) make any necessary adjustments to the zoning table. The revised plans shall be subject to review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit, and shed relocation shall occur prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the deck addition.

5. In accordance with Section 225-35(C)(1) of the Ordinance, these variances shall expire unless the authorized construction is commenced within one year from the date of this resolution and is subsequently pursued in a reasonably diligent manner.

6. Compliance with all approval conditions shall be addressed by the Zoning Officer, who shall provide written confirmation for the municipal records.

Vote on Resolutions

For the Oral Resolution: Addonizio, Maselli, Newlin, Rosenbaum, Sovolos, Symonds & Flanagan.

Against the Oral Resolution: None.

For the Form of the Written Resolution: Addonizio, Maselli, Newlin, Rosenbaum, Sovolos, Symonds & Flanagan.

Against the Form of the Written Resolution: None.

Page 1	Page 2
HARDING TOWNSHIP	1 A P P E A R A N C E S:
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT	2 CDEENDAUNA DOWE CMITH & DAVIG LUD
IN THE MATTER OF: : TRANSCRIPT :	GREENBAUM, ROWE, SMITH & DAVIS, LLP 3 BY: STEVEN G. MLENAK, ESQUIRE
CASE: BOA# 17-18 : OF New York SMSA Limited Partnership:	Attorneys for the Board
D/b/a Verizon Wireless : PROCEEDINGS Millbrook Road :	4 5 VOGEL, CHAIT, COLLINS & SCHNEIDER, ESQUIRES
Block 17; Lot 1; PL Zone : X	BY: RICHARD SCHNEIDER, ESQUIRE
Thursday, February 17, 2022	6 Attorneys for the Applicant
Municipal Building	7 HEROLD LAW, PA
21 Blue Mill Road New Vernon, NJ 07976	8 BY: ROBERT F. SIMON, ESQUIRE
Commencing at 7:15 p.m.	Attorneys for the Objectors: SGSL, LLC; Harsh and
BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:	 9 Nina Bansal; Michael and Susan Koeneke; David and Eunice Conine; Brian and
MIKE FLANAGAN, Chairman ALF NEWLIN	10 Christina McKittrick; Livio Saganic and
DAN MASELLI THOMAS ADDONIZIO	Christel Engel; James M. Carifa and
ARIC ROSENBAUM	11 Sarah G. Conine; Ted Cotton
GEORGE BOYAN HUGH SYMONDS	13
MICHAEL CAMMARATA	14
ALSO PRESENT:	15
LORI TAGLAIRINO, Board Administrator	17
PAUL D. FOX, P.E., CME McKINLEY MERTZ, PP, AICP	18
DR. BRUCE EISENSTEIN, Cellular Communications Consultant	19 20
IRIS LaROSA,	21
Certified Shorthand Reporter	22
PRECISION REPORTING SERVICE Certified Shorthand Reporters	23 24
(908) 642-4299	25
Page 3	Page 4
1 INDEX	1 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Welcome everyone to our
2	2 regularly scheduled meeting noticed in the Observer
3	3 Tribune and other outlets. And tonight is
Mr. Paul Fox, P.ESworn Page 5	4 February 17th. Lori, will you call the roll?
4 Ms. McKinley Mertz, P.PSworn Page 6	5 SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. Mr. Boyan?
6	6 BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Here.
7	7 SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Addonizio?
8 E X H I B I T S	8 BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Here.
9	9 SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Ms. Sovolos is
EXHIBIT DESCRIPTION PAGE	10 excused. Mr. Maselli?
10	11 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Here.
11 12	12 SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Make sure you use
13	13 your microphone, people. Mr. Cammarata?
14	14 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: Here.
15	15 SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Thank you. Mr.
PUBLIC MEMBERS ARE SWORN:	 16 Rosenbaum? 17 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Here.
16	17 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Here. 18 SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Symonds?
17 18	19 BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Here.
19	20 SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Newlin?
20	21 BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Here.
21	22 SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Flanagan?
22	23 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I am here.
23	24 SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: And McKinley and
3.1	
24 25	25 Ms. Mertz and Mr. Fox are here. We will get to you and

	Page 5		Page 6
1	get you sworn in at some point. All right.	1	M c K I N L E Y M E R T Z, P.P., is duly
2	Administrative.	2	sworn.
3	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So tonight the	3	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Thank you.
4	only application we have is Verizon. Before we get to	4	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So now
5	that we're going to do a little bit of housekeeping	5	we're on Verizon. Mr. Schneider welcome back. Happy
6	upfront.	6	New Year. Is it too late to say that?
7	(Whereupon, the Board discusses	7	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Make sure you put
8	Administrative matters at this time.)	8	your microphone on and make sure you speak into it
9	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Steve, there was a	9	loudly and clearly.
10	request just so you know that Ms. Mertz and Mr. Fox	10	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Lunar New Year, is it
11	were not here at the last meeting and they have not	11	too late too?
12	been sworn in as professionals. We were wondering if	12	MR. SCHNEIDER: Happy New Year.
13	you can swear them in for the purposes of the	13	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Thank you. Welcome
14	application this evening?	14	back. So tonight what are we going to talk about?
15	MR. MLENAK: Sure. Do you want to do it	15	MR. SCHNEIDER: I think we'll be brief, but
16	together? Let's start for the record so we know who's	16	best laid plans sometimes go astray.
17	being sworn in for the record, your name.	17	Good evening. Once again for the record,
18	MR. FOX: Paul Fox.	18	Richard Schneider of law firm of Vogel, Chait, Collins
19	MS. MERTZ: McKinley Mertz.	19	and Schneider on behalf of the Applicant New York SMSA
20	MR. MLENAK: Okay. Do you swear that the	20	Limited Partnership doing business as Verizon Wireless.
21	testimony that you may give during this hearing is the	21	Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, as you
22	truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth?	22	I'm sure all recall when we last convened it was at the
23	MR. FOX: I do.	23	Board's December meeting, at which time the Board
24	MS. MERTZ: I do.	24	engaged in its deliberative process as to whether
25	PAUL FOX, P.E., is duly sworn.	25	approve whether to approve or to deny the
	Demo 7		
	Page 7		Page 8
1	application that was pending before the Board.	1	Page 8 structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid
1 2	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't	1 2	
	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made	1	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid
2	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't	2	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the
2 3	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made	2 3	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition
2 3 4	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended	2 3 4 5 6	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains
2 3 4 5	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet.	2 3 4 5	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the
2 3 4 5 6	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant	2 3 4 5 6	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless
2 3 4 5 6 7	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's	2 3 4 5 6 7	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12 public hearings of the 22 or so that we have had, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is prepared to ultimately and necessary avail itself of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12 public hearings of the 22 or so that we have had, I don't think it requires a lot of further explanation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is prepared to ultimately and necessary avail itself of all remedies if it has not obtained approval, it very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12 public hearings of the 22 or so that we have had, I don't think it requires a lot of further explanation tonight, at the 2100 frequency band, that being the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is prepared to ultimately and necessary avail itself of all remedies if it has not obtained approval, it very much sincerely wishes to avoid potential litigation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12 public hearings of the 22 or so that we have had, I don't think it requires a lot of further explanation tonight, at the 2100 frequency band, that being the higher frequency band at the 80 feet there is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is prepared to ultimately and necessary avail itself of all remedies if it has not obtained approval, it very much sincerely wishes to avoid potential litigation. Therefore, the Applicant in my opinion has made a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12 public hearings of the 22 or so that we have had, I don't think it requires a lot of further explanation tonight, at the 2100 frequency band, that being the higher frequency band at the 80 feet there is essentially no reliable coverage at the Harding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is prepared to ultimately and necessary avail itself of all remedies if it has not obtained approval, it very much sincerely wishes to avoid potential litigation. Therefore, the Applicant in my opinion has made a significant compromise that it wishes to very simply	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12 public hearings of the 22 or so that we have had, I don't think it requires a lot of further explanation tonight, at the 2100 frequency band, that being the higher frequency band at the 80 feet there is essentially no reliable coverage at the Harding Township Elementary School. That's the crux of what is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is prepared to ultimately and necessary avail itself of all remedies if it has not obtained approval, it very much sincerely wishes to avoid potential litigation. Therefore, the Applicant in my opinion has made a significant compromise that it wishes to very simply put forward to the Board.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12 public hearings of the 22 or so that we have had, I don't think it requires a lot of further explanation tonight, at the 2100 frequency band, that being the higher frequency band at the 80 feet there is essentially no reliable coverage at the Harding Township Elementary School. That's the crux of what is lost at 80 feet versus the higher height, and it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is prepared to ultimately and necessary avail itself of all remedies if it has not obtained approval, it very much sincerely wishes to avoid potential litigation. Therefore, the Applicant in my opinion has made a significant compromise that it wishes to very simply put forward to the Board. The Applicant is prepared to, as a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12 public hearings of the 22 or so that we have had, I don't think it requires a lot of further explanation tonight, at the 2100 frequency band, that being the higher frequency band at the 80 feet there is essentially no reliable coverage at the Harding Township Elementary School. That's the crux of what is lost at 80 feet versus the higher height, and it's primarily to draw the distinction a loss in coverage at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	application that was pending before the Board. Objectively, I think the takeaway, I don't think this is in dispute was, I think the Board made clear at least to myself and I don't think it's in dispute, that there were not sufficient votes, five being required, to obtain approval at the amended proposed height of 120 feet. Summarily, the Board asked the Applicant what it wished to do in response to the Board's deliberative process, whether the Applicant wished to proceed to a vote or to reconsider the application, specifically as it related to the proposed height. The applicant in response to the clear message from the Board did review the matter substantially internally as to what it wished to do in response. In an effort frankly, honestly, and with no undue respect to the Board, while the Applicant is prepared to ultimately and necessary avail itself of all remedies if it has not obtained approval, it very much sincerely wishes to avoid potential litigation. Therefore, the Applicant in my opinion has made a significant compromise that it wishes to very simply put forward to the Board.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	structure to 80 feet. If you recall the original bid was 140. We amended it during the course of the application to 120. We are now offering as a condition of approval to lower the height to 80 feet. I would make the following additional comments in that regard. The Applicant remains committed to honoring the Board's preferences as to the design of the tower, whether that be a flagless flagpole, akin to that which is located at the Green Village Fire Department, or the King Shopping Center, or a stealth tree as was discussed and presented during the course of the public hearing. The impact of lowering the height from the previously amended 120 to 80 does have some impacts on the nature of the coverage. Primarily and summarily, and this has been the subject of probably ten to 12 public hearings of the 22 or so that we have had, I don't think it requires a lot of further explanation tonight, at the 2100 frequency band, that being the higher frequency band at the 80 feet there is essentially no reliable coverage at the Harding Township Elementary School. That's the crux of what is lost at 80 feet versus the higher height, and it's

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

	Page 9		Page 10
1	capacity.	1	slang expression, while you may get more bang for the
2	The Applicant clearly would have preferred	2	buck at the higher height the point being that when
3	the higher height. There was, and I remember this	3	you're talking about a flagpole the ten or 20 feet from
4	vividly, there was a lot of discussion during many of	4	the Applicant's perspective is not a significant visual
5	the public hearings as to whether practically speaking,	5	impact when you're using a stealth design verse the
6	not legally speaking, but practically speaking from a	6	increase in coverage. We think it's a fair tradeoff to
7	visual impact whether the added coverage is appropriate	7	have the better coverage at the higher height when
8	when you're only talking about a 20-foot increase in a		you're talking only 20 feet in differences in height,
	design mode of a flagpole. That being said, the Board	8	
9		9	especially when you're talking about a flagpole.
10	collectively had a certainly different opinion as	10	I think from the Applicant's perspective,
11	reflected in its deliberative process in December.	11	Mr. Newlin, I had the opportunity to review the photo
12	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Rich, I'm sorry. Can	12	sims that we presented. And if you will recall, as I
13	you re-explain that point?	13	know you would, we presented three photo sims: 140,
14	MR. SCHNEIDER: Sure.	14	120 and 100 early on in the process. As I reflect on
15	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I didn't quite	15	it the visual impact between, the 20-foot intervals is
16	follow.	16	not significant. Once you recognize that there's going
17	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. I'd be glad to, Mr.	17	to be a structure of a certain height the 20 feet from
18	Newlin. I apologize if I didn't make that clear.	18	the Applicant's perspective and from my advocacy
19	I guess what I was trying to say is I think	19	perspective is not significant. So we think that the
20	it was an honest and fair discussion during the public	20	additional height justifies the better coverage.
21	hearing that clearly, and I'm speaking not as an expert	21	The Board came to a different conclusion in
22	RF witness, but based on the testimony clearly there is	22	December. I mean, I think that's obvious, and we can
23	some degree of coverage differences between 80, 100 and	23	agree to disagree. So what the Applicant is coming
24	120. And maybe I didn't say this in an articulate	24	back to is saying we can agree to disagree, but in an
25	manner. What I was trying to say was I think, to use a	25	effort to provide still a reasonable degree of reliable
	Page 11		Page 12
1	coverage, albeit not what we think is appropriate and	1	school that cannot be resolved by an ODAS
2	necessary, we're prepared to propose an 80-foot	2	implementation. You cannot, I think as Ms. Boschulte
3	structure with the understanding, and I don't think	3	testified, it's not a scenario whereby you could
4	there's any respectful disagreement about this, that	4	install 20 nodes around the Harding Township Elementary
5	there are some constraints and limitations on the	5	School.
6	coverage that is being offered at 80.	6	But be that as it may, the Applicant has
7	We have been very, I think, upfront about	7	made the internal determination that to provide a
8	what those differences are. Specifically, Mr. Newlin	8	degree of reliable coverage to get a site on air in
9	and I had a back and forth about that through a couple	9	Harding Township and to avoid, with all due respect, a
10	of public hearings. And A-21 in Section 5 lays it all	10	lot of money being spent by a lot of different people
11	out in terms of what the difference is between 80, 100	11	at the taxpayers' expense, that we're prepared to
12	and 120 both at the lower frequency band that being the	12	proceed with what I've offered as a condition of
13	seven or 850 verse the 2100. And simply stated in that	13	approval. I can only sincerely hope in a hopefully
14	regard, and I quote from the report from Ms. Boschulte,	14	civil offer that that is looked upon favorably as an
15	"80 feet covers the same as 120. I'm talking about the	15	appropriate compromise to provide a very to provide
16	higher frequency bands, with the exception of the	16	a degree of reliable coverage that will provide
17	following areas." And the basic point there is it's at	17	coverage to a good portion of Harding, albeit not what
± /	tonowing areas. And the basic point there is it's at	[⊥] ′	coverage to a good portion of Harding, about not wildt

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we originally contemplated.

tonight to answer any question.

And I do not -- I think after 23 hearings

Boschulte. You've heard from your recognized expert

supplemental testimony, although Ms. Boschulte is here

Dr. Eisenstein. And I do not intend to have any

we have either informed you, bored you, or somewhere in

between with ample RF testimony. You've heard from Ms.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Harding Township School.

The last comment I'll make in that regard

capacity that would address the deficiency in coverage

interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at

is this. There is no ODAS solution relative to

the 80 feet. That's something that if the Board --

excuse me, that if the Board is inclined to accept

there still will be a deficiency in coverage at the

	Page 13		Page 14
1	Let me make one other comment. Putting	1	thing, but one last thing. That collocation concept is
2	aside the height of the tower every other stipulated	2	somewhat different if the Board was otherwise inclined
3	condition that I offered remains offered as a condition	3	to approve a tree design. The reason for that is under
4	of approval. And I will I neglected to make one	4	the tree design all of the antennas are at one
5	other advocacy argument. Not withstanding the	5	elevation. So under that scenario Verizon
6	compromise that's being offered by the Applicant as a	6	hypothetically would be at 80 feet and there will be
7	condition of approval, the reality is, and I say this	7	collocation possibilities at 70 and 60 feet because
8	in full disclosure, going to the 80-foot height, and	8	we're only taking one elevation.
9	I'll play RF engineer for 30 seconds, but just to	9	I offer that to the Board hopefully in the
10	refresh in the year 2022, if we end up with a flagpole,	10	spirit of compromise in an effort to bring to closure
11	flagless flagpole, as you recall we need to take two	11	what's approaching a three-year process, albeit
12	elevations. In other words, because all the antennas	12	objectively interrupted by the Pandemic. I would just
13	can't fit at one elevation. So we would essentially be	13	respectfully ask that you give that matter due an
14	taking 80 feet and 70 feet.	14	appropriate consideration based on what I just
15	The point I'm making in that regard is	15	articulated. Thank you.
16	objectively it significantly limits the collocation	16	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So two
17	possibilities of other carriers. That's ultimately not	17	questions, and going back to the school and the
18	a concern of Verizon Wireless other than our offer to	18	coverage. I know we had testimony from Chief Heller
19	make it obviously, and we're required to make it	19	and others I think probably from an RF expert, Dr.
20	available under your ordinance to other collocators at	20	Eisenstein, and I remember specifically with Chief
21	prevailing market rates under both our lease and the	21	Heller that even their radios didn't work inside the
22	ordinance, and we do that at 80 feet we do	22	building. They attributed it to the fact that it was
23	practically lose the significant collocation	23	masonry walls, et cetera. So I wonder even if the
24	possibility.	24	tower were at 120 would you have had reliable
25	Never trust a lawyer when he says one last	25	in-building coverage at neg 95 dBa?
20	Never trust a lawyer when he says one last	25	in-ounding coverage at neg 75 uba.
	Page 15		D 16
	iage is		Page 16
1	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is	1	you're saying?
1 2	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes.	1 2	-
	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120		you're saying?
2	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't.	2	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior
2 3	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120	2 3	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80.
2 3 4	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for	2 3 4	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior
2 3 4 5	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest	2 3 4 5	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for	2 3 4 5 6	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is	2 3 4 5 6 7	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of – I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of – I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all building structures including the Harding Township	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all building structures including the Harding Township School."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes, that's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of – I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all building structures including the Harding Township School."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes, that's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I think it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all building structures including the Harding Township School."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes, that's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I think it's probably I don't need testimony, but I just want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all building structures including the Harding Township School."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes, that's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I think it's probably I don't need testimony, but I just want to know if you know. We're talking about in-building
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all building structures including the Harding Township School." So there's in-building coverage at 120 at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes, that's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I think it's probably I don't need testimony, but I just want to know if you know. We're talking about in-building versus out-of-building coverage. Knowing the testimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all building structures including the Harding Township School." So there's in-building coverage at 120 at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: But you just said at 80, right, the deficiency with 80 is at 2100, not at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes, that's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I think it's probably I don't need testimony, but I just want to know if you know. We're talking about in-building versus out-of-building coverage. Knowing the testimony we have from Chief Heller and Dr. Eisenstein and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all building structures including the Harding Township School." So there's in-building coverage at 120 at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm building coverage at 120 at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm building coverage at 120 at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes, that's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I think it's probably I don't need testimony, but I just want to know if you know. We're talking about in-building versus out-of-building coverage. Knowing the testimony we have from Chief Heller and Dr. Eisenstein and others, given the fact that construction of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe the answer is yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So in-building at 120 but when you go to 80 you don't. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right. And in the interest of I think I've been honest with the Board for three, for over three years. What you just said is correct, but let me draw a distinction in the interest of full disclosure. Coverage would be provided at 120 interior to the Harding Township Elementary School at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, I'm looking right now, Mr. Chairman, at the report Exhibit A-21. At 120 the testimony and the narrative says "coverage would be provided to all building structures including the Harding Township School." So there's in-building coverage at 120 at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. In fact, in-building coverage at 120 at the lower frequency band, not at the higher frequency band. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: But you just said at 80, right, the deficiency with 80 is at 2100, not at the lower frequency band.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 you're saying? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's what I heard. MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. No, 120 you are getting at 120 you are getting interior coverage at the higher frequency band, not at 80. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You are getting. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So a 120-foot tower you get in-building coverage at both the high and low frequency band? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: At 80 feet you'll get in-building coverage at the low frequency band but not at the high, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. Yes, that's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. I think it's probably I don't need testimony, but I just want to know if you know. We're talking about in-building versus out-of-building coverage. Knowing the testimony we have from Chief Heller and Dr. Eisenstein and others, given the fact that construction of the building, is it safe to assume one would have coverage

	Page 17		Page 18
1	MR. SCHNEIDER: I think the answer is yes,	1	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Can we quantify
2	that there would be coverage exterior to the building;	2	that? Is it a difference between 10,000 at 20,000
3	correct.	3	poles or is it between five and 50?
4	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. So the tradeoff	4	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There's a difference.
5	that we face is between 120 and 80 at the school. They	5	I mean, I don't know, if I want to get into it.
6	are the same regarding outside spaces. It is the same	6	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, that's a
7	regarding with regard to the low frequency band.	7	pretty technical question.
8	The only difference now between 80 and 120 is you will	8	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: All right. I'll
9	not get the higher frequency band inside the school.	9	withdraw it.
10	All right.	10	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: You know, okay. That
11	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I have a followup	11	was my one question regarding the school coverage. And
12	on that. So are modern devices, do they require to	12	I know part of our analysis, and you heard it and
13	support both frequencies? Is there a time frame where	13	you've seen it. Actually, Steve had summarized sort of
14	one frequency is not	14	the thought process we went through it I think pretty
15	MR. SCHNEIDER: I think Ms. Boschulte	15	thoroughly the last time.
16	testified to that at length, but the big issue is	16	One of the questions, or two of the
17	let me play out this scenario. When you're dealing	17	questions, the first is, is there a gap? Right. Yes.
18	with, God forbid, an emergency situation, God forbid,	18	Let's for argument sake say there is. I don't think
19	the issue is the at the higher frequency band you	19	anyone disputes that.
20	have as Ms. Boschulte testified significant	20	The next question is, does the tower
21	greater capacity. So God forbid there was some	21	propose to fill that gap? And I'm paraphrasing, Steve,
22	emergent situation which required in-building reliable	22	tell me. But so my question to you, and I think we
23	coverage, while you may be able to achieve that	23	need to answer in the affirmative and both. So the
24	coverage, while you may be able to achieve that	24	question is, does an 80-foot tower fill the gap that
25	able to do that for capacity reasons at higher	25	you see?
20	uble to do that for exploring reasons at higher		you see.
	Page 19		Page 20
1	Page 19 MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the	1	_
1 2	-	1	Page 20 that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this
	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the		that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but
2	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end.	2	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this
2 3	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be	2 3	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer
2 3 4	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right?	2 3 4	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat.
2 3 4 5	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter).	2 3 4 5	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to
2 3 4 5 6	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my	2 3 4 5 6	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says?	2 3 4 5 6 7	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed fill that gap? Right. So we need to answer both of those questions, I believe, in the affirmative that yes there is a gap and yes the tower does fill that gap.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands of dollars to avail ourselves of maybe something we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed fill that gap? Right. So we need to answer both of those questions, I believe, in the affirmative that yes there is a gap and yes the tower does fill that gap. Because if the tower doesn't fill the gap there's no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands of dollars to avail ourselves of maybe something we think we're entitled to. But we want in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed fill that gap? Right. So we need to answer both of those questions, I believe, in the affirmative that yes there is a gap and yes the tower does fill that gap.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands of dollars to avail ourselves of maybe something we think we're entitled to. But we want in this industry it's very critical to get the coverage to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed fill that gap? Right. So we need to answer both of those questions, I believe, in the affirmative that yes there is a gap and yes the tower does fill that gap. Because if the tower doesn't fill the gap there's no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands of dollars to avail ourselves of maybe something we think we're entitled to. But we want in this industry it's very critical to get the coverage to market in a reasonable time frame. Perhaps not made
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed of does the tower that is being proposed fill that gap? Right. So we need to answer both of those questions, I believe, in the affirmative that yes there is a gap and yes the tower does fill that gap. Because if the tower doesn't fill the gap there's no point in approving it. That seems to be the logic to ine. So my question to you is, does this 80-foot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands of dollars to avail ourselves of maybe something we think we're entitled to. But we want in this industry it's very critical to get the coverage to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed fill that gap? Right. So we need to answer both of those questions, I believe, in the affirmative that yes there is a gap and yes the tower does fill that gap. Because if the tower doesn't fill the gap there's no point in approving it. That seems to be the logic to me. So my question to you is, does this 80-foot tower you're proposing fill your gap and allow us to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands of dollars to avail ourselves of maybe something we think we're entitled to. But we want in this industry it's very critical to get the coverage to market in a reasonable time frame. Perhaps not made clear during the course of the public hearing process, because ultimately I don't know that it's that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed of those questions, I believe, in the affirmative that yes there is a gap and yes the tower does fill that gap. Because if the tower doesn't fill the gap there's no point in approving it. That seems to be the logic to me. So my question to you is, does this 80-foot tower you're proposing fill your gap and allow us to answer in the affirmative to that second question?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands of dollars to avail ourselves of maybe something we think we're entitled to. But we want in this industry it's very critical to get the coverage to market in a reasonable time frame. Perhaps not made clear during the course of the public hearing process, because ultimately I don't know that it's that significant, but it is worth knowing, and I was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: I trailed off right at the end. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I know. I can be boring, right? MR. SCHNEIDER: No, no. (Laughter). CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you imagine what my wife says? MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe as I turned over 60 my hearing is going. That could be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So real quickly, two-step analysis, there are several questions we need to answer: One is, isn't there a gap? I think we all think that there is a gap. The next question is, is the tower that's being proposed or does the tower that is being proposed fill that gap? Right. So we need to answer both of those questions, I believe, in the affirmative that yes there is a gap and yes the tower does fill that gap. Because if the tower doesn't fill the gap there's no point in approving it. That seems to be the logic to me. So my question to you is, does this 80-foot tower you're proposing fill your gap and allow us to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that the entirety of the gap is not filled, but nevertheless a gap is filled. Let me answer it this way, Mr. Chairman. I'm not going to play my lawyer hat. If 80 feet provided us no benefit to address the gap, in other words if it didn't address the gap in any meaningful way, we wouldn't be offering it. It would be of no purpose. So I wouldn't be here I would have taken my denial in December. So the practical decision is it fills a portion of the gap, albeit not the entirety of the gap, but like everything, I don't want to say in life, but maybe everything in certain portions of the Land Use Law sometimes Applicants make a decision as to what's reasonable to accept. If you have a pie you don't get to eat the whole pie, but you accept a portion of the pie because it takes us 18 months or so and thousands of dollars to avail ourselves of maybe something we think we're entitled to. But we want in this industry it's very critical to get the coverage to market in a reasonable time frame. Perhaps not made clear during the course of the public hearing process, because ultimately I don't know that it's that

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

	Page 21		Page 22
1	The efforts of the Applicant to site a	1	We have had a lot of discussion about the 20 percent
2	facility in Harding did not commence in 2017 with the	2	increase and as of right, et cetera, et cetera. So are
3	public bid process. I forget whether it was you, Mr.	3	you proposing an 80-foot tower that would be prohibited
4	Chairman, or Mr. Newlin. Somebody mentioned many years	4	in some fashion from growing taller than 80 feet?
5	ago in the early 2000s	5	MR. SCHNEIDER: What I'm I'm offering an
6	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It was him.	6	80-foot tower, and if the Board sought to impose as a
7	MR. SCHNEIDER: that there was actually	7	either a recommendation or a condition that I go to the
8	a	8	governing body and seek their approval not to authorize
9	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Rich, can I ask you?	9	an extension I'd be amenable to doing that.
10	What question are you answering? I'm serious. We have	10	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And there's law around
11	got a lot of stuff to go over.	11	this. As I understood it at one point we cannot impose
12	MR. SCHNEIDER: Okay. The point is that	12	such a condition, but how does that magic happen?
13	Verizon's been making an effort to locate a facility in	13	MR. SCHNEIDER: In do you want to go,
14	Harding since the early 2000s. That was my point. And	14	Steve?
15	there comes a point in time where you want a hundred	15	MR. MLENAK: Go ahead.
16	percent but you don't get a hundred percent. That was	16	MR. SCHNEIDER: In my opinion the Board
		17	• •
17	my point.		cannot impose that requirement, but the township as a
18	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And that seems logical	18	landlord or land owner, acting in a proprietary
19	and reasonable. I asked the question because the law	19	capacity not in a governmental capacity, would have the
20	requires me to ask it, so that's why I asked it.	20	right to limit the height of the tower if it was so
21	MR. SCHNEIDER: And I was long-winded and I	21	inclined.
22	apologize.	22	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then mechanically
23	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: One final thing, I	23	how would this happen? We would put, I guess, or could
24	guess, for me, or maybe not final, but the next thing	24	put a condition saying we condition this approval on
25	on the top of my mind is, we talked about the height.	25	the Applicant going back to the landlord, and informing
	Page 23		Page 24
		1	raye 24
1	the township committee that this Board would like to	1	-
1 2	_	1 2	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So
	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore		can't hear you. I'm sorry.
2	the township committee that this Board would like to	2	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So
2 3	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it	2 3	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then
2 3 4	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the	2 3 4	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition?
2 3 4 5	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this?	2 3 4 5	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If
2 3 4 5 6	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have	2 3 4 5 6	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at
2 3 4 5 6 7	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better.	2 3 4 5 6 7	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually the town enters into a lease and if the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually the town enters into a lease and if the town and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease they can change that condition?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually the town enters into a lease and if the town and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can negotiate that out.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually the town enters into a lease and if the town and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease they can change that condition? MR. MLENAK: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If it wasn't in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can negotiate that out. MR. MLENAK: Theoretically.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually – the town enters into a lease and if the town – and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease they can change that condition? MR. MLENAK: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If it wasn't in there, let's say 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can negotiate that out. MR. MLENAK: Theoretically. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So do we put something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually the town enters into a lease and if the town and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease they can change that condition? MR. MLENAK: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If it wasn't in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can negotiate that out. MR. MLENAK: Theoretically. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So do we put something in our resolution that says the Board recommends that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually the town enters into a lease and if the town and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease they can change that condition? MR. MLENAK: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If it wasn't in there, let's say CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what wasn't in there? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can negotiate that out. MR. MLENAK: Theoretically. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So do we put something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually the town enters into a lease and if the town and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease they can change that condition? MR. MLENAK: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If it wasn't in there, let's say CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what wasn't in there? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can negotiate that out. MR. MLENAK: Theoretically. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So do we put something in our resolution that says the Board recommends that the township amend the lease to prohibit it from being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually the town enters into a lease and if the town and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease they can change that condition? MR. MLENAK: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If it wasn't in there, let's say CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what wasn't in there? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can negotiate that out. MR. MLENAK: Theoretically. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So do we put something in our resolution that says the Board recommends that the township amend the lease to prohibit it from being taller than 80 feet?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the township committee that this Board would like to see that tower be no taller than 80 feet, and therefore ask the Township Committee to restrict the lease so it could not be taller than 80 feet. Is that the condition we put on this? MR. SCHNEIDER: Exactly. I couldn't have said it better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And does that protect us, Steve? MR. MLENAK: Yes. The condition would be tied to the proprietary interest and the amendment of the lease. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The town could actually the town enters into a lease and if the town and if Verizon decided to negotiate the lease they can change that condition? MR. MLENAK: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If it wasn't in there, let's say CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what wasn't in there? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Okay. I'm sorry. So I'm looking at the scenarios so we can cut to the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 can't hear you. I'm sorry. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Sorry. Okay. So that if if that condition is in the lease then CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Be more specific. If what condition? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: The height limit at 80 feet, the town can put in the lease and Verizon can agree to it, we cannot require that, is that true? MR. MLENAK: That is true. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So how do we get from a approval if we do, to that? Leap of faith, right? We can ask for it, but we can't require it. MR. MLENAK: Yes. Exactly. They can do that and to your point at some point later they're two private parties. The Town is BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Next week they can negotiate that out. MR. MLENAK: Theoretically. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So do we put something in our resolution that says the Board recommends that the township amend the lease to prohibit it from being taller than 80 feet? MR. MLENAK: You can.

	Page 25		Page 26
1	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes. And then it goes	1	provision here would be the FCC order and it's a
2	back to the Township Committee.	2	20-foot automatic right of extension. So long as it
3	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Let's look at it with	3	so long as it doesn't materially defeat any concealment
4	the cases there. Let's say we don't have this in there	4	efforts. In other words, which wouldn't be applicable
5	at all and they enter into a lease at 80 feet. There's	5	here. In other words, if it's a flagpole or a tree as
6	nothing in there in the lease that says they can't go	6	long as you maintain the same stealth structure you do
7	above. Wouldn't they have to go back to the town and	7	have the automatic right you have the automatic
8	get approval anyway to go above 80?	8	right to increase it by 20 feet, as long as you
9	MR. MLENAK: I believe their lease already	9	maintain the flagpole or the tree.
10	permits 140, right?	10	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So logistically if
11	MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct.	11	this Board was okay with 80 feet, I'm still not saying
12	MR. MLENAK: So they wouldn't have to come	12	we are, but if we are, then the way you mechanically
13	back.	13	get to 80 is you approach 60, don't you, 60 with the 20
14	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm sorry.	14	add-on?
15	Mathematically, what's the add-on?	15	MR. MLENAK: No.
16	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think 20 percent as	16	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Why not?
17	of right.	17	MR. MLENAK: Because you'll be approving
18	MR. SCHNEIDER: As a matter of law under	18	something that's not supported on the record. It's an
19	FCC regulations for towers located outside the public	19	indirect.
20	right-of-way we have a right to increase the height of	20	DR. EISENSTEIN: Maybe I can straighten it
21	the tower by 20 feet.	21	out. First of all, with respect to Mr. Schneider I
22	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. There's a	22	think it's in the Middle Class Tax Relief Act,
23	percentage in there.	23	provision 64-9A, that authorizes that the next
24	MR. SCHNEIDER: There's a percentage under	24	applicant, not the current applicant, the next
25	the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law, but the relevant	25	applicant can increase the height of the tower by ten
	Page 27		Page 28
-			
1	percent or 20 feet, whichever is greater. That's one	1	and say you know what, your Board of Adjustment wants
1 2	percent or 20 feet, whichever is greater. That's one part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider	1 2	and say you know what, your Board of Adjustment wants this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that
		1	
2	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider	2	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that
2 3	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect	2	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget
2 3 4	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some	2 3 4	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred
2 3 4 5	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what	2 3 4 5	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that
2 3 4 5 6	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of	2 3 4 5 6	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again
2 3 4 5 6 7	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the	2 3 4 5 6 7	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No. MR. MLENAK: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no testimony at all on what a tower at 60 feet looks like.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No. MR. MLENAK: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the right in the lease, the lease could say it shall never
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no testimony at all on what a tower at 60 feet looks like. What we could do, and the Applicant seems	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No. MR. MLENAK: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the right in the lease, the lease could say it shall never be more than 80 feet and that's it. So there's no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no testimony at all on what a tower at 60 feet looks like. What we could do, and the Applicant seems amenable to it is, if we're okay at 80 feet we would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No. MR. MLENAK: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the right in the lease, the lease could say it shall never be more than 80 feet and that's it. So there's no going above 80. So you're putting it back in their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no testimony at all on what a tower at 60 feet looks like. What we could do, and the Applicant seems amenable to it is, if we're okay at 80 feet we would then we would in our Resolution say, hey, Township	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No. MR. MLENAK: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the right in the lease, the lease could say it shall never be more than 80 feet and that's it. So there's no going above 80. So you're putting it back in their court a little bit. And I think we make it clear if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no testimony at all on what a tower at 60 feet looks like. What we could do, and the Applicant seems amenable to it is, if we're okay at 80 feet we would then we would in our Resolution say, hey, Township Committee in their role as landlord, we really think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No. MR. MLENAK: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the right in the lease, the lease could say it shall never be more than 80 feet and that's it. So there's no going above 80. So you're putting it back in their court a little bit. And I think we make it clear if our view is 80 feet is okay I think we need to make it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no testimony at all on what a tower at 60 feet looks like. What we could do, and the Applicant seems amenable to it is, if we're okay at 80 feet we would then we would in our Resolution say, hey, Township Committee in their role as landlord, we really think you need to limit the height of this lease that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No. MR. MLENAK: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the right in the lease, the lease could say it shall never be more than 80 feet and that's it. So there's no going above 80. So you're putting it back in their court a little bit. And I think we make it clear if our view is 80 feet is okay I think we need to make it clear in the Resolution we want it to never be more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no testimony at all on what a tower at 60 feet looks like. What we could do, and the Applicant seems amenable to it is, if we're okay at 80 feet we would then we would in our Resolution say, hey, Township Committee in their role as landlord, we really think you need to limit the height of this lease that the lease permits to 80 feet. And the Applicant has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No. MR. MLENAK: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the right in the lease, the lease could say it shall never be more than 80 feet and that's it. So there's no going above 80. So you're putting it back in their court a little bit. And I think we make it clear if our view is 80 feet is okay I think we need to make it clear in the Resolution we want it to never be more than 80 feet. And if the lease needs to be amended it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	part of it. And then the rest of what Mr. Schneider says is correct, assume they don't materially affect the site plan or other things. There's some definitions that they've added in there to what constitutes a material change, the amount of disturbance on the ground, you can't change the stealthing, if any. But that's the next applicant that would come in would have the right to do that, not this Applicant. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for the Board's benefit I think it's worth understanding what we're talking about here. And I agree with you, and we had had that discussion I think during the hearings earlier, well, if I really want it to be an X I'm going to say I'm going to approve 80 percent of X. And as Steve points out we can't approve 60 feet. There's no testimony at all on what a tower at 60 feet looks like. What we could do, and the Applicant seems amenable to it is, if we're okay at 80 feet we would then we would in our Resolution say, hey, Township Committee in their role as landlord, we really think you need to limit the height of this lease that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	this to be 80 feet and wants it to be locked at that height. So the Township Committee can say, forget those guys. I'm going to allow them to go to a hundred feet. You know, there's nothing we can do about that at this point. But then again BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: They can allow an extension to a second provider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Right. They could, if they chose, allow the tower to be bumped up 20 feet if a collocator came along. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Would that collocator need to appear before this body? DR. EISENSTEIN: No. MR. MLENAK: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But the Township Committee has it in their role as a landlord has the right in the lease, the lease could say it shall never be more than 80 feet and that's it. So there's no going above 80. So you're putting it back in their court a little bit. And I think we make it clear if our view is 80 feet is okay I think we need to make it clear in the Resolution we want it to never be more

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

	Page 29		Page 30
1	it be amended to whatever. You know, at the end of the	1	that has a lot of information why we came up at 80 and
2	day I think you've got to be this is here because	2	not 120, and historic zone and residential zone. So
3	the Township Committee sent it. If the Township	3	there should be good information in that Resolution to
4	Committee did not want this tower we would not have	4	back that up.
5	been spending three years on this, right?	5	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. All right.
6	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: If they really wanted	6	Those are my first three questions. Who else has
7	the tower, though, they could make it a permitted use.	7	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can I ask about the
8	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They could make it a	8	setback?
9	permitted use, but in fairness, and I think there's	9	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ask about whatever
10	some logic to it, they said, you know, we don't spend	10	you'd like, Alf.
11	our time thinking about land use stuff. We have a	11	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So one of the issues,
12	Board that does. Let's let them think about it. I	12	Mr. Schneider, is the setback aspect. And that for me
13	mean, that's logical.	13	and speaking just for me that that impacts the height.
14	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: But we can't make it	14	So 80 I think is all things being said, is a big
15	a condition of approval.	15	change from your standpoint. But the setback is a
16	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We can't, but if the	16	problem because it's pretty close, it's 58,
17	Township Committee is looking at this Board as the	17	57-point-something feet from the property line, from
18	experts on land use, or the best Board to make	18	the nearest neighbor. And I'm sure you did go back to
19	decisions on land use and we put a recommendation in	19	the town because I'm sure you don't really want that
20	our Resolution, hey, in our best judgment you ought to	20	now setback. But I didn't hear any changes there,
21	change your lease to say 80 feet is the max but we	21	which seems to imply there are no changes. So can you
22	can't make you then I think they would listen to it.	22	talk about that and what can you do to that to me is
23	All right. I would hope they would. Whether they do	23	one of the main issues with this location, and there
24	or not, I would hope they would.	24	hasn't been a lot of testimony in the screening aspect.
25	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We have a Resolution	25	To the extent there's been some, but not a lot. And
	Page 31		Page 32
1	just for me this is the remaining issue.	1	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made
2	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to	2	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the
2 3	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your	2 3	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation.
2 3 4	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by	2 3 4	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the
2 3 4 5	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news.	2 3 4 5	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney?
2 3 4 5 6	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high	2 3 4 5 6	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response. My communications with him were verbal. It may very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards? MR. SCHNEIDER: I made an inquiry. I did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response. My communications with him were verbal. It may very well be that the Township Committee did not give him 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards? MR. SCHNEIDER: I made an inquiry. I did not receive a response. Let's put it that way. I made
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response. My communications with him were verbal. It may very well be that the Township Committee did not give him any authority to do that. I don't know the answer to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards? MR. SCHNEIDER: I made an inquiry. I did not receive a response. Let's put it that way. I made a couple of inquiries. Let me be more clear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response. My communications with him were verbal. It may very well be that the Township Committee did not give him any authority to do that. I don't know the answer to that. I'm representing that honestly. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards? MR. SCHNEIDER: I made an inquiry. I did not receive a response. Let's put it that way. I made a couple of inquiries. Let me be more clear. Point two: While I understand your concern
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response. My communications with him were verbal. It may very well be that the Township Committee did not give him any authority to do that. I don't know the answer to that. I'm representing that honestly. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards? MR. SCHNEIDER: I made an inquiry. I did not receive a response. Let's put it that way. I made a couple of inquiries. Let me be more clear. Point two: While I understand your concern about the setback, I think to a certain extent the I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response. My communications with him were verbal. It may very well be that the Township Committee did not give him any authority to do that. I don't know the answer to that. I'm representing that honestly. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So you got no response whatsoever to that inquiry? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards? MR. SCHNEIDER: I made an inquiry. I did not receive a response. Let's put it that way. I made a couple of inquiries. Let me be more clear. Point two: While I understand your concern about the setback, I think to a certain extent the I would hope that the setback concerns are mitigated by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response. My communications with him were verbal. It may very well be that the Township Committee did not give him any authority to do that. I don't know the answer to that. I'm representing that honestly. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So you got no response whatsoever to that inquiry? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards? MR. SCHNEIDER: I made an inquiry. I did not receive a response. Let's put it that way. I made a couple of inquiries. Let me be more clear. Point two: While I understand your concern about the setback, I think to a certain extent the I would hope that the setback concerns are mitigated by the lower height.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 just for me this is the remaining issue. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand. I'm going to make five points in response to your BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's a bad sign, by the way. Not good news. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm going to take the high road here. I did reach out to the township as to whether they would consider revising the location. I received no appropriate response to this. Point two BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: What do you mean by is there silence or CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Did they not respond? MR. SCHNEIDER: I was directed to, Mr. Falzarano referred me to the Township Attorney. I indicated to him exactly what you essentially indicated to him in December and I did not receive a response. My communications with him were verbal. It may very well be that the Township Committee did not give him any authority to do that. I don't know the answer to that. I'm representing that honestly. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So you got no response whatsoever to that inquiry? 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not write. I made inquiry to Mr. Falzarano. He referred me to the municipal attorney. I explained the situation. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So then you called the municipal attorney? MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And he MR. SCHNEIDER: I did not receive he said he would discuss it with the Township Committee. I received no response one way or another. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. So he said he would discuss it and he never called you back? MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't know what happened afterwards. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, did he ever call you back afterwards? MR. SCHNEIDER: I made an inquiry. I did not receive a response. Let's put it that way. I made a couple of inquiries. Let me be more clear. Point two: While I understand your concern about the setback, I think to a certain extent the I would hope that the setback concerns are mitigated by

	Page 33		Page 34
1	and a B part to it. One is, if you significantly	1	80-foot structure in terms of buffering.
2	relocate it, the facility, you very arguably	2	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Oh, you mean a
3	potentially would have to go through a complete new	3	landscaping question?
4	public bidding process, because the township bid out a	4	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
5	specific portion of the subject property.	5	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Of course.
6	Point four	6	MR. SCHNEIDER: That being said, as I've
7	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So back to that one,	7	offered, if there was anything within reason that your
8	quantitative, significantly what?	8	planner or any other township official reasonably
9	MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry.	9	required in terms of supplemental landscaping to help
10	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Quantitative, if you	10	shield the ground equipment the applicant is completely
11	were 10 feet?	11	amenable to that. We would standard condition would
12	MR. SCHNEIDER: I think it was 10 feet. I	12	be subject to a supplemental landscaping plan at the
13	don't think 10 feet would be, but if it was 50 feet the	13	reasonable approval of the Township Planner.
14	answer is yes. And if it was in a different location	14	Generally what we've done in those
15	on the subject property the answer in my opinion would	15	circumstances is agree to an on-site site visit with
16	be yes.	16	your planner to buttress whatever landscaping plan that
17	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Okay. Thanks.	17	we have already submitted.
18	MR. SCHNEIDER: Point four or 3B: Mr.	18	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: While we're on that
19	Simon has made clear that if that was the case his	19	topic quickly, and again I think we have spoken about
20	position would be the Applicant would have to go	20	it. If surrounding property owners expressed a desire
21	through a completely new site plan review process at	21	to have plantings on their property within reason would
22	the revised location. And frankly, three years after	22	you be amenable to that?
23	the fact we're not prepared to do that.	23	MR. SCHNEIDER: I would take it under
24	Point five: I have limited ability to	24	advisement. The problem with that, Mr. Chairman, is my
25	Verizon has limited ability to effectively shield an	25	experience is putting it on other people's properties
	Page 35		Page 36
			2
1	creates issues about responsibility for maintenance and	1	done on the setbacks, is what I'm saying.
1 2	creates issues about responsibility for maintenance and making sure we have access to it. But if that really	1 2	done on the setbacks, is what I'm saying. MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.
2	making sure we have access to it. But if that really	2	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.
2 3	making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something	2 3	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it
2 3 4	making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that.	2 3 4	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it
2 3 4 5 6 7	making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do. MR. SCHNEIDER: in a reasonable amount 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the wireless facility constitutes a second principal use on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do. MR. SCHNEIDER: in a reasonable amount and let the Shade Tree Commission I don't want the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the wireless facility constitutes a second principal use on the property. And my point was it's located in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do. MR. SCHNEIDER: in a reasonable amount and let the Shade Tree Commission I don't want the responsibility of planting on other people's property, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the wireless facility constitutes a second principal use on the property. And my point was it's located in a manner that doesn't operationally interfere. So then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do. MR. SCHNEIDER: in a reasonable amount and let the Shade Tree Commission I don't want the responsibility of planting on other people's property, but I am amenable to making a reasonable contribution 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the wireless facility constitutes a second principal use on the property. And my point was it's located in a manner that doesn't operationally interfere. So then if I move it closer to anywhere close anywhere more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do. MR. SCHNEIDER: in a reasonable amount and let the Shade Tree Commission I don't want the responsibility of planting on other people's property, but I am amenable to making a reasonable contribution to the Shade Tree Commission or whatever agency you 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the wireless facility constitutes a second principal use on the property. And my point was it's located in a manner that doesn't operationally interfere. So then if I move it closer to anywhere close anywhere more in the middle of the property I'm creating the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do. MR. SCHNEIDER: in a reasonable amount and let the Shade Tree Commission I don't want the responsibility of planting on other people's property, but I am amenable to making a reasonable contribution to the Shade Tree Commission or whatever agency you internally do that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the wireless facility constitutes a second principal use on the property. And my point was it's located in a manner that doesn't operationally interfere. So then if I move it closer to anywhere close anywhere more in the middle of the property I'm creating the potential for operational interference with the DPW in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do. MR. SCHNEIDER: in a reasonable amount and let the Shade Tree Commission I don't want the responsibility of planting on other people's property, but I am amenable to making a reasonable contribution to the Shade Tree Commission or whatever agency you internally do that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the wireless facility constitutes a second principal use on the property. And my point was it's located in a manner that doesn't operationally interfere. So then if I move it closer to anywhere close anywhere more in the middle of the property I'm creating the potential for operational interference with the DPW in any meaningful manner. I'm not talking about five or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 making sure we have access to it. But if that really was a major concern I think we can work out something with the advice of Counsel about how to CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'm not sure there's even a desire for that. MR. SCHNEIDER: My experience is it turns out to be a very difficult planting doing plantings on third-party's property, I've never had one that turned out well. What I've done in the past is agree and I don't want this to be taken the wrong way, I've agreed to make a contribution, a reasonable contribution to the Township Shade Tree Commission, if there is one, or I don't know if you have a Shade Tree Commission. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We do. MR. SCHNEIDER: in a reasonable amount and let the Shade Tree Commission I don't want the responsibility of planting on other people's property, but I am amenable to making a reasonable contribution to the Shade Tree Commission or whatever agency you internally do that. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We can't move it somewhat. There's no room on that plan. And it's not that you can't, it's because here we are and one party doesn't want to respond. And then if it's too much it triggers a potentially triggers expense and cost MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me be clear. Mr. Newlin, even if the Township said tomorrow we want to relocate it to point A on the property, three years after the fact would be difficult for us. And then I'm going to be frank to you and I'm going to play planner since I played RF engineer. I know what would happen here. If I move it further away from the property line I'm putting it, with all due respect, in the midst potentially of the ongoing DPW operation. And we heard about a meeting and a half from Mr. Steck about how the wireless facility constitutes a second principal use on the property. And my point was it's located in a manner that doesn't operationally interfere. So then if I move it closer to anywhere close anywhere more in the middle of the property I'm creating the potential for operational interference with the DPW in

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

	Page 37		Page 38
1	the property line I'm putting it right in the midst	1	if the pad got smaller the Township has to approve
2	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I understand. But	2	that?
3	Mr. Steck is not us. We listened to him. And it	3	MR. SCHNEIDER: Well, because the Township
4	doesn't mean we agree with him in content or duration,	4	leased out 1,800-square feet to Verizon. So we have no
5	but what about 10 feet? Why can't you give more	5	issue reducing the size of the compound if the Township
6	relief? Surely there's some wiggle room.	6	Committee is amenable to
7	Actually, I'm going to ask other Board	7	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But even if you had use
8	members, because maybe other Board members don't care.	8	of that 1,800 feet when you build your pad you're going
9	BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I have a question on	9	to improve it with stuff. You're going to fence in
10	this topic. Because as we lower the height of the	10	that stuff. And I forget what you said you actually
11	tower it seems like we have eliminated the significant	11	needed for yourself, let's say 900 feet, just for
12	opportunity for collocation.	12	argument sake. So while you have access to 1,800 feet
13	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, maybe.	13	why build a fence around the whole thing when you don't
14	BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Maybe.	14	need the whole thing fenced.
15	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Depends on whether it's	15	So would you be amenable to just using the
16	a tree or a pole.	16	portion you needed for your own stuff if and when a
17	BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: That's going to be	17	collocator comes in then you go take down the fence and
18	one of the questions. We need to decide that before we	18	put up a new one?
19	go too much further. But the other question is can the	19	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
20	equipment pad, equipment shed, equipment area be made	20	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Does that answer your
21	smaller in anticipation that there will not be	21	question?
22	collocation	22	BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Yes. You said
23	MR. SCHNEIDER: Can it be? Yes. Subject	23	I'm sorry. Just to clear this up. You said you would
24	to the approval of the Township.	24	be amenable to using the smaller footprint?
25	BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Like in other words,	25	MR. SCHNEIDER: Let me relate it back to
	BOARD MEMBER STIMONDS. Elke in outer words,		
		1	
	Page 39		Page 40
1	Page 39 what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to	1	Page 40 separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you
1 2	_	1 2	
	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to	1	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you
2	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and	2	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me.
2 3	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related	2 3	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this
2 3 4	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional	2 3 4	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one
2 3 4 5	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves	2 3 4 5	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say?
2 3 4 5 6	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound.	2 3 4 5 6	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go
2 3 4 5 6 7	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And	2 3 4 5 6 7	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I'm sorry. Put the site plan up? Mr. Schneider, which sheet? Would it be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this compound area?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this compound area? MR. SCHNEIDER: Right in that compound
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I'm sorry. Put the site plan up? Mr. Schneider, which sheet? Would it be the one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this compound area? MR. SCHNEIDER: Right in that compound area. If you go down see there's a tree species
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I'm sorry. Put the site plan up? Mr. Schneider, which sheet? Would it be the one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this compound area? MR. SCHNEIDER: Right in that compound area. If you go down see there's a tree species being removed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I'm sorry. Put the site plan up? Mr. Schneider, which sheet? Would it be the one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this compound area? MR. SCHNEIDER: Right in that compound area. If you go down see there's a tree species being removed? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I'm sorry. Put the site plan up? Mr. Schneider, which sheet? Would it be the one MR. SCHNEIDER: You know what I think is actually the easiest? You can, but Lori, me and you had a conversation today about that separate exhibit. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this compound area? MR. SCHNEIDER: Right in that compound area. If you go down see there's a tree species being removed? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right above that is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I'm sorry. Put the site plan up? Mr. Schneider, which sheet? Would it be the one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this compound area? MR. SCHNEIDER: Right in that compound area. If you go down see there's a tree species being removed? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right above that is a picture of the compound. Okay? So if you enlarge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 what the Chair just indicated. I would be amenable to constructing only what is necessary for the tower and the Verizon Wireless equipment cabinetry and related appurtenances, and if and when any additional collocators came to the site they would have themselves the responsibility for expanding the compound. The answer to that suggestion is yes. And that's not uncommon. It's not the common way to do it. You usually build the entirety of the 1,800-square foot compound, but the way the Chair just suggested would be amenable to us. In other words, just build what's necessary for the tower structure, the cabinetry, and the generator. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you possibly projected the site plan as you talk about it? Is that possible, Lori? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I'm sorry. Put the site plan up? Mr. Schneider, which sheet? Would it be the one MR. SCHNEIDER: You know what I think is actually the easiest? You can, but Lori, me and you had a conversation today about that separate exhibit. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	separate exhibit it will be an easier plan view, if you bear with me. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I think it's this one. Is this it? Let me rotate it. Is this the one from July, what did we say? MR. SCHNEIDER: July 1st, 2019. If you go to sheet, perhaps it's easy if you go to Sheet SP-2 for a second. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Okay. I have somewhere there's a pointer. MR. SCHNEIDER: Now you're getting CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So Lori, let me ask. Can you maximize that window on the projector screen? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. This isn't the one that works. Is there another remote down there somewhere? Yes. Give that to Mr. Schneider and then I'll focus in. Where do you want me to go, in this compound area? MR. SCHNEIDER: Right in that compound area. If you go down see there's a tree species being removed? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. MR. SCHNEIDER: Right above that is a

	Page 41		Page 42
1	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Are we getting	1	cabinetry, collocator one, collocator two, collocator
2	there? More?	2	three. What you could do is cut the compound
3	MR. SCHNEIDER: No, you're there. So right	3	essentially right here and eliminate that whole portion
4	in the center of that compound is the tower, and to the	4	of the compound.
5	right of that is the Verizon Wireless equipment	5	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Could you eliminate
6	cabinetry. Does everyone see where I'm looking?	6	the box for collocator one on the bottom right-hand
7	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Push the yellow	7	side?
8	button.	8	MR. SCHNEIDER: You could do that.
9	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's backwards.	9	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Say that again,
10	MR. SCHNEIDER: So there.	10	George?
11	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you zoom in on	11	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I said could you
12	that, Lori?	12	remove the dotted box on the bottom right-hand side
13	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: I can go in. Sure.	13	that was designated for collocator one. That would
14	MR. SCHNEIDER: So that's the tower.	14	help the setback, because I understand the neighbors on
15	That's the Verizon equipment cabinetry. Right there	15	the bottom.
16	and there are spaces that have been designed for future	16	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, the setback
17	collocation, if everyone can follow me. And also	17	we're referring to I think is the tower, right, 58?
18	there's a third collocator right there.	18	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Not the pad?
19	So if to follow up on the Chair's, you	19	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Not the pad. I
20	could cut the compound such that it's only in that	20	think the pad is closer, right, than
21	general area and eliminate the portion of the compound	21	MR. SCHNEIDER: The pad is closer, that's
22	originally for the which addresses those two	22	correct.
23	those are 10-by-20-foot areas by the way for each of	23	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: But the setback that
24	the future compound. So the way this was theoretically	24	people are concerned about is to the tower. That's
25	designed would be you'd have tower, Verizon equipment	25	57-something feet?
	Page 43	1	Page 44
1	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.	1	
1	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.	1	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well,
	_	1	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to
2	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so	2	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had
2 3	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small.	2 3	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to
2 3 4	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more?	2 3 4	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that.
2 3 4 5	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that.	2 3 4 5	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance
2 3 4 5 6	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember	2 3 4 5 6	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members.	2 3 4 5 6 7	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this – so that square, that rectangle we see is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this – so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this – so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed moving it towards that if you're looking at the open	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this – so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed moving it towards that if you're looking at the open if you're looking at the metal recycling, like the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so. MR. MLENAK: Are we talking about moving the rectangle or moving the tower within the rectangle? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Moving the entire
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed moving it towards that if you're looking at the open if you're looking at the metal recycling, like the cans and BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you point while he's talking, Rich?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so. MR. MLENAK: Are we talking about moving the rectangle or moving the tower within the rectangle? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Moving the entire rectangle over. Because as I recall there's a tree
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed moving it towards that if you're looking at the open if you're looking at the metal recycling, like the cans and BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you point while he's talking, Rich? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: moving it to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so. MR. MLENAK: Are we talking about moving the rectangle or moving the tower within the rectangle? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Moving the entire rectangle over. Because as I recall there's a tree kind of to the upper-right portion that's going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed moving it towards that if you're looking at the open if you're looking at the metal recycling, like the cans and BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you point while he's talking, Rich? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: moving it to the right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so. MR. MLENAK: Are we talking about moving the rectangle or moving the tower within the rectangle? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Moving the entire rectangle over. Because as I recall there's a tree kind of to the upper-right portion that's going to be lost if it goes there. And, you know, and I would say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed moving it towards that if you're looking at the open if you're looking at the metal recycling, like the cans and BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you point while he's talking, Rich? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: moving it to the right. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: That would be to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so. MR. MLENAK: Are we talking about moving the rectangle or moving the tower within the rectangle? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Moving the entire rectangle over. Because as I recall there's a tree kind of to the upper-right portion that's going to be lost if it goes there. And, you know, and I would say if we were to approve this I would ask, I guess it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed moving it towards that if you're looking at the open if you're looking at the metal recycling, like the cans and BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you point while he's talking, Rich? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: moving it to the right. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: That would be to the left of this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so. MR. MLENAK: Are we talking about moving the rectangle or moving the tower within the rectangle? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Moving the entire rectangle over. Because as I recall there's a tree kind of to the upper-right portion that's going to be lost if it goes there. And, you know, and I would say if we were to approve this I would ask, I guess it's Paul? I'm not sure, Paul, to help locate that to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed moving it towards that if you're looking at the open if you're looking at the metal recycling, like the cans and BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you point while he's talking, Rich? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: moving it to the right. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: That would be to the left of this. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think it's you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this – so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so. MR. MLENAK: Are we talking about moving the rectangle or moving the tower within the rectangle? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Moving the entire rectangle over. Because as I recall there's a tree kind of to the upper-right portion that's going to be lost if it goes there. And, you know, and I would say if we were to approve this I would ask, I guess it's Paul? I'm not sure, Paul, to help locate that to reduce the number of trees that have to be taken down,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That drawing's so small. MR. SCHNEIDER: Lori, can you zoom in more? We don't need to see anything but that. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: You have to remember the demographic of certain Board members. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: There we go. SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Is that good? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That's better. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And what's the possibility of moving that tower some feet without triggering a brand new site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, we discussed moving it towards that if you're looking at the open if you're looking at the metal recycling, like the cans and BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you point while he's talking, Rich? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: moving it to the right. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: That would be to the left of this.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	could do. We had this discussion surrounding, well, can we save more trees by moving it a little further to the left in this picture? And I think you had indicated you could do that. MR. SCHNEIDER: There's no significance from an RF perspective or anything about relocating the tower that amount, that degree. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Meaning you can. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It would be a question for this so that square, that rectangle we see is what's indicated in the lease. So it would be a question of amending the lease to shift that rectangle to the left, I guess, right? I think it can save you a tree or so. MR. MLENAK: Are we talking about moving the rectangle or moving the tower within the rectangle? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Moving the entire rectangle over. Because as I recall there's a tree kind of to the upper-right portion that's going to be lost if it goes there. And, you know, and I would say if we were to approve this I would ask, I guess it's Paul? I'm not sure, Paul, to help locate that to

	Page 45		Page 46
1	an objection to that?	1	involve Mr. Fox, et cetera, to see what I can do to the
2	MR. SCHNEIDER: No.	2	maximum extent within my control and the Township to
3	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Mike. I know you're	3	address your site plan concerns to mitigate your
4	not going to like this at all, but I do think the	4	reduction in trees and do whatever I could to increase
5	Applicant should go back and see what can be done about	5	the setback.
6	the site plan. Yes, I understand it's not at this	6	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And you would then be
7	meeting, but if you get support for everything else, I	7	okay with coming back and running through this with us?
8	guess that's an if, and do the best you can to address	8	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. But I don't want to
9	the setback items, the tree items, the screening within	9	go on a wild goose chase.
10	reason. According to we're not looking for things	10	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Understood. Also, I
11	that are not do able, that are not reasonable. I think	11	was just speaking for myself. I don't know if other
12	that's a fair request.	12	Board Members agree with me. So
13	And in terms of our standards, when we go	13	MR. SCHNEIDER: But I am amenable to doing
14	through site plans we look at things in detail and this	14	that.
15	is probably the biggest application that we've done	15	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So what is it we
16	certainly in a long time. And I think we should be	16	have more questions, but what is it you would envision
17	very careful about site plan. I'm not very comfortable	17	you would walk out of here tonight with that would get
18	just saying leave this to Paul or would you do this or,	18	you comfortable you're not going down a wild goose
19	I think that's against our standards.	19	chase? Do you want to have a straw poll like we did
20	MR. SCHNEIDER: May I respond, Mr. Newlin?	20	the last time?
21	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Please do.	21	MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like a straw poll
22	MR. SCHNEIDER: Subject to what you	22	to the extent that the Board would be amenable to
23	prefaced your comments, if there was a consensus that	23	approving an 80-foot tower, and subject to all the
24	the height was worthy of us going back and doing that I	24	conditions that I indicated, including the condition we
25	am more than willing to engage formally the Township,	25	talked about relative to the Township all of the
		<u> </u>	
	$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{r}} \propto 17$		
	Page 47		Page 48
1	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to	1	trees?
2	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr.	2	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it
2 3	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come	2 3	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think
2 3 4	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those.	2 3 4	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different
2 3 4 5	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan.	2 3 4 5	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees.
2 3 4 5 6	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board	2 3 4 5 6	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me
2 3 4 5 6 7	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight	2 3 4 5 6 7	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've also seen some decent ones.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live in that are awful so I'm not going to go in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've also seen some decent ones. So I think one thing we would like you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live in that are awful so I'm not going to go in Randolph. You have a tree on Route 10.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've also seen some decent ones. So I think one thing we would like you to come back with if we were to go down this path in 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live in that are awful so I'm not going to go in Randolph. You have a tree on Route 10. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But there must be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've also seen some decent ones. So I think one thing we would like you to come back with if we were to go down this path in addition to site plan is a menu of what these things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live in that are awful so I'm not going to go in Randolph. You have a tree on Route 10.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've also seen some decent ones. So I think one thing we would like you to come back with if we were to go down this path in addition to site plan is a menu of what these things could look like, right. Because have you driven down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live in that are awful so I'm not going to go in Randolph. You have a tree on Route 10. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But there must be a catalog, is there not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've also seen some decent ones. So I think one thing we would like you to come back with if we were to go down this path in addition to site plan is a menu of what these things could look like, right. Because have you driven down the turnpike say Exit 103 there's a really ugly tree,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live in that are awful so I'm not going to go in Randolph. You have a tree on Route 10. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But there must be a catalog, is there not? MR. SCHNEIDER: There is. </pre>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've also seen some decent ones. So I think one thing we would like you to come back with if we were to go down this path in addition to site plan is a menu of what these things could look like, right. Because have you driven down	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	trees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live in that are awful so I'm not going to go in Randolph. You have a tree on Route 10. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But there must be a catalog, is there not? MR. SCHNEIDER: There is. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is there not the Sears
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 conditions that I did, and direct the Applicant to address the site plan concerns as articulated by Mr. Newlin, and collective by the Board, and I would come back with a plan in March to address those. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Revised site plan. And I think, fair enough, if we did do that every Board member should give you input as best they can tonight on the site plan. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would welcome that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And can I add one more thing to that? If we were to go down this path, we have had a lot of discussion back and forth about flagless flagpole versus tree. And I think some members I think are in favor from listening to comments from the dais of a tree. Some for a flagless flagpole. Personally, I've seen some really ugly trees, but I've also seen some decent ones. So I think one thing we would like you to come back with if we were to go down this path in addition to site plan is a menu of what these things could look like, right. Because have you driven down the turnpike say Exit 103 there's a really ugly tree, just a raggedy little old thing, but then I think 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	rrees? I think a flagless flagpole it is what it is. I think we have all seen those. I don't think they vary much, but there are certainly different designs of trees. MR. SCHNEIDER: May I make let me address it this way. If I came back with photographs of two or three trees would that be responsive to your request? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I think so. And I would ask, if we get there, if the Board knows of the location of any trees they find MR. SCHNEIDER: One of the ones that have let me throw out two, okay, based on my experience. One is, and Mr. Masters testified, the one at DelBarton. There are ones in the town that I live in that are awful so I'm not going to go in Randolph. You have a tree on Route 10. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But there must be a catalog, is there not? MR. SCHNEIDER: There is. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is there not the Sears Catalog?

	Page 49		Page 50
1	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: West of 287?	1	I'd put that tower in the middle of those buildings
2	MR. SCHNEIDER: As you approach	2	like the wood one that's there now that no one seems to
3	Pennsylvania on the eastbound side that I think	3	even notice.
4	actually looks pretty good. So why don't I do this. I	4	MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry. I had trouble
5	will come forward with photographs of three	5	hearing what you said.
6	representative vantage points of three in terms of a	6	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Dan, put your
7	design. Does that seem like a	7	microphone on, please?
8	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: That would be great.	8	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I've been told I was
9	That sound fair. And I'm serious	9	loud without one.
10	MR. SCHNEIDER: But you don't need anymore	10	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: But you're even
11	flagless flag poles?	11	louder.
12	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, I think we have	12	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: If I had my choice I
13	all seen unless there's variations. But seriously,	13	would put that tower in the middle of those buildings
14	are there not companies, though, that design fake trees	14	where the wood one is, if I had the ability to make all
15	and can we not go to that company and show me your	15	the decisions on my own. And I would house all the
16	picture book?	16	equipment in the building, in the shed, just like Green
17	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. There are stealth	17	Village. All right. And even if that was at a hundred
18	manufacturers. The answer is yes. I will come forward	18	feet it wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. But
19	with that.	19	that's not what's on that's not what's being
20	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. Okay. All	20	presented to us.
21	right. So what else do we want to do tonight?	21	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sorry. What did say
22	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, Alf keeps	22	that again?
23	asking if he's alone and he's not alone on the setback	23	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Which part?
24	issue. That's one of my biggest concerns still. So if	24 25	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The part about even if
25	I was running this town, which I don't run this town	2.5	it were at a hundred feet it wouldn't be as noticeable.
	Page 51		Page 52
	5	1	Tage 52
1	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as	1	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is
1 2	_	1 2	
	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as	1	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is
2	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one.	2	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling
2 3	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a	2 3	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside
2 3 4	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village?	2 3 4	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead.
2 3 4 5	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower	2 3 4 5	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the
2 3 4 5 6	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything would be put on the ground, we're not going to go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything would be put on the ground, we're not going to go there, but even Green Village is a good example of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the equipment is ugly I'm sure they would go and design and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything would be put on the ground, we're not going to go there, but even Green Village is a good example of trying to hide something a little bit better than what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the equipment is ugly I'm sure they would go and design and put it in shed, a single shed, multiple sheds. So what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting when you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything would be put on the ground, we're not going to go there, but even Green Village is a good example of trying to hide something a little bit better than what this one is doing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the equipment is ugly I'm sure they would go and design and put it in shed, a single shed, multiple sheds. So what is it you would put it in, two sheds or one shed?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything would be put on the ground, we're not going to go there, but even Green Village is a good example of trying to hide something a little bit better than what this one is doing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the equipment is ugly I'm sure they would go and design and put it in shed, a single shed, multiple sheds. So what is it you would put it in, two sheds or one shed? Because Green Village is like two.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting when you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything would be put on the ground, we're not going to go there, but even Green Village is a good example of trying to hide something a little bit better than what this one is doing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the equipment is ugly I'm sure they would go and design and put it in shed, a single shed, multiple sheds. So what is it you would put it in, two sheds or one shed? Because Green Village is like two.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disruption to what's current as activity that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything would be put on the ground, we're not going to go there, but even Green Village is a good example of trying to hide something a little bit better than what this one is doing. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: How did they hide that one at Green Village?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the equipment is ugly I'm sure they would go and design and put it in shed, a single shed, multiple sheds. So what is it you would put it in, two sheds or one shed? Because Green Village is like two.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting that wood tower that's there now, it's not really a tower, it's a pole, doesn't really interrupt anything activity-wise that's going on. And I'm no engineering expert with towers, but I am a builder and I'm also an architect and I try to make very little impact on the environment, if I could. And I don't know if anything would be put on the ground, we're not going to go there, but even Green Village is a good example of trying to hide something a little bit better than what this one is doing. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: How did they hide that one at Green Village?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the equipment is ugly I'm sure they would go and design and put it in shed, a single shed, multiple sheds. So what is it you would put it in, two sheds or one shed? Because Green Village is like two. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I think it's just a matter of I don't know if they built those sheds
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It wouldn't be as noticeable as this one. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If what were at a hundred feet, Green Village? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: No. If this tower were at 80 or a hundred is irrelevant to me if it was not in this location. When you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting, when you talk about disrupting of the source of the source	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: All the equipment is inside a shed. So here we are, we have a recycling shed adjacent to that. So instead of it being outside like that it could simply go into that shed instead. But again, I'm not designing it. If I were to design it I would try to mitigate because of where it is, because of neighbors, and because of so it's in the middle of a neighborhood. We can't help that, but how can we help it? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to take that equipment you see on the picture, and I'm sure they could put it in the shed or maybe one big shed, is it better to have it in one big shed? I'm guessing, Mr. Schneider can confirm this, if this Board were to say, yeah, you know what, we're okay at 80 feet but we're worried that the equipment is ugly I'm sure they would go and design and put it in shed, a single shed, multiple sheds. So what is it you would put it in, two sheds or one shed? Because Green Village is like two. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I think it's just a matter of I don't know if they built those sheds specifically for equipment. I have no idea. There's

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

	Page 53		Page 54
1	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I just described	1	go back and see what we can do to do that within our
2	what I would like to see but I'm not going to get that.	2	technical parameters perhaps.
3	If that tower is where the wood one is now that would	3	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Again, I think the
4	be ideal for me, but I'm not getting that. So how else	4	ask is to push the tower away from the property line as
5	can we mitigate this to be less impactful than the	5	much as you can.
6	neighbor that's closest to that, that's all.	6	BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Even 40 feet back
7	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can I ask	7	from lowering the tower.
8	theoretically, can you actually from an engineering	8	MR. SCHNEIDER: Again, my ability to
9	perspective have the tower separated from the equipment	9	significantly mitigate, to relocate the tower is
10	with a driveway in between?	10	limited for the reasons
11	MR. SCHNEIDER: We've looked at that. So	11	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, as much as you
12	there's a two-fold answer. There are certain	12	could. So I mean, little steps. What's the distance
13	circumstances where you could put the equipment within	13	between the tower and the top edge of your compound
14	a instead of cabinetry within a shed. I will tell	14	there? What's the total size of that compound?
15	you that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. A lot	15	MR. SCHNEIDER: I think it's 1,800-square
16	of people find that the cabinetry creates more of an	16	feet.
17	impact than the shed creates more than the outdoor	17	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What is the width?
18	cabinets. That's a different issue.	18	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Even if you look at
19	To answer Alf's question, there is a	19	that it's 35 feet.
20	correlation, the equipment has to be within a certain	20	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If you were to put the
21	physical proximity because you're running lines from	21	tower on the upper-most edge of your area there you
22	the tower to the equipment. So there's a proximity	22 23	would be moving it 10 feet further from the property
23	number where if the equipment is further away from the	23	line, right.
24 25	tower you start to lose gain. But we've looked at that Mr. Newlin. So I could, in the spirit of time I will	25	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: It actually says right there. It says 60 feet.
20	with rewain. So reodice, in the spirit of time r with	20	ngiit there. It says to rect.
	Page 55		Page 56
1	Page 55	1	Page 56
1	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern	1	don't really notice them because it's something you
2	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a	2	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see
2 3	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located	1	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape.
2 3 4	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just	2 3 4	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the
2 3	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to	2 3	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with
2 3 4 5	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters.	2 3 4 5	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another
2 3 4 5 6	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to	2 3 4 5 6	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound	2 3 4 5 6 7	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further away.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the neighbors
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So even in that upper	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the neighbors are. So who is going to see it is the O'Donnells.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So even in that upper right-hand corner I don't know where the property line	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the neighbors are. So who is going to see it is the O'Donnells. MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe, I understand very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So even in that upper right-hand corner I don't know where the property line is, but the further away you can get it to that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the neighbors are. So who is going to see it is the O'Donnells. MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe, I understand very clearly what you're trying to achieve. What I will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So even in that upper right-hand corner I don't know where the property line is, but the further away you can get it to that. MR. SCHNEIDER: I can do that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: As far as just to comment on the, you know, enclosures being more	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the neighbors are. So who is going to see it is the O'Donnells. MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe, I understand very clearly what you're trying to achieve. What I will do you have my commitment I will have my design
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So even in that upper right-hand corner I don't know where the property line is, but the further away you can get it to that. MR. SCHNEIDER: I can do that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: As far as just to comment on the, you know, enclosures being more obnoxious than a screened fence. The reason why it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the neighbors are. So who is going to see it is the O'Donnells. MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe, I understand very clearly what you're trying to achieve. What I will do you have my commitment I will have my design professionals to the extent work with the Township Official, but most specifically confer with Mr. Fox. I think he would be the perfect point person to try to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So even in that upper right-hand corner I don't know where the property line is, but the further away you can get it to that. MR. SCHNEIDER: I can do that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: As far as just to comment on the, you know, enclosures being more obnoxious than a screened fence. The reason why it works well is when you build the buildings are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the neighbors are. So who is going to see it is the O'Donnells. MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe, I understand very clearly what you're trying to achieve. What I will do you have my commitment I will have my design professionals to the extent work with the Township Official, but most specifically confer with Mr. Fox. I think he would be the perfect point person to try to BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Mr. Fox, do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand the concern and I suspect here's the I'll play engineer for a second. I suspect the reason the tower was located where it was originally was for the reason I just mentioned. The tower has to be generally wants to be proximate to the three or four equipment shelters. So if you locate it in one corner of the compound CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I just ask you to locate it because my guess is 10 feet doesn't make a bit of difference and some engineer just drew this up. MR. SCHNEIDER: Point is noted. I will look at every effort to shift the tower further away from the property line even if it's even if it's pushing it to the far end of the compound away, further away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So even in that upper right-hand corner I don't know where the property line is, but the further away you can get it to that. MR. SCHNEIDER: I can do that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: As far as just to comment on the, you know, enclosures being more obnoxious than a screened fence. The reason why it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 don't really notice them because it's something you would see in our landscape and something you would see in our hardscape. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And it begs the question then, right. So if you want to blend in with the other buildings there do you go and put up another pop-up building? BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not really pop-up buildings yeah, they're pop-ups. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can you give us a couple of options as to how you would cover the hide the equipment? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I mean, no one is going to see it unless you go to the recycling. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, the neighbors are. So who is going to see it is the O'Donnells. MR. SCHNEIDER: Maybe, I understand very clearly what you're trying to achieve. What I will do you have my commitment I will have my design professionals to the extent work with the Township Official, but most specifically confer with Mr. Fox. I think he would be the perfect point person to try to

	Page 57		Page 58
1	-	1	-
1 2	MR. FOX: The Board.	1	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: It's three years later.
2	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is the fence there for	2	I've grown.
	security or is that for aesthetics?	3	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: There has to be a
4 5	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Visual mitigation.	4	compromise. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I don't know what the
6	MR. SCHNEIDER: Both.	6	
7	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I would argue then if you want to further minimize the visual impact get rid	7	right answer is, but aesthetically you understand what
8	of the fence. Right. You're building a big fence. If	8	 MR. SCHNEIDER: I think you've given me
9	you're going to put that and a couple of sheds, well,	9	clear direction, the details of which have to be
10	look like Green Village works because there's no fence	10	addressed, what you're seeking to achieve. Let me
11	around that.	11	phrase it that way.
12	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Right. Because it	12	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And just one more
13	goes into buildings.	13	thing. Never trust a lawyer when he says one more
14	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So if you were to do a	14	thing.
15	similar thing here I would get rid of the fence to be	15	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Or architect.
16	honest with you, because it just calls more attention	16	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: I'd feel more
17	to it. I don't know. Get your designers out, maybe	17	comfortable if we had an answer from who you were
18	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, you can't hide	18	trying to get an answer from earlier.
19	all of it.	19	MR. SCHNEIDER: But Mr. Maselli, I want to
20	MR. SCHNEIDER: But I do remember, Mr.	20	be clear. Relocating it anywhere else creates a lot
21	Chairman, out of fairness. Many years ago when we did	21	of it creates a whole new site plan and a whole new
22	the original site visit	22	public bidding process that I can't go through. I can
23	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I wanted a fence?	23	work within the confines of the equipment cabinet or
24	MR. SCHNEIDER: You wanted the fence even I	24	shifting it in a general location, but putting it in
25	thought a little higher to shield the equipment.	25	the center of the DPW property
		1	
	Page 59		Page 60
1	Page 59 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put	1	Page 60 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating
1 2	-	1	-
	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put	1	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating
2	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would	2	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that?
2 3	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower	2 3	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think
2 3 4	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment	2 3 4	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a
2 3 4 5	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I	2 3 4 5	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say
2 3 4 5 6	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know,	2 3 4 5 6	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property."
2 3 4 5 6 7	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away.	2 3 4 5 6 7	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put put all that stuff aside.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it. MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved – and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put – put all that stuff aside. What I had heard is that somebody else could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it. MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more than amenable to trying to address your concerns with the assistance of Mr. Fox. And hopefully good cooperation from the Township Committee as to reducing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put put all that stuff aside. What I had heard is that somebody else could potentially look at that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And collocate it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody could look at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it. MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more than amenable to trying to address your concerns with the assistance of Mr. Fox. And hopefully good cooperation from the Township Committee as to reducing the size of the compound. I have no issue with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put put all that stuff aside. What I had heard is that somebody else could potentially look at that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And collocate it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody could look at that and say, wait a minute, I didn't bid on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it. MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more than amenable to trying to address your concerns with the assistance of Mr. Fox. And hopefully good cooperation from the Township Committee as to reducing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved – and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put – put all that stuff aside. What I had heard is that somebody else could potentially look at that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And collocate it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody could look at that and say, wait a minute, I didn't bid on the project because I didn't want to put it there. But if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it. MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more than amenable to trying to address your concerns with the assistance of Mr. Fox. And hopefully good cooperation from the Township Committee as to reducing the size of the compound. I have no issue with reducing CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, but you don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put put all that stuff aside. What I had heard is that somebody else could potentially look at that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And collocate it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody could look at that and say, wait a minute, I didn't bid on the project because I didn't want to put it there. But if I knew it was going in the center of the driveway I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it. MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more than amenable to trying to address your concerns with the assistance of Mr. Fox. And hopefully good cooperation from the Township Committee as to reducing the size of the compound. I have no issue with reducing CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, but you don't need their approval to improve a section of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put put all that stuff aside. What I had heard is that somebody else could potentially look at that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And collocate it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody could look at that and say, wait a minute, I didn't bid on the project because I didn't want to put it there. But if I knew it was going in the center of the driveway I would have bid on it. So someone could make the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it. MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more than amenable to trying to address your concerns with the assistance of Mr. Fox. And hopefully good cooperation from the Township Committee as to reducing the size of the compound. I have no issue with reducing CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, but you don't need their approval to improve a section of the property you've leased, right? So I imagine the way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put put all that stuff aside. What I had heard is that somebody else could potentially look at that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And collocate it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody could look at that and say, wait a minute, I didn't bid on the project because I didn't want to put it there. But if I knew it was going in the center of the driveway I would have bid on it. So someone could make the argument that it wasn't properly put out to the public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it. MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more than amenable to trying to address your concerns with the assistance of Mr. Fox. And hopefully good cooperation from the Township Committee as to reducing the size of the compound. I have no issue with reducing CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, but you don't need their approval to improve a section of the property you've leased, right? So I imagine the way the lease is written is, as it stands you have that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: You can't just put the whole thing in the middle of the DPW. It would have to be disjointed, right, meaning that the tower would need to be there and then maybe the equipment still stays here. And what you're talking about, I think I'm guessing, is voltage drop between, you know, it being disjointed, but it's not that far away. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: My understanding of what Mr. Schneider is saying, though, even aside from that, if they went and moved and let's say just for argument sake they left the equipment where it is but they moved the tower right to the middle of the turnaround. And let's put aside, you know, it's going to mess up the traffic and the township, you know, DPW guys won't let you put put all that stuff aside. What I had heard is that somebody else could potentially look at that. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: And collocate it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody could look at that and say, wait a minute, I didn't bid on the project because I didn't want to put it there. But if I knew it was going in the center of the driveway I would have bid on it. So someone could make the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Are you speculating on that? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: No. I think MR. SCHNEIDER: And that the Township bid a specific portion of the property. They did not say "the DPW property." CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: They said this spot on the DPW. MR. SCHNEIDER: And again, I think I would be within my reason if it was 5, 10 feet, but 50 feet is a different scenario. And it invokes the whole need for a completely different site plan. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think that's his concern about moving it. I get it. MR. SCHNEIDER: But I will repeat, I'm more than amenable to trying to address your concerns with the assistance of Mr. Fox. And hopefully good cooperation from the Township Committee as to reducing the size of the compound. I have no issue with reducing CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, but you don't need their approval to improve a section of the property you've leased, right? So I imagine the way

	Page 61		Page 62
1	you go and improve it or not, right?	1	can't say definitively until I see what 80 feet would
2	MR. SCHNEIDER: That's probably correct.	2	look like, and that's a concern. Particularly, if we
3	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think you just	3	said we can't approve 60 feet because there's nothing
4	exercise your option to not improve it or only improve	4	in the record. Well, is there anything in the record
5	the section you need.	5	with respect to the visual impact at 80 feet? And I
6	What else does the Board have? Any	6	think I just got my answer is no.
7	questions on this?	7	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. There's Mr.
8	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I've got a lot of	8	Boyan's answer. And I don't want to get into it, but I
9	questions if I can have a few minutes.	9	think his answer is he's open to it but without seeing
10	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yes. Go ahead.	10	it he can't give you a definitive but straw poll
11	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I remember photo	11	in a straw poll he is open to 80 feet?
12	sims of 140, 120 and a 100. Were there any photo	12	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But I would love to
13	simulations created at the 80 feet?	13	see a simulation at 80 feet. I know we're going to see
14	MR. SCHNEIDER: No.	14	the pictures of the the catalog, but if we could
15	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Is that something that	15	superimpose them at 80 feet I would feel more
16	can be done prior to the March meeting? It's hard to	16	comfortable about voting one way or another.
17	vote on something maybe I'm okay with 80 feet, but	17	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Can you take the
18	until I see a simulation of what it's going to look	18	existing photograph and with some kind of accuracy
19	like I'm not sure if I'm a yes or a no without it.	19	MR. SCHNEIDER: I will take it under
20	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. Well, let me	20	advisement. It's not I don't have the ability to
21	ask. Could you do that? I think he wants to walk out	21	confirm that, but your request is noted.
22	of here tonight with well, what you said earlier is	22	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay.
23	a straw poll on whether 80 feet could work or not. And	23	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Secondly, Paul, do we
24	I think your answer is you don't know if it works.	24	have any idea can you enter is there anything in
25	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm open to it, but I	25	the record that says the height of the existing trees
1	Page 63	1	Page 64
1	in that area	1	some testimony.
2	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not.	2	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation.
2 3	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they	2 3	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr.
2 3 4	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet?	2 3 4	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my
2 3 4 5	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record.	2 3 4 5	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection.
2 3 4 5 6	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate	2 3 4 5 6	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer?
2 3 4 5 6 7	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on	2 3 4 5	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are?	2 3 4 5 6 7	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds
2 3 4 5 6 7	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking about the site at the school, my recollection is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr. Schneider?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking about the site at the school, my recollection is that you approached them with respect to a tower at 140; is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr. Schneider? MR. SCHNEIDER: I thought there was. There	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking about the site at the school, my recollection is that you approached them with respect to a tower at 140; is that right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr. Schneider? MR. SCHNEIDER: I thought there was. There was also discussion I went through the record. Just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking about the site at the school, my recollection is that you approached them with respect to a tower at 140; is that right? And then I guess a followup to that is, has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr. Schneider? MR. SCHNEIDER: I thought there was. There was also discussion I went through the record. Just one of the comments you made last time, or Mr. Simon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking about the site at the school, my recollection is that you approached them with respect to a tower at 140; is that right? And then I guess a followup to that is, has there been 80 is a material change from 140. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr. Schneider? MR. SCHNEIDER: I though there was. There was also discussion I went through the record. Just one of the comments you made last time, or Mr. Simon made was about the caliper of the trees. That it 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking about the site at the school, my recollection is that you approached them with respect to a tower at 140; is that right? And then I guess a followup to that is, has there been 80 is a material change from 140. And would there be would you be amenable to or maybe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr. Schneider? MR. SCHNEIDER: I thought there was. There was also discussion I went through the record. Just one of the comments you made last time, or Mr. Simon made was about the caliper of the trees. That it actually is reflected on the plans. It's reflected on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking about the site at the school, my recollection is that you approached them with respect to a tower at 140; is that right? And then I guess a followup to that is, has there been 80 is a material change from 140. And would there be would you be amenable to or maybe from a legal perspective are we required to see that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr. Schneider? MR. SCHNEIDER: I thought there was. There was also discussion I went through the record. Just one of the comments you made last time, or Mr. Simon made was about the caliper of the trees. That it actually is reflected on the plans. It's reflected on the original survey submitted with the application. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: But not the height? MR. SCHNEIDER: Not the height, correct. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking about the site at the school, my recollection is that you approached them with respect to a tower at 140; is that right? MR then I guess a followup to that is, has there been 80 is a material change from 140. And would there be would you be amenable to or maybe from a legal perspective are we required to see that there aren't any alternative potential sites for the tower at an 80-foot height versus the 140 that the school was originally approached with?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 in that area MR. FOX: No there is not. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: or know what they are in relation to 80 feet? MR. FOX: That is not in the record. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you have an estimate based on the boy scout method or any other method on how tall those trees are? MR. FOX: I think it would be best if the Applicant were requested to provide that information. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: There was some testimony about that. There was some guess. I think we discussed on the site visit and somebody on one of the sides came back with something more quantitative. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you recall that, Mr. Schneider? MR. SCHNEIDER: I thought there was. There was also discussion I went through the record. Just one of the comments you made last time, or Mr. Simon made was about the caliper of the trees. That it actually is reflected on the plans. It's reflected on the original survey submitted with the application. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	some testimony. MR. SCHNEIDER: There was an approximation. I can't recall what it was. It was through Mr. Mawrowski. I want to say 50 to 60 feet was my recollection. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: That's your engineer? MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I think that sounds reasonable. So it would be approximately 20 or 30 taller MR. SCHNEIDER: That's correct. My recollection, sir, was that the testimony was that there are trees 50 to 60 feet. So 20 feet above that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: When we were talking about the site at the school, my recollection is that you approached them with respect to a tower at 140; is that right? Mathen I guess a followup to that is, has there been 80 is a material change from 140. And would there be would you be amenable to or maybe from a legal perspective are we required to see that there aren't any alternative potential sites for the tower at an 80-foot height versus the 140 that the

	Page 65		Page 66
1	going to have to answer with respect to the first part	1	able to accommodate T-Mobile, for instance.
2	of this which is the positive criteria is whether or	2	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Wait. Wait. That's
3	not the Applicant has met its burden in investigating	3	not true, is it? You can can you explain that
4	alternative sites that can fill the gap.	4	again?
5	Now, there's been a lot of testimony on	5	MR. SCHNEIDER: Obviously, the lower the
6	that, specifically with the school. I don't recall off	6	height of the structure you limit the structure's
7	the top what the e-mail said about the height, but the	7	ability to meet the technical objectives of future
8	Board would consider whether that reduction per the	8	collocators.
9	offered condition of approval at 80 feet was properly	9	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Rich, I'm sorry to
10	investigated by the applicant at the school.	10	bud in, but can you you need the 20 feet.
11	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. So to follow on	11	MR. SCHNEIDER: I'll get there. So on a
12	that comment thank you, Steve. I would love for	12	flagpole, as you recall, we take and as Dr.
13	another overture to be made to the school at the	13	Eisenstein explained, we take two elevations: 80 and
14	80-foot height. And maybe the answer is the same and	14	70.
15	we're right back where we started, but at least we'll	15	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So 60 is not available
16	in good conscience be able to check that box of	16	for a collocator?
17	alternative sites at that particular height.	17	MR. SCHNEIDER: It's available.
18	MR. SCHNEIDER: That one I'm not at this	18	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But no one wants it.
19	point in the proceedings prepared to do.	19	MR. SCHNEIDER: Well, they may or may not.
20	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: With respect to the	20	I can't comment on T-Mobile or AT&T on whether they
21	tree structure, you said that would allow for a	21	would or not. But the point I think Mr. Newlin was
22	collocator. Does that, in your opinion, reduce the	22	trying to lead me to is, you increase the collocation
23	chances of another maybe this is an unfair question	23	possibilities if you go to a tree because you would be
24	but another provider coming in asking for a site?	24	able to have 70 feet available for a collocator;
25	If we were to do the flagless flagpole you wouldn't be	25	whereas, 60 feet would be the next available height on
	Page 67		Page 68
1	_	1	_
1 2	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you	1	Page 68 MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application.
	a flagpole.	1	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find
2	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you	2	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application.
2 3	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider	2 3	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's
2 3 4	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in	2 3 4	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The
2 3 4 5	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town.	2 3 4 5	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a
2 3 4 5 6	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a	2 3 4 5 6	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly
2 3 4 5 6 7	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Continuing on.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Continuing on. You said that at 80 feet it would not fill the gap, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Continuing on. You said that at 80 feet it would not fill the gap, it would substantially fill the gap and there may be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Maybe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Continuing on. You said that at 80 feet it would not fill the gap, it would substantially fill the gap and there may be remaining gaps. Is Verizon willing to say that it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Maybe. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And the Applicant has made it clear tonight that they're not willing to ask
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Continuing on. You said that at 80 feet it would not fill the gap, it would substantially fill the gap and there may be remaining gaps. Is Verizon willing to say that it would not seek another tower in town in order to fill	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Maybe. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Maybe.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Continuing on. You said that at 80 feet it would not fill the gap, it would substantially fill the gap and there may be remaining gaps. Is Verizon willing to say that it would not seek another tower in town in order to fill that remaining gap?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Maybe. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And the Applicant has made it clear tonight that they're not willing to ask the school again for 80, which surprises me but nonetheless that's their position and they have a right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Continuing on. You said that at 80 feet it would not fill the gap, it would substantially fill the gap and there may be remaining gaps. Is Verizon willing to say that it would not seek another tower in town in order to fill that remaining gap?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And the Applicant has made it clear tonight that they're not willing to ask the school again for 80, which surprises me but nonetheless that's their position and they have a right to it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Continuing on. You said that at 80 feet it would not fill the gap, it would substantially fill the gap and there may be remaining gaps. Is Verizon willing to say that it would not seek another tower in town in order to fill that remaining gap? MR. SCHNEIDER: I can never say that. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So by going to 80 feet	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And the Applicant has made it clear tonight that they're not willing to ask the school again for 80, which surprises me but nonetheless that's their position and they have a right to it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a flagpole. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: But in theory you should reduce the probability of another provider coming before this body asking for a second pole in town. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And I think that's a Township objective, right? Try to design it so if you can get a collocator on it. I think the long and the short of it is if T-Mobile came in and the can only get at 50 feet I guess they would go to somebody and say, that doesn't work for me. I need another location. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: It's also true enough that the firehouse antennas were about 45 feet. So 60 feet is a lot more than 45. We don't have a whole lot of backup but that is true. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Okay. Continuing on. You said that at 80 feet it would not fill the gap, it would substantially fill the gap and there may be remaining gaps. Is Verizon willing to say that it would not seek another tower in town in order to fill that remaining gap?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SCHNEIDER: Theoretically, I would find it highly unlikely you will have another application. The reality is that at 80 feet it's the school that's the problem. I think we have been through that. The thought process that Verizon Wireless would construct a new tower to serve the school is, I would say, highly unlikely. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: And by the way on that point, and you noted it. I think it was an incredibly astute observation. The school has had the opportunity to put a tower on their property, and despite all the testimony of how critical it was to get coverage at the school, which seems reasonable to me, despite all of that the school Board said no, I don't want it. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Well, because maybe partially because they were asked for 140. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And the Applicant has made it clear tonight that they're not willing to ask the school again for 80, which surprises me but nonetheless that's their position and they have a right to it.

	Page 69		Page 70
1	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Correct. A couple of	1	close to Clinton Township?
2	one line e-mails.	2	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Yes. I work in
3	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So for all the	3	Clinton. I pass it every day.
4	discussion about and hey, listen, I have kids in	4	MR. SCHNEIDER: It's near a Cracker Barrel
5	that school. I get it. It's important. The School	5	or some restaurant?
6	Board doesn't seem concerned about it because they must	6	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not familiar with
7	have different plans or whatever it is. I can't force	7	the Cracker Barrel.
8	them to	8	MR. SCHNEIDER: That's how it was referred
9	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Three years later the	9	to me.
10	composition of the School Board has changed	10	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: It's on Petticoat
11	substantially, though, right?	11	Lane.
12	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Has it?	12	MR. SCHNEIDER: I know where it is. It's
13	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Sure. John.	13	on the eastbound side.
14	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: John Flynn? He's been	14	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Exactly. The south
15	on there forever.	15	side.
16	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: He's not on there.	16	MR. SCHNEIDER: I will get you a photo of
17	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Oh, so there's a	17	that. I'm familiar with it.
18	change. I don't know.	18	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And I guess my final
19	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Circling back to the	19	question piggybacking on Dan's comments, I'm
20	Route 78 comment. I just want to highlight, I think I	20	envisioning and I'm wondering feasibility, could you
21	know the tower you're talking about. The tower on	21	put all these cabinets in a lock underground? Like I'm
22	Route 78 approximately mile marker 19 in my opinion is	22	thinking like a doomsday prepper. Can you pour
23	the best looking tree tower that I've seen in the	23	concrete, put them underground and not see any of it?
24	state.	24	MR. SCHNEIDER: It was done once in Madison
25	MR. SCHNEIDER: I think that's the one up	25	and it turned out to be the biggest problem the
	Page 71		Page 72
1	Page 71 industry had in years.	1	Page 72 his peace.
1 2	_	1 2	2
	industry had in years.		his peace.
2	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in	2	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you
2 3	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off	2 3	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace?
2 3 4	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever	2 3 4 5 6	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well – MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob
2 3 4 5 6 7	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon.	2 3 4 5 6 7	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well – MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that – okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone. MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask this,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well – MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that – okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're – CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone. MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm propossing is that Rob can respond right now, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask this, as I see a hand. What's next?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone. MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm proposing is that Rob can respond right now, but because if the Board gives a response to the unofficial
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask this, as I see a hand. What's next? MR. MLENAK: I was going to suggest. Let	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone. MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm proposing is that Rob can respond right now, but because if the Board gives a response to the unofficial straw poll to the Applicant in a manner that he's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask this, as I see a hand. What's next? MR. MLENAK: I was going to suggest. Let Rich say what he wants to suggest for the Board to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone. MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm proposing is that Rob can respond right now, but because if the Board gives a response to the unofficial straw poll to the Applicant in a manner that he's amenable to coming back with more testimony next month
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask this, as I see a hand. What's next? MR. MLENAK: I was going to suggest. Let Rich say what he wants to suggest for the Board to consider. But I think it's only fair given the amount 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone. MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm proposing is that Rob can respond right now, but because if the Board gives a response to the unofficial straw poll to the Applicant in a manner that he's amenable to coming back with more testimony next month there's certainly no need to open it up to anybody else
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask this, as I see a hand. What's next? MR. MLENAK: I was going to suggest. Let Rich say what he wants to suggest for the Board to consider. But I think it's only fair given the amount of discussion tonight and the changes that have been 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well – MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that – okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone. MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm proposing is that Rob can respond right now, but because if the Board gives a response to the unofficial straw poll to the Applicant in a manner that he's amenable to coming back with more testimony next month there's certainly no need to open it up to anybody else at this point because there's going to be new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask this, as I see a hand. What's next? MR. MLENAK: I was going to suggest. Let Rich say what he wants to suggest for the Board to consider. But I think it's only fair given the amount of discussion tonight and the changes that have been since the last time both attorneys have given closing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone. MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm proposing is that Rob can respond right now, but because if the Board gives a response to the unofficial straw poll to the Applicant in a manner that he's amenable to coming back with more testimony next month there's certainly no need to open it up to anybody else at this point because there's going to be new testimony, there's going to be cross-examination,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 industry had in years. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: How so? Water? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Water. MR. SCHNEIDER: Water. They did it once in the Borough of Madison and they would cut my head off if I would suggest it. It would be the last job I ever would do for Verizon. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Put in sump pumps. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm sorry? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: You should see my basement after a storm. There are sump pumps that do the trick. I'm done, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Who else? All right. So you'd like a straw poll, I guess, right? What would you like the question to be? MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like the question to be as follows. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, let me ask this, as I see a hand. What's next? MR. MLENAK: I was going to suggest. Let Rich say what he wants to suggest for the Board to consider. But I think it's only fair given the amount of discussion tonight and the changes that have been 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	his peace. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Mr. Simon, would you likes to say your peace? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Well – MR. SIMON: I'd like to say more than that. MR. MLENAK: Let Rich finish so then Rob can respond. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that – okay. What about the gallery, Steve? So here's the question, right. And I'm going it ask the lawyers. When we have testimony then anybody in the gallery, Mr. Simon, can ask questions of the person who gave the testimony. I believe the way this works is if it's an attorney it's not really testimony because it's not. MR. MLENAK: So what we're CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Use your microphone. MR. MLENAK: Oh, of course. So what I'm proposing is that Rob can respond right now, but because if the Board gives a response to the unofficial straw poll to the Applicant in a manner that he's amenable to coming back with more testimony next month there's certainly no need to open it up to anybody else at this point because there's going to be new

	Page 73		Page 74
1	would have an opportunity to comment only on the new	1	vote.
2	material.	2	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Does that make sense?
3	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So let me say that	3	Does that make sense to everybody in the gallery, the
4	again, just more simply. We're not voting to approve	4	public? You will have another chance to ask questions.
5	anything tonight, right, Mr. Schneider?	5	We will not make a decision without people having an
6	MR. SCHNEIDER: Agreed.	6	opportunity to ask a question. Fair enough? Okay.
7	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All Mr. Schneider is	7	What would you like us to consider?
8	asking us to do is to say, you know what, I don't know	8	MR. SCHNEIDER: I would like to solicit the
9	exactly how he wants to phrase it, but hey could	9	Board's opinion that subject to all of the direction
10	80 feet work? And if the answer to that is yes Mr.	10	that it has given to the Applicant this evening
11	Schneider's going to go away and do all those things we	11	relative to the site plan considerations and the
12	just talked about, site plans and drawings and	12	design, that the Board believes that the pursuit of
13	whatever. And at that point that would be in March,	13	those that the Board believes that the Applicant's
14	that would be new testimony from whomever. And at that	14	response to those suggestions are worth pursuing in
15	point whenever there's new testimony the gallery can	15	recognition of the offer of 80 feet as a condition of
16	ask questions, the public can ask questions. So does	16	approval. I'm not asking the Board to commit to
17	that make sense?	17	approval, I'm asking the Board to give the Applicant
18	Fear not, we're not voting to approve	18	a a reasonable comfort level that those matters are
19	anything tonight. All we're doing is	19	worth pursuing in an effort to gain approval. And it
20	MR. MLENAK: Well, we don't know that. And	20	is satisfactorily resolved that the Board would
21	again the straw poll we want to call it, the Board is	21	reasonably consider that.
22	deliberating and giving opinions. It's not an advisory	22	MR. MLENAK: I think Mr. Simon would like
23	opinion. You're giving your opinions right now and the	23	to say something at this point.
24	Applicant can interpret those any way he wishes and	24	MR. SIMON: I think requesting a second
25	determine whether to come back or not or ask for a	25	straw poll is enormously unfair and violative of the
	Page 75		Page 76
-	_		-
1 2	Municipal Land Use Law. This case was over. There were summations. Deliberation. Straw poll was taken	1 2	height issue. And the way that Mr. Schneider, with all due respect presented this, and I give him credit for
3	in terms of the Board's feelings on the application	3	being crafty, he positioned it like it was clear to me
4	that was submitted that we went through 22 hearings on,	4	that what the concern was was the height.
5	and now on the 23rd hearing, oh wait.	5	I took copious notes, too. There were a
6	I took copious notes as to the Board's	6	lot of concerns eloquently, comprehensively addressed
7	feelings about the application that was submitted 22	7	by the various Board members with regard to this
8	hearings ago. And its feelings based on all the	8	application that went well beyond what was the proposed
9	testimony, all of the evidence, all of the comments	9	height. And I also respectfully submit that a decision
10	from all of the members of the public, whether it's	10	should not be based on a threat of litigation at any
11	visual impact, whether it's Historic District, whether	11	height, whether it's the Applicant who's threatening
12	it's other concerns. And the Board deliberated	12	litigation, whether it's a member of the public who is
13	appropriately and gave its opinion. The Applicant	13	threatening litigation. The Board needs to determine
14	comes back and says, oh, I took some notes and now I'm	14	the application based on the evidence that has been
15	going to address or try to address all of those	15	submitted.
16	concerns so I can get some votes.	16	And we submit that certainly, for example,
17	So I'm going to as if it's the only issue	17	if you are changing and presenting new evidence now as
18	in this case, which respectfully is offensive, is I'm	18	to heights, visual impacts, setbacks based on do we
19	just going to just take what was 140. We provided	19	have to take another site visit? Is there new
20	sworn testimony that we needed 140 no wait, we	20	testimony that's now going to be presented? Am I or
21	provided sworn testimony that we needed 130 no wait,	21	members of the public now obligated to make our own
22	120. Now we're down to all of a sudden Vwa-La. Eighty	22	record to come back before this Board with expert
23	feet now works. Surprise, surprise, after 22 hearings	23	witnesses and testimony as to this new 80-foot tower
24	we have to wait to find out that that is acceptable as	24	that is being proposed at an unknown setback at an
25	a height. The issue, though, is that it is not just a	25	unknown equipment compound size, but the one thing
l			10 (Pages 72 + 5.76)

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

Page	78

	Page 77		Page 78
1	and there's questions also actually under the Municipal	1	Historic District. And the fact that what's the
2	Land Use Law, under Section 46 of the Municipal Land	2	difference if this is 58 feet away from neighboring
3	Use Law that if a change to a plan represents a	3	properties, or as admitted to Mr. Schneider's credit 68
4	substantial amendment in the layout or improvements	4	feet away from neighboring properties.
5	proposed by a developer that has been subject of a	5	What did Mr. Masters say? Did he ever see
6	hearing an amended application shall be submitted and	6	a monopole in Historic District? No. Did he ever see
7	processed.	7	a monopole within a hundred feet of residential
8	So is it substantial? Do we have to start	8	properties that were one acre or greater? No. Did he
9	with this amended application? And in essence start	9	ever see a cell tower in a redevelopment zone? No.
10	again after 23 hearings with new testimony in evidence	10	Did he ever see a cell tower on the same property as
11	as to the impact of this 80-foot tower given the tree	11	one that is on the National and State Register of
12	line, given the vegetation and trees that are going to	12	Historic Places? No.
13	be removed, given the impact on the Historic District.	13	So I respectfully asked you to take into
14	Given the fact, and you heard my closing statement at	14	consideration the fact that we have been down this road
15	length, the fact that not only is this a prohibited	15	for a long time and Verizon was the one who went to the
16	use, not only are there multiple principal uses on a	16	Township. It wasn't the other way around. So they're
17	lot that are not permitted, not only does it violate	17	claiming, with all due respect, that oh, we're
18	many provisions of the conditional use standard for	18	precluding from changing this ridiculous my word
19	towers that are only permitted in two separate zones	19	setback to residential properties because the town
20	near Route 202, including the fact that you need to be	20	hasn't returned our phone calls or the town won't let
21	a thousand feet away from a Historic District versus	21	us, or oh if we do that Simon's going to start an
22	the fact that we're right smack in the middle of a	22	action claiming that the public bidding process was
23	Historic District. And we heard testimony in evidence	23	wrong. We didn't make that decision. That was the
24	and I summed it up in terms of the impacts, you heard	24	Applicant's decision to make.
25	it from the members of the public as well, to the	25	Did the Applicant to Mr. Boyan's point,
20	it nom the memory of the public as well, to the		Did the Applicant to Mil. Doyan's point,
	Dage 70		
			Page 80
	Page 79		Page 80
1	there's a whole issue about was there a proper	1	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite
2	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate	2	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township.
2 3	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as	2 3	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that
2 3 4	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise	2 3 4	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public
2 3 4 5	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is	2 3 4 5	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses.
2 3 4 5 6	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental	2 3 4 5 6	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about,
2 3 4 5 6 7	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on	2 3 4 5 6 7	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can
2 4 5 7 8	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I
2 3 4 5 6 7	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's	2 3 4 5 6 7	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test against the detrimental impacts to residential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years later just like we talked about with the Board of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test against the detrimental impacts to residential properties to the Historic District? I'm not going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years later just like we talked about with the Board of Education, there are new sheriffs in town. And now all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test against the detrimental impacts to residential properties to the Historic District? I'm not going to bore you with the many, many, many, many instances in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years later just like we talked about with the Board of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test against the detrimental impacts to residential properties to the Historic District? I'm not going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years later just like we talked about with the Board of Education, there are new sheriffs in town. And now all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test against the detrimental impacts to residential properties to the Historic District? I'm not going to bore you with the many, many, many, many instances in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years later just like we talked about with the Board of Education, there are new sheriffs in town. And now all of a sudden that new governing body says, well, look, they said what they're going to say. How can they bind us seven years later? What, are they binding us till
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test against the detrimental impacts to residential properties to the Historic District? I'm not going to bore you with the many, many, many, many instances in the zoning ordinance, in the wireless telecommunications ordinance, in the redevelopment plan, in the Master Plan that talks about the need to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years later just like we talked about with the Board of Education, there are new sheriffs in town. And now all of a sudden that new governing body says, well, look, they said what they're going to say. How can they bind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test against the detrimental impacts to residential properties to the Historic District? I'm not going to bore you with the many, many, many, many instances in the zoning ordinance, in the wireless telecommunications ordinance, in the redevelopment plan, in the Master Plan that talks about the need to protect the Historic District and residential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years later just like we talked about with the Board of Education, there are new sheriffs in town. And now all of a sudden that new governing body says, well, look, they said what they're going to say. How can they bind us seven years later? What, are they binding us till the end of time just because they were of a certain political persuasion or had a certain opinion as to a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test against the detrimental impacts to residential properties to the Historic District? I'm not going to bore you with the many, many, many instances in the zoning ordinance, in the wireless telecommunications ordinance, in the redevelopment plan, in the Master Plan that talks about the need to protect the Historic District and residential properties. Information, and I know Mr. Schneider and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years later just like we talked about with the Board of Education, there are new sheriffs in town. And now all of a sudden that new governing body says, well, look, they said what they're going to say. How can they bind us seven years later? What, are they binding us till the end of time just because they were of a certain
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	there's a whole issue about was there a proper investigation of alternate sites and alternate technologies given a proposed 80-foot tower? And as Mr. Mlenak has advised you, and will continue to advise you, under the Sica balancing test what you look at is the public interest at stake, versus the detrimental impacts, and then you balance and you determine on balance whether there's a substantial detriment. Right? We've heard that. We read that in Steve's memo. Well, guess what? What happens when this tower that was 140-feet tall and was providing all this coverage. And Ms. Boschulte testified that, oh, we can't do it at 80 feet. 80 feet doesn't make any sense. It's in the transcript. And now we say, okay, well, it's going to have less coverage. Well, how do you compare that less coverage in the balancing test against the detrimental impacts to residential properties to the Historic District? I'm not going to bore you with the many, many, many, many instances in the zoning ordinance, in the wireless telecommunications ordinance, in the redevelopment plan, in the Master Plan that talks about the need to protect the Historic District and residential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	or maybe transparently barely addressed, despite growing up here in Harding Township. We didn't pick this property not only that is subject to a bidding process as being a public property, but one that has all these different uses. We didn't do that. With regard to this issue about, oh, well, we can go to the governing body and they can agree or not agree to limit the height of the tower. I have been involved in litigation over the issue of either a carrier saying, well, we're not bound by that. I'm looking at state law. I'm looking at Section 46.2. I'm looking at Federal law in terms of what I can do, and that's what I'm doing. I've also been involved in cases where the governing body who made a promise, and in fact imposed the deed restriction as to a various issue, seven years later just like we talked about with the Board of Education, there are new sheriffs in town. And now all of a sudden that new governing body says, well, look, they said what they're going to say. How can they bind us seven years later? What, are they binding us till the end of time just because they were of a certain political persuasion or had a certain opinion as to a

	Page 81		Page 82
1	tower 200 yards away and let them sue us. Let the	1	one way or another. And certainly a threshold issue
2	neighbors or whomever sue us.	2	here again, I took really pretty good notes on your
3	So this is not simply, oh, we're going to	3	excellent intelligent comments the last time we were
4	go to the governing body with a condition that they	4	together as to your concerns, and it wasn't just, hey,
5	need to agree X, Y or Z. It is not as simple as that.	5	if they lower this to 80 feet, you know, I'm good. Did
6	Whether you want to talk about the public bidding	6	we say the word we, we, did we say the word
7	process or whether you want to talk about the law, just	7	"historic" once in two hours? The answer is no. As if
8	generally. So, you know, again, there are a lot of	8	we're ignoring, we, are ignoring the evidence and
9	complications associated with, in essence, opening this	9	testimony and commentary regarding the impacts to the
10	case back up again after you've heard from all the	10	Historic District. Have we heard once about the impact
11	evidence and you've heard the testimony, based on the	11	of taking a tower and lowering it to 80 feet and how
12	application that was submitted. Hey, we didn't have	12	that works with alternate technology including outdoor
13	this discussion in the third hearing or the first	13	DAS, Distributed Antenna Systems, along roadways in
14	hearing or the fourth hearing. You know, come on guys,	14	light of models that are conceptual, potential models,
15	it's 140. Can't you reduce it to 80 and we can	15	how that works, how this is all interplayed with the
16	eliminate some of these equipment cabinets, et cetera,	16	telecommunications ordinance in the Township, as well
17	et cetera, right? It's not until the 22nd hearing or	17	as the small cell public right-of-way ordinance that we
18	the 23rd hearing, I'm sorry, Rich, that all of a sudden	18	talked about last time, or at least I talked about last
19	it's, oh, well, we're going to go in a different	19	time, where the height is 35 feet, right, and placing
20	direction now. Why are they going in a different	20	them along the right-of-way. And what's the delta,
21	direction? Because they were going to lose the vote.	21	what's the difference in the coverage? And how that
22	And we submit that making this type of change that's	22	plays into a balancing with the consideration of the
23	going to open the case up to additional proofs that are	23	impact to the neighbors and the impact to the Historic
24	going to be required, evidence that's going to be	24	District. Whether this is a hundred feet, or 80 feet,
25	required we believe, because a record needs to be made	25	it's big. It is wide as a flagless flagpole, as a
	Page 83		Page 84
1	Page 83	1	Page 84
1	alleged stealth tree.	1 2	later after they heard the Board's comments and know
2	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the	1 2 3	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go.
	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to	2	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I
2 3	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and	2 3 4	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a
2 3 4	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as	2 3	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly
2 3 4 5	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I	2 3 4 5	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours,
2 3 4 5 6	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District,	2 3 4 5 6	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to
2 3 4 5 6 7	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get	2 3 4 5 6 7	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. And I'm sure that there are other members
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. And I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then, oh, yeah, we didn't get a phone call back from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. Mad I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. And I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said my peace for the record with regard to with regard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then, oh, yeah, we didn't get a phone call back from the township attorney, but we'll try that again and see if we can move it 10 more feet, as if it's going to make a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. And I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said my peace for the record with regard to with regard to this particular issue about taking a straw poll and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then, oh, yeah, we didn't get a phone call back from the township attorney, but we'll try that again and see if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. And I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said my peace for the record with regard to with regard to this particular issue about taking a straw poll and potentially boxing in the Board where we're going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then, oh, yeah, we didn't get a phone call back from the township attorney, but we'll try that again and see if we can move it 10 more feet, as if it's going to make a difference, frankly, right, within the compound. So again, and I apologize if I seem a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. Mad I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said my peace for the record with regard to with regard to this particular issue about taking a straw poll and potentially boxing in the Board where we're going to have just an amended application and it's going to go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then, oh, yeah, we didn't get a phone call back from the township attorney, but we'll try that again and see if we can move it 10 more feet, as if it's going to make a difference, frankly, right, within the compound.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. And I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said my peace for the record with regard to with regard to this particular issue about taking a straw poll and potentially boxing in the Board where we're going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then, oh, yeah, we didn't get a phone call back from the township attorney, but we'll try that again and see if we can move it 10 more feet, as if it's going to make a difference, frankly, right, within the compound. So again, and I apologize if I seem a little animated. And you know, it's just unbelievable to me, and I put like three exclamation points on my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. Mad I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said my peace for the record with regard to with regard to this particular issue about taking a straw poll and potentially boxing in the Board where we're going to have just an amended application and it's going to go on so that a record can appropriately be made by any interested party.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then, oh, yeah, we didn't get a phone call back from the township attorney, but we'll try that again and see if we can move it 10 more feet, as if it's going to make a difference, frankly, right, within the compound. So again, and I apologize if I seem a little animated. And you know, it's just unbelievable to me, and I put like three exclamation points on my notes here, that three years later Verizon suddenly has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. And I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said my peace for the record with regard to with regard to this particular issue about taking a straw poll and potentially boxing in the Board where we're going to go on so that a record can appropriately be made by any interested party.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	alleged stealth tree. So, you know, with all due respect to the Applicant, you know, again, I think that going to another straw poll and reopening the case and continuing on and then we have to present evidence as to the impact of this 80-foot tower on everything I discussed, including of course the Historic District, right, do we need to spend money, our own money to get a crane operator out there at 80 feet and fly the yellow balloon and do a walk about? Do we need to do that? And I'm not saying that sarcastically. I'm making a point that it is not as simple as, okay, we're going to go from 140, 130, 120, 100, 80, 80, that's it. That's the number. That's the one I want. And then, oh, yeah, we didn't get a phone call back from the township attorney, but we'll try that again and see if we can move it 10 more feet, as if it's going to make a difference, frankly, right, within the compound. So again, and I apologize if I seem a little animated. And you know, it's just unbelievable to me, and I put like three exclamation points on my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	later after they heard the Board's comments and know which way this case was going to go. So again, I have many more things that I could say about this, and I apologize again for being a little animated, but it is unbelievable and admittedly upsetting that this dialogue over the last two hours, at least from my perspective, with all due respect to the Board, has turned into can we just lower it to 80 feet and do a couple of things here and there and not take site of all 22 hearings guys, 22 hearings, of a lot of information that was submitted to this Board. Mad I'm sure that there are other members of the public that may want to speak on this issue. I'm not sure, maybe not. But I believe that I've said my peace for the record with regard to with regard to this particular issue about taking a straw poll and potentially boxing in the Board where we're going to have just an amended application and it's going to go on so that a record can appropriately be made by any interested party.

25

25

if we can move the setback a little bit. Three years

we're entering a new phase of this that I respectfully

	Page 85		Page 86
1	believe is possibly inappropriate given where we are	1	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: Here.
2	procedurally with regard to the case. Thank you.	2	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Rosenbaum?
3	(Applause from the public.)	3	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Here.
4	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. How about	4	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Symonds?
5	we take a five-minute break. We'll come back and when	5	BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: Here.
6	we come back remind me I think I have to ask the Board	6	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Newlin?
7	if they have any questions for Mr. Simon. We'll take a	7	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Here.
8	five-minute break.	8	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Flanagan?
9	(Whereupon, a brief recess is taken at	9	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Here.
10	9:05 p.m.)	10	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: And Mr. Fox and Ms.
11	(Back on the record at 9:10 p.m.)	11	Mertz are still here, and Mr. Mlenak.
12	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Lori can you put	12	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We're waiting for Mr.
13	us back on?	13	Schneider. Is Mr. Schneider in the hallway?
14	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: We're back on. Can	14	We're back on the record. Everyone's back
15	everyone please have a seat? We're back on. We're	15	in the room. So Mr. Simon, thank you. My first
16	recording.	16	question is Steve, is there anything procedurally
17	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Can we dot roll call?	17	inappropriate about us taking a straw poll tonight?
18	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Yes. Mr. Boyan?	18	MR. MLENAK: In my opinion it's not. The
19	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Here.	19	fact that the Board is doing what its designed to do.
20	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Addonizio?	20	You're evaluating a case under a standard where one of
21	BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: Here.	21	the prongs specifically requires the Board to evaluate
22	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Ms. Sovolos is	22	what conditions can be proposed to mitigate certain
23	excused. Mr. Maselli?	23	detrimental effects. That process is often undertaken
24	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Here.	24	in consultation with the Applicant as to what they
25	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Mr. Cammarata?	25	would consent to, and that's been the basis of the
	Page 87		Page 88
1	discussion tonight. I don't see anything	1	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon.
1 2	discussion tonight. I don't see anything inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find	1 2	-
			right. Thank you, Mr. Simon.
2	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find	2	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked
2 3	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without	2 3	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a
2 3 4	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially	2 3 4	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not
2 3 4 5	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's	2 3 4 5	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the
2 3 4 5 6	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is	2 3 4 5 6	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is
2 3 4 5 6 7	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate.	2 3 4 5 6 7	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application. Everybody here knows because you're involved in I believe more than one currently suit. Any Applicant or any Objector for that matter has the right to bring	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the tower you're reducing the negative visual impact. To answer the question, yes, I do think it's worth discussing further. Does anybody else want to go next?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application. Everybody here knows because you're involved in I believe more than one currently suit. Any Applicant or any Objector for that matter has the right to bring suit to a higher tribunal to adjudicate what they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the tower you're reducing the negative visual impact. To answer the question, yes, I do think it's worth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application. Everybody here knows because you're involved in I believe more than one currently suit. Any Applicant or any Objector for that matter has the right to bring	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the tower you're reducing the negative visual impact. To answer the question, yes, I do think it's worth discussing further. Does anybody else want to go next?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application. Everybody here knows because you're involved in I believe more than one currently suit. Any Applicant or any Objector for that matter has the right to bring suit to a higher tribunal to adjudicate what they thought was a wrong decision by this Board. And any cost associated with that should not be considered by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the tower you're reducing the negative visual impact. To answer the question, yes, I do think it's worth discussing further. Does anybody else want to go next? BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: You said last time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application. Everybody here knows because you're involved in I believe more than one currently suit. Any Applicant or any Objector for that matter has the right to bring suit to a higher tribunal to adjudicate what they thought was a wrong decision by this Board. And any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the tower you're reducing the negative visual impact. To answer the question, yes, I do think it's worth discussing further. Does anybody else want to go next? BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: You said last time you were going from the left.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application. Everybody here knows because you're involved in I believe more than one currently suit. Any Applicant or any Objector for that matter has the right to bring suit to a higher tribunal to adjudicate what they thought was a wrong decision by this Board. And any cost associated with that should not be considered by the Board. You have my memo which sets forth what you should consider.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the tower you're reducing the negative visual impact. To answer the question, yes, I do think it's worth discussing further. Does anybody else want to go next? BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: You said last time you were going from the left.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application. Everybody here knows because you're involved in I believe more than one currently suit. Any Applicant or any Objector for that matter has the right to bring suit to a higher tribunal to adjudicate what they thought was a wrong decision by this Board. And any cost associated with that should not be considered by the Board. You have my memo which sets forth what you should consider. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Anybody on the Board	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the tower you're reducing the negative visual impact. To answer the question, yes, I do think it's worth discussing further. Does anybody else want to go next? BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: You said last time you were going from the left. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Oh, I lied. Tom, you're up. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: I'm so I've heard both sides. I'm still what I said last time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	inappropriate. In fact, I think a Court would find that forcing you to vote on something without evaluating those options would be potentially inefficiency of this Board's time, the municipality's time and ultimately the Court's time. So I think it is appropriate. I will comment on one thing that Mr. Simon noted that I do agree with, although it didn't come up in any deliberations by the Board members so I didn't address it, but I will address it now that it has been brought up twice. This Board knows not to, and I will make sure that I will say now so you do if you didn't, that you should not consider at all any threat of litigation as a basis for considering this application. Everybody here knows because you're involved in I believe more than one currently suit. Any Applicant or any Objector for that matter has the right to bring suit to a higher tribunal to adjudicate what they thought was a wrong decision by this Board. And any cost associated with that should not be considered by the Board. You have my memo which sets forth what you should consider.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	right. Thank you, Mr. Simon. So we're back to I think what you had asked right before Mr. Simon. As I recall, to put it in a nutshell, you would like a straw poll on whether or not this is worth pursuing at 80 feet given all of the mitigating or all the discussions we had tonight. Is that the question? MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll tell you what, in no particular order I'm happy to go first. I think it is worth discussing at 80 feet. I think in my mind this has always been, I think I put on the record the last time, the concern is about the visual impact being in a Historic District. The visual impact is caused by the height of the tower. By reducing the height of the tower you're reducing the negative visual impact. To answer the question, yes, I do think it's worth discussing further. Does anybody else want to go next? BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: You said last time you were going from the left.

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

1In the obset of the way it is.I understand that there1The other site.The other site.12is - there's some hereft to those, to call phone useand cell phone tower, but at the same time there's aif is very initual		Page 89		Page 90
2is - there's some benefit to those, to cell phone use and cell phone tore, but at the same time there's a to for all agrees where, but at the same time there's a to for all agrees but any get that we're the supposed to follow that says that this phace, this to for all agrees but any get that we're that says that this phace, this to for all agrees but any get that we're that says that this phace, this to for all agrees but any get that says that this phace, this to for all agrees but any get that says that this phace, this to for all agrees but any get that says that this phace, this to for all agrees but any get that says that this phace, this to for all agrees but any get that says the this is a restored everything I said last time, but this is a restored everything I said last time, but this is a restored everything I said last time, but this is a restored everything I said last time, but this is a restored everything I said last time, but this is a restored everything I said last time, but this is a restored everything I said last time, but this is a restored everything I said last time, but this is a restored everything I said last time, but this is a restored agree with your summary. I do think that there's to diagree with your summary. I do think that there's to diagree with your summary. I do think that there's to diagree with your summary. I do think that there's to diagree with your summary. I do think that there show thit this and the said the said the would take back to is that you would agree with weight because that your summary. I do think that there's this, I'll and there show thit that your summary. I do think that we have the set that you would have the set proven that your summary. I do think that we have the set that you would have that your summary. I do think that we have the set that you would have that your summary. I do that your summa	1	hard to keep it the way it is. I understand that there	1	The other site. I mean. I think you've
1 and cell phone tower, but at the same time there's a 3 if's very minimal. And I guess barely. That's it, 4 bit of language in these books that were 3 if's very minimal. And I guess barely. That's it, 6 beating in these books that were 3 if's very minimal. And I guess barely. That's it, 7 audy constructions in out bright place for it. So with that 5 CHARMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Arte? 8 CHARMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fair enough. 5 retirent everything I said last time, but this is a 9 Obviously, lowering it from 10 guest 64 fermer, we the visual impact. 50 11 do agree with your summay. 160 think that there's 10 would definitely like to see the Applicant take into 12 been proven a need, ag pn in coverage. As you said 12 account all of the conversations we had tokay and all 14 the injust. So if that height can be reduced is a good 11 that answers in from Arie? 15 Landy, I will complain that 1 just don't CHARMAN FLANAGAN: by words minimizing and the back ho height because 16 Landy, I will complain the? modersation the said he words a significant 17 and how if yor an undersation there of a good 10 18 BOARD		1 2	2	
4 bot of language in these books that we get that we're 4 Mike. 5 supposed to follow that says that this place, this 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Arie? 6 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fair enough. 7 reinnide rmy biggest deterent was the visual impact. 10 FORED MEMBER NEWLIN: So Mike, I mostly, I 0 Obviously, lowering if the 100 feet to 80 feet goes a 11 do agree with your ammungs. Lo do like that there's 10 lowg way towarks minimizing that visual impact. 12 been proven a need, a gap in coverage. As you said 12 account all of the conversations we had today and all 13 before Tm going to add that. I do think the bright is 12 account all of the conversations we had today and all 14 that going to be an important consideration for me. 16 Hat answer is from Arie? 15 that's going to be an important consideration for mo. 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Buy werth proceeding 14 there of the property. I's a mystery to 18 Obviously. Far worth for a dim the lipst for 15 or stanks. 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Buy Net Proceeding 18 14 there one a minor far supper, because that would 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN		-	1	
5 supposed to follow that says that this place, this 5 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: All right. Arie? 6 location is not the right place for it. So with that 6 released everything is sail baits time, but this is a 7 and All no sup want to go near? 0 released everything is sail baits time, but this is a 10 BOARD MEMBER NEVLIN: So Mike, I mostly, I 0 released everything is sail baits time, but this is a 11 do agree with your aummary. 1do think that there's 10 long way towards minimizing that visual impact. So I 12 beer proven a need, agp in covernge, 4 soy us said 11 the inpact. So I fina height can be reduced in a good 13 before I'm going to add that. 1do think the beight is 11 the inpact. So I fina height can be reduced in a good 14 the impact. So I fina height can be reduced in a good 11 do agree with your concerned about the setback 15 that going to be an important consideration for me. 12 clients. So that sm y comment. 15 that going to be an important consideration for me. 13 there was a number of items that is don't 16 Lands Jui Will complain that 1 jisst don't 13 there was a number of items that is don't ward to locace the 16		•	1	
6 Iscatton is not for it. 6 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Im not going to reinterace everything is said last time, but this is a reinterate werything is said last time, but this is a reinterate with bigseid determine with evisaul impact. 9 ALf do you want to go next? 9 Obviously, lowering it from 130 feet to 80 feet goes a long way towards with evisaul impact. 10 do agree with your summary. I do think that there's long way towards we had today and all lot fee conversations we had today and all lot mere. 13 Im make very concerned about the setback lot first informatic consideration for me. 18 CHARIMAN FLANAGAN: Do you understand whar that seging to be an important consideration for me. 18 CHARIMAN FLANAGAN: No worth preceeding as the feet? 14 that seging to be an important consideration for me. 18 CHARIMAN FLANAGAN: Do you understand whar that seging to property. If s a mystery to understand why the torm of didn try had to locate the locate the center of the property. If s a mystery to understand why the constant have doet to have a sequent property. If s a mystery to understand with the set all worth gene center of the property. If s a mystery to understand with the dasout this is a serease that worth preceedin			1	
7 said, In not for it. 7 reiterate everything I said last time, but this is a 8 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay, Fair enough, 7 reiterate everything I said last time, but this is a 10 BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So Mike, Innosity, I 0 00/sicolary, lowering if non 130 feet to 80 feet goes a 11 do agree with your aurumay. I do think that there's 10 long way towards minimizing that visual impact. So I 12 the import on exercise, As you said 11 the import on exercise, As you said 13 before I'm going to add that. I do think the height is 11 the opints that be said he would take book to his 14 the import on what Mr. Schneider comes back with 11 that answer is from Air.? 14 the import on what Mr. Schneider comes back with 12 MR. SCHNEIDER: Until the last sentence. 15 Lastly, I'will complain that I just don't get any 13 the frace. To me if's not just the height because 16 tower in the center of the property. If's a mystery to me. And I'm disperbited that we don't get any 14 frace and I'm disperbited that we don't get any 16 mandso with is being migrant. 14 frace and I'm disperbited that we don't get any 16 mead mow it be any migrant cons			1	-
8 CHARMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fair enough. 8 reminder my biggest deterent was the visual impact. 9 Aff, do you want to go next? Obviously, lowering in from 130 feet to 80 feet goes a 11 do agree with your summary. I do think that there's before Prooren a need, a gap in coverage. As you said 12 before Prooren a need, a gap in coverage. As you said 11 13 before Prooren a need, a gap in coverage. As you said 12 14 the impact. So if that beight can be reduced is a good 13 the ownload take back to his 15 thing. I am also very concerned about the setback 14 that's going to be an important consideration for me. 16 I am also very concerned about the setback 16 that's going to be an important consideration for me. 17 tand genopating to be an important consideration for me. 18 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: bi it worth proceeding at 80 feet? 16 tansy information on that appect, because that would 19 10 10 10 17 and feet af least in terms 21 board MLMBER AGENBAUM: Yes. I think it's worth proceeding. 18 18 18 evening. But equally important is this setback issue 10 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARTA: I's was on			7	
9 Alf. do yeu want to ge next? 9 Obviously, lowering it from 130 fact to 80 feet gees a 10 BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So Mike, I mostly, I 10 Image way towards minimizing that visual impact. So I 11 before The going to add that. I do hink the theight is 10 would definitely like to see the Applicant take into 12 before The going to add that. I do hink the theight is 11 the impact. So if faut height can be reduced is a good 13 the fauge. So if faut height can be reduced is a good 12 cancent all of the conversations we had today and all 14 I and alow erv concerned about the setback 13 the points that be said he would take back his 15 I and alopending on what Mr. Schneider concers back with 16 TMR SCHNEDER: Unif the last sentence. 16 I and shoppointed that wold to the setback 16 TMR SCHNEDER: Unif the last sentence. 17 MR SCHNEDER: Unif the last sentence. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is it worth proceeding. 18 18 moderstand whyth Towoid that to locate the tower in the center of the property. It is an mystery to me. And I'm disappointed that wold 18 18 18 19 information on that seque. Cheause that would 18 Encer. Tone is inon in that I dolen teel 19 <th></th> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th></th>			1	
10 BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: So Mike, I mostly, I 11 do agree with your summary. I do think that there's 12 been proven a need, a gap in coverage. As you said 13 before Tm going to ad that. I do hink the height is 14 the impact. So I that height can be reduced is a good 15 thing. 16 I an also very concerned about the setback 17 and depending on what Mr. Schneider comes back with 18 that's ging to be an important consideration for me. 19 Lastly, I will complain that I just don't 10 understand why the Town didn't ty hard to locate the 10 tower in the center of the property. It's a mystery to 11 tower in the center of the property. It's a mystery to 11 tower in the center of the property. It's a mystery to 11 tower in the center of the property. It's a mystery to 12 of setbacks. 13 and mode in this steek is ase 14 the concert is not just the height is asset take that would 15 of setbacks. 16 that asset is being mitigated. Might not be enough but 17 my list, even thought it wash't alked about this			1	
11 do agree with your summary. I do think that there's 11 would definitely like to see the Applicant take into 12 before moging to add that. I do think the hight is 12 account all of the conversations we had doaly and all 13 the impact. So if that height can be reduced is a good 13 the points that he said he would take back to his 14 the impact. So if that height can be reduced is a good 14 clients. So that's my comment. 15 thing. I an also very concerned about the setback 16 16 that's going to be an important consideration for me. 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is it worth proceeding 16 table, Yill Complia that I just dot 1 16 BOARD MEMBER NOSENBAUM: Yes. I think ifs 17 me. And I misappoint that used at least in terms 21 the fonce. To me is no just the height because 18 of setbacks. 12 BOARD MEMBER NASELLE: Personally. Two on the fonce to nowing formation on that aspeet, because that would 23 19 my list, even hough it wasrt laked about this use 24 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I vas on the fence, to, like Dun, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. 10 think tree's a significant 24 portentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms 24 Feage 91			1	
12 been proven a need, a gap in coverage. As you said 12 account all of the conversations we had today and all 13 before Pr going to add that. I do think the height is 13 the points that he said he would take back to his 14 the impact. So it that height can be reduced is a good 14 the points that he said he would take back to his 15 that a move is from AGM. 15 CHAIRMAN FLANGAN: Do you understand what 16 that spoing to be an important consideration for me. 16 CHAIRMAN FLANGAN: Is it worth proceeding. 19 Lastly, I will complain that I just don' 19 at 80 fee? 20 understand why the Town dight try hard to locate the 20 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Personally, Im on 14 the fence. To m if s no just the height because 10 the fence. To m if s no just the height because 15 of setbacks. 25 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 26 20 mod wir be beign minigrated. Might not be enough but 1 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 21 woodh have to be a pretry significant wing from the 2 scawet that I dilate to seaw shaft George relayed to to 23 and how ir being minigrated. Might not be enough but 3 <			1	
13 before Pm going to add that. I do think the height is 13 the points that he said he would take back to his 14 the impact. So if that height can be reduced is a good 14 clients. So that's my comment. 15 thing. 15 clients. So that's my comment. 16 Tam also very concerned about the setback 16 clients. So that's my comment. 18 that's going to be an important consideration for me. 18 clients. So that's my comment. 19 Tastly. I will complain that I just don't met and Pm disappointed that we dark get any at 80 feer? 20 understand why the Town didn't ry bard to locate the 20 BOARD MEMBER MASELLE Personally. Fm on 21 rec. And Pm disappointed that we dark get any 23 the fence. To me ifs not just the height because 23 information on that aspect, because that would 23 there was a number of items that I didn't feel 25 of setbacks. 25 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the top of 24 there was a number of items that I didn't feel 26 25 of setbacks 1 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the feel core on the stop on that. 26 reventing. But equaly important is this setbac			1	
14 the impact. So if that height can be reduced is a good 14 clients. So that's my comment. 15 thing. and abovery concerned about the setback 15 CHARMAN FLANAGAN: Do you understand what 16 and depending on what Mr. Schneider comes back with 16 CHARMAN FLANAGAN: Is it worth proceeding 19 Lastly, I will complain that J just don't 18 CHARMAN FLANAGAN: Is it worth proceeding 19 Lastly, I will complain that Y just don't 19 at 80 feet? 20 understand why the Town didn't ty hand to locate the 20 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Personally, Iro on 21 me: And Im disappointed that we don't get any 22 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Personally, Iro on 22 of setbacks. 25 ordernation on that szept. clocause that would 23 there row a number of items that I didn't feel 25 23 of setbacks. 25 board find the beight because 24 there was a number of items that I didn't feel 26 comfartable with. Historic is definitely on the top of 24 evening. But equally important is this setback issue 14 Feage 92 Feage 92 Feage 92 26 my bist, even though it wasm't talked about this 1 <th></th> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th></th>			1	
15 thing. 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Do you understand what 16 I am also very concerned about the selback 16 that sever is from Arie? 17 and depending on what Mr. Schneider comes back with 17 MR. SCHNEIDER: Unit the last sentence. 18 that's going to be an important consideration for me. 17 MR. SCHNEIDER: Unit the last sentence. 20 understand why the Town didn't try hard to locate the 20 DOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think it's 21 tworth proceeding. 22 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think it's 22 me. And I'm disappointed that we don't get any 22 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think it's 22 me. And I'm disappointed that we don't get any 23 the fence. To me it's not just the height because 24 potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms 24 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think it's 25 of setbacks. 23 there was a number of items that I didn't feel 25 26 my list, even though it wasn't talked about this 21 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 26 evening. 12 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 26 27 my list,			1	-
16 I am also very concerned about the sebuck 16 I am also very concerned about the sebuck 17 and depending on what Mr. Schneider comes back with 17 MR. SCHNEIDER: Until the last sentence. 18 that's going to be an important consideration for me. 18 I Am ANN LANAGAN: Is it worth proceeding 19 Lastly, I will complain that lights don't 19 at 80 feet? 20 understand why the Town didn't try hard to locate the 20 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think it's 21 worth proceeding. 22 BOARD MEMBER MASELL: Personally, I'm on 14 free was a number of items that I didn't feel 20 23 of setbacks. 21 Worth Proceeding. 24 potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms 23 the fence. To me it's not just the height because 24 there was a number of items that I didn't feel 25 comfortable with. Historic's a significant 25 of setbacks. 1 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 26 that if what is being proposed, but it 3 visual impact. I do think three's a significant 26 current the application that's before us right now for 5 cavent that I dike t			1	
17 and depending on what Mr. Schneider comes back with 18 18 that's going to be an important consideration for me. 18 19 Lastly, I will complain that I just don't 19 10 understand why the row didh't ry hard to locate the 10 10 understand why the row didh't ry hard to locate the 20 10 understand why the row didh't ry hard to locate the 20 21 tower in the center of the property. It's a mystery to 20 22 me. And I'm disappointed that we don't get any 21 23 information on that aspect, because that would 23 24 potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms 24 25 of setbacks. 25 Page 91 Page 92 1 my list, even though it wasn't talked about this 2 evening. But equally important is this setback issue 2 3 and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but 3 4 fmw willing to look at what is being proposed, but it 4 5 ceventing. But equally important is this setback issue 2 and how it's being mitigated.		-	1	
18 that's going to be an important consideration for me. 18 that's going to be an important consideration for me. 19 Lasty, I will complain that I just don't 19 at 80 feet? 20 understand why the Town didn't try hard to locate the 20 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think it's 21 tworth proceeding. 21 worth proceeding. 22 me. And I'm disappointed that we don't get any 22 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think it's 24 potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms 23 the fence. To me it's not just the height because 25 of setbacks. 20 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the enough but 21 26 my list, even though it wasn't talked about this 2 fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the 3 and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but 3 visual impact. I do think there's a significant 4 mwilling to look at what is being roposed, but it 4 reduction but Th all for moving forward with it with a 5 carveat that Pilikiton an digreg proposed to 1 mailso concerned about the school, 6 current the application that's before us right now for 1 1 1 </th <th></th> <th>-</th> <th></th> <th></th>		-		
19 Lastly, I will complain that I just don't 19 at 80 feet? 20 understand why the Town didn't try hard to locate the 20 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think its 21 tower in the center of the property. It's a mystery to 20 BOARD MEMBER MOSELL: Personally, I'm on 23 information on that aspect, because that would 23 the fence. To me it's not just the height because 24 potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms 24 there was a number of items that I didn't feel 25 of setbacks. 25 comfortable with. Historic is definitely on the top of Page 921 Page 921 Page 921 Page 921 Page 92 1 my list, even though it wash talked about this 1 91 Page 92 Page 92 1 91 Page 92 1 92 1 1 1			1	
20 understand why the Town didn't try hard to locate the 20 understand why the Town didn't try hard to locate the 21 tower in the center of the property. It's a mystery to 22 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: Yes. I think it's 22 me. And I'm disappointed that we don't get any 23 information on that speet, because that would 23 23 information on that speet, because that would 23 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Personally, I'm on 24 potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms 25 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the top of 25 of setbacks. 26 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the top of 26 revering. But equally important is this setback issue 1 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 26 evening. But equally important is this setback issue 1 Frace too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the 3 and how it's being motions that being proposed, but it 3 evening. But equally important is thin setback issue 1 4 I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it 4 reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a 3 and how it's being mitigated. Might now for 1 1 1 me. 1 1<			1	
21 tower in the center of the property. It's a mystery to 21 worth proceeding. 22 me. And I'm disappointed that we don't get any 22 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Personally, I'm on 23 information on that speet, because that would 23 the fence. To me it's not just the height because 24 potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms of setbacks. 24 25 of setbacks. 25 comfortable with. Historic is definitely on the top of 26 my list, even though it wasn't talked about this 1 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 2 evening. But equally important is this setback issue 1 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 3 would have to be a pretty significant swing from the 3 visual impact. I do think there's a significant 4 I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it 4 reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a 4 add would like to see some input from 6 superimpose the cell tower. 1 7 me. 7 Tam also concerned about the school, 1 8 thorgo of a aggressive approach to 1 10 20-foot drop of cell towere. It's just a				
22 me. And I'm disappointed that we don't get any information on that aspect, because that would potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms of setbacks. 22 BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Personally, I'm on the fence. To me it's not just the height because there was a number of items that I didn't feel comfortable with. Historic is definitely on the top of 25 of setbacks. 24 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual inpact. I do think there's a significant reduction but Th all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I di like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell lower. 3 and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but it would have to be a pretry significant symptome the current the application that's before us right now for me. 7 I am also concerned about the school, though. Th unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 10 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just a 10 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just a 10 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just a 10 aorarival for you? 14 that if the bright is mitigated and the setback issue 11 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? 16 16 beight issue, my concern has always been the bright. 18 18 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. 16 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Sokay. Hugh? 16 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>1</th><th></th></t<>			1	
23 information of that aspect, because that would 24 potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms 25 of setbacks. Page 91 Page 92 1 Page 92 2 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant 2 evening mitigated. Might not be enough but 4 Pri willing to look at what is being proposed, but it 4 5 would have to be a pretty significant swing from the 6 current the application that's before us right now for 7 me. Tam also concerned about the school, 9 may bits to may be a little bit more of an aggressive approach to 10 the rege 11 11 CHARMAN FLANAGAN: Colspan="2">Cander and bow the school, 11 mode the property. Because I think 12 that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue 12 CHARMAN FLANAGAN: Colspan="2">Calspan= 2 11 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I would the top of 12 m			1	
24 potentially give you a hundred feet at least in terms 25 25 of setbacks. 26 Page 91 Page 92 1 my list, even though it wasn't talked about this 1 2 evening. But equally important is this setback issue 1 3 and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but 1 4 Fm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it 3 5 would have to be a pretty significant swing from the carvent that 12 like to see what George relayed to to 6 current the application that's before us right now for 7 Tam also concerned about the school, 7 me. 7 Tam also concerned about the school, 8 And I would like to see some input from 8 thor what are be: 10 the Town and getting an answer about whether it could 10 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just a 12 that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? 16 BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would 16 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. 15 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? 15 BOARD MEMBER DYAN: So			1	•
25 of setbacks. 25 and of with Minisch Oriman Origina Origin		-	1	
Page 91 Page 92 1 my list, even though it wasn't talked about this 1 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 2 evening. But equally important is this setback issue 1 BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the 3 and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but 1 reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a 4 I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it 4 reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a 5 would have to be a pretty significant swing from the 5 caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to 6 current the application that's before us right now for 6 superimpose the cell tower. 7 reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to 8 And I would like to see some input from 9 superimpose the cell tower. 9 maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to 9 still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 10 the Town and getting an answer about whether it could 10 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just an clear as to 11 go somewhere else on that property. Because I think 11 how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Ok			1	
1my list, even though it wasn't talked about this1BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the2evening. But equally important is this setback issue2fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the3and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but3visual impact. I do think there's a significant4I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it4reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a5would have to be a pretty significant swing from the5caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to6current the application that's before us right now for6superimpose the cell tower.7me.7I am also concerned about the school,8And I would like to see some input from8though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't9maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to9still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a10the Town and getting an answer about whether it could1020-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to11go somewhere else on that property. Because I think11how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think I made my16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I w			2.5	connorable with. Thistorie is deminicity on the top of
2evening. But equally important is this setback issue2fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the3and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but3visual impact. I do think there's a significant4I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it4reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a5would have to be a pretty significant swing from the5caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to6current the application that's before us right now for6superimpose the cell tower.7me.7I am also concerned about the school,8Mol Would like to see some input from8though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't9still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a20-foot drop of cell tower.10the Town and getting an answer about whether it could1020-foot drop of cell tower. It's just a11go somewhere else on that property. Because I think11how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think I made my16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clea				
3and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but3visual impact. I do think there's a significant4I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it4reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a5would have to be a pretty significant swing from the5caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to6current the application that's before us right now for6superimpose the cell tower.7me.7I am also concerned about the school,8And I would like to see some input from8though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't9maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to9still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a10the Town and getting an answer about whether it could1020-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to11go somewhere else on that property. Because I think11how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my16bove to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'l take the opportunity17love to see the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria18height issue, my		Page 91		Page 92
4I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it4reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a5would have to be a pretty significant swing from the5caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to6current the application that's before us right now for6superimpose the cell tower.7me.7I am also concerned about the school,8And I would like to see some input from8though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't9maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to9still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a10the Town and getting an answer about whether it could1020-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to11go somewhere else on that property. Because I think11how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issue resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'l take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20<	1	_	1	2
5would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me.5caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower.7me.7I am also concerned about the school,8And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think is mitigated and the setback issue1020-foot drop of cell tower. It's just a tow that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to object.23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point		my list, even though it wasn't talked about this	1	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the
6current the application that's before us right now for me.6superimpose the cell tower.7me.7Iam also concerned about the school,8And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could 108though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's 1313chAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if 2121without more information on the actual visual impact at 2222they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went 232280 feet I would be welcome to receive that testimony 2323down to 80 feet I would not really be in	2	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue	2	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the
ne.7I am also concerned about the school,8And I would like to see some input from8though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't9maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to9still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a10the Town and getting an answer about whether it could1020-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to11go somewhere else on that property. Because I think11how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'l take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a h	2 3	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but	2 3	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant
8And I would like to see some input from8though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't9maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to9still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a10the Town and getting an answer about whether it could1020-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to11go somewhere else on that property. Because I think11how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated them maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear carlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcom	2 3 4	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it	2 3 4	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a
9maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could9still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a10the Town and getting an answer about whether it could1020-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to11go somewhere else on that property. Because I think11how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'l take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I woul	2 3 4 5	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the	2 3 4 5	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to
10the Town and getting an answer about whether it could1020-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to11go somewhere else on that property. Because I think11how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceedin	2 3 4 5 6	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for	2 3 4 5 6	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower.
11go somewhere else on that property. Because I think11how that can be.12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me.	2 3 4 5 6 7	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school,
12that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't
13is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's13on arrival for you?14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a
14my opinion on that.14BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to
15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?15CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be.
16BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would16BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead
17love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the17position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you?
18height issue, my concern has always been the height.18to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No.
19Early on several months ago when I realized you could19on the record today in order to be able to complete the20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George?
20get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was20balancing test required in the negative criteria21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my
21provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if21without more information on the actual visual impact at22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity
22they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went2280 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the height issue, my concern has always been the height.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information
23down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to23and to look at it and make a determination at that24object.24point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the height issue, my concern has always been the height. Early on several months ago when I realized you could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information on the record today in order to be able to complete the
24 object. 24 point, so in that respect I'm wide open to proceeding,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the height issue, my concern has always been the height. Early on several months ago when I realized you could get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information on the record today in order to be able to complete the balancing test required in the negative criteria
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would love to see the setback issue resolved as well as the height issue, my concern has always been the height. Early on several months ago when I realized you could get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information on the record today in order to be able to complete the balancing test required in the negative criteria without more information on the actual visual impact at
25 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Mr. Cammarata? 25 but with the information that I have today I don't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the height issue, my concern has always been the height. Early on several months ago when I realized you could get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information on the record today in order to be able to complete the balancing test required in the negative criteria without more information on the actual visual impact at 80 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	my list, even though it wasn't talked about this evening. But equally important is this setback issue and how it's being mitigated. Might not be enough but I'm willing to look at what is being proposed, but it would have to be a pretty significant swing from the current the application that's before us right now for me. And I would like to see some input from maybe a little bit more of an aggressive approach to the Town and getting an answer about whether it could go somewhere else on that property. Because I think that if the height is mitigated and the setback issue is mitigated then maybe we have something. So that's my opinion on that. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Hugh? BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: As much as I would love to see the setback issues resolved as well as the height issue, my concern has always been the height. Early on several months ago when I realized you could get pretty much the same coverage at 80 feet as was provided at 120 or 140 it seemed clear to me that if they went down to a hundred, you know, if they went down to 80 feet I would not really be in a position to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: I was on the fence, too, like Dan, but my biggest issue was the visual impact. I do think there's a significant reduction but I'm all for moving forward with it with a caveat that I'd like to see what George relayed to to superimpose the cell tower. I am also concerned about the school, though. I'm unclear why this ODAS system couldn't still bring that cellular signal in there. It's just a 20-foot drop of cell tower. It's just unclear as to how that can be. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But 80 feet is not dead on arrival for you? BOARD MEMBER CAMMARATA: No. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: George? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: So I think I made my position clear earlier, but I'll take the opportunity to recapitulate. I don't think we have the information on the record today in order to be able to complete the balancing test required in the negative criteria without more information on the actual visual impact at 80 feet. I would be welcome to receive that testimony and to look at it and make a determination at that

	Page 93		Page 94
1	enough information to make that determination.	1	present them and provide them ten days before the next
2	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: But it's not dead on	2	hearing?
3	arrival?	3	MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
4	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: It's not dead on	4	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Is that it?
5	arrival, no. That being said, I want to highlight	5	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: The meeting is
6	again I am disturbed by the Applicant's unwillingness	6	March 17th.
7	to reapproach the school at 80 feet. And I'm not sure	7	MR. SCHNEIDER: I'll wear a green tie.
8	that I could in good conscience check the box that says	8	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Happy St. Patrick's
9	that we have looked at alternative sites without making	9	Day. So it's carried. No further notice is required.
10	that overture at this new height. So not dead on	10	We'll see you on the 17th.
11	arrival, but I'm just not sure.	11	MR. SIMON: I have a hearing that night. I
12	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. All right. Mr.	12	assumed I think I thought accurately that this
13	Schneider? That's I don't know how to categorize a	13	matter was going to end tonight, and I have been
14	couple of those. It sounds like well, you heard	14	putting off many different applications on the third
15	what everybody said. What would you like to do?	15	Thursday, okay. Right now I have a hearing on
16	MR. SCHNEIDER: I'll review the matter with	16	March 17th that I cannot I will not get coverage
17	my client. Take it under advisement, and advise the	17	for. It's a big case. Not to mention the fact that if
18	Board of I'd like to carry it to the March meeting	18	new evidence and information is going to be presented,
19	to review with my client your comments and make a	19	what are those witnesses? And do I have to bring
20	determination as to how to address your comments.	20	witnesses that night? And, you know, I mean I've
21	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fine. So this	21	said my peace on that. I'm just saying that it raises
22	is carried. This is carried hold on. Go ahead.	22	a lot of issues. That's all.
23 24	MR. MLENAK: I just want to, before you	23 24	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I don't know. I don't
24	carry it. If you decide, if your client decides to bring new exhibits or revised plans, do you agree to	24	think it's fair at this point to schedule it on a date that Mr. Simon can't be here, to be honest with you,
2.5	oring new exhibits of revised plans, do you agree to	2.5	that will Simon can't be nere, to be nonest with you,
	Page 95		
			Page 96
1	after however many meetings. And I also understand	1	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot.
1 2	2	1 2	-
	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think	2 3	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without
2	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third	2 3 4	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever
2 3 4 5	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our	2 3 4 5	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think
2 3 4 5 6	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works	2 3 4 5 6	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich
2 3 4 5 6 7	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue?	2 3 4 5 6 7	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich. MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board think about this? I think I did promise people there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich. MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I didn't interrupt you when you gave your second	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich. MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I didn't interrupt you when you gave your second summation tonight. So I think I should be afforded the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board think about this? I think I did promise people there would not be extraordinary meetings.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich. MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I didn't interrupt you when you gave your second	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board think about this? I think I did promise people there would not be extraordinary meetings. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Under the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich. MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I didn't interrupt you when you gave your second summation tonight. So I think I should be afforded the courtesy to comment. I don't think it's fair to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board think about this? I think I did promise people there would not be extraordinary meetings. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Under the circumstances I'm open to it, Mike.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich. MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I didn't interrupt you when you gave your second summation tonight. So I think I should be afforded the courtesy to comment. I don't think it's fair to comment on what may have happened on third hearing or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I. MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board think about this? I think I did promise people there would not be extraordinary meetings. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Under the circumstances I'm open to it, Mike.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich. MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I didn't interrupt you when you gave your second summation tonight. So I think I should be afforded the courtesy to comment. I don't think it's fair to comment on what may have happened on third hearing or what we should is have done. The issue before the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board think about this? I think I did promise people there would not be extraordinary meetings. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Under the circumstances I'm open to it, Mike. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, we wouldn't do two meetings all in the same month, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich. MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I didn't interrupt you when you gave your second summation tonight. So I think I should be afforded the courtesy to comment. I don't think it's fair to comment on what may have happened on third hearing or what we should is have done. The issue before the Board is scheduling, okay, with all due respect. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board think about this? I think I did promise people there would not be extraordinary meetings. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Under the circumstances I'm open to it, Mike. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, we wouldn't do two meetings all in the same month, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	after however many meetings. And I also understand that your client probably wants to get something done and doesn't want to wait too much longer. And I think you also understand that we have all booked the third Thursday to be the date and we have all booked our travel plans around that. Is there a time that works for you? Is it a timing issue? MR. SIMON: No. This is a live meeting down in South Jersey. And frankly, if the Applicant had presented their case at 80 feet at the beginning we wouldn't probably have gone, you know, maybe MR. SCHNEIDER: Rob, I don't think it's fair to relitigate the whole matter. MR. SIMON: I'm just talking about my schedule, Rich. MR. SCHNEIDER: Please let me speak. I didn't interrupt you when you gave your second summation tonight. So I think I should be afforded the courtesy to comment. I don't think it's fair to comment on what may have happened on third hearing or what we should is have done. The issue before the Board is scheduling, okay, with all due respect. And frankly, for 23 public hearings I think I've made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 with all due respect, I think that's a cheap shot. That being said, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to proceed on March 17th, but can I finish without sarcastic comments, please? I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I've ever treated you disrespectfully and I don't think I. MR. SIMON: Rich MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think I deserve to be laughed at. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Both of you stop. Stop. MR. SCHNEIDER: So my suggestion is I'll throw open to accommodate Mr. Simon, March as five Thursdays. Can we accommodate a meeting on the fifth Thursday of the month? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What does the Board think about this? I think I did promise people there would not be extraordinary meetings. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: Under the circumstances I'm open to it, Mike. BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: Well, we wouldn't do two meetings all in the same month, right? SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: Well, we have a lot of residentials that have been waiting in the wings

	Page 97		Page 98
1	BOARD MEMBER MASELLI: They're not here	1	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: No. I can't do
2	tonight. They keep pushing their agenda, so they have	2	the 10th.
3	to wait, too.	3	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: The room is not
4	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So we push everybody to	4	available the 10th anyway.
5	the 31st? I'm with you. I don't want to have the	5	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: The 31st. Does that
6	Board show up two nights in one month if we don't need	6	work with everybody's calendar? Mr. Simon?
7	to.	7	MR. SIMON: I actually have a hearing, but
8	Alf, what do you think, do you want to do	8	I'll accommodate this Board.
9	the 31st?	9	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: So we're going to carry
10	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: I support whatever	10	this to 7 p.m., March 31st. No further notice
11	you want to do.	11	required.
12	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: If we're moving the	12	MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.
13	week we're doing it for everybody.	13	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Is this in lieu of the
14	MR. SCHNEIDER: I only suggested the fifth	14	17th, not in addition to the 17th?
15	Thursday because it's usually a month where the other	15	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: This is in lieu of the
16	professionals don't have a conflict. I'm amenable to	16	17th. Unless you guys want to do two meetings? I
17	another dates.	17	realize it's a lot, right.
18	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What do people think?	18	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: What does the deck
19	So we shift it a week? Which one? Do you want to go	19	look like for
20	to the 31st? I'll be honest with you, why not the	20	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Lori says it's busy.
21	24th?	21	There's a lots of residentials.
22	BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I can't do the	22	SECRETARY TAGLAIRINO: We're going to have
23	24th.	23	Whitig and we're going to have Cortez and we're going
24	MR. MLENAK: I can't do the 24th.	24	to have Cotter and there's another one in there that I
25	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: What about the 10th?	25	can't remember the name of that's going on. So and
	Page 99	1	$\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a}$
	_		Page 100
1	I think we're going to so that's where we're going	1	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here
2	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be.	2	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet?
2 3	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike,	2 3	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they
2 3 4	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but	2 3 4	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also?
2 3 4 5	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time	2 3 4 5	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted.
2 3 4 5 6	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents.	2 3 4 5 6	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business?
2 3 4 5 6 7	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be	2 3 4 5 6 7	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll do it. That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony correct me if I'm wrong if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony correct me if I'm wrong if there's testimony Mr. Simon and any member of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll do it. That's four. Alf?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony correct me if I'm wrong if there's testimony Mr. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll do it. That's four. Alf? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony 4. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And then I imagine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: YII do it. That's four. Alf? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to. BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I think we have to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony correct me if I'm wrong if there's testimony Mr. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: YII do it. That's four. Alf? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to. BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I think we have to get the work done, so fine.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony correct me if I'm wrong if there's testimony Mr. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And then I imagine there may be new testimony from the Objectors, right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll do it. That's four. Alf? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to. BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I think we have to get the work done, so fine. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fine. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony 4. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And then I imagine there may be new testimony from the Objectors, right? MR. MLENAK: They would have that right,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll do it. That's four. Alf? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to. BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I think we have to get the work done, so fine. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fine. So residential stuff happens on the 17th, or non-Verizon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony correct me if I'm wrong if there's testimony Mr. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And then I imagine there may be new testimony from the Objectors, right? MR. MLENAK: They would have that right, which is why I made sure before that anything new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: YII do it. That's four. Alf? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to. BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I think we have to get the work done, so fine. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fine. So residential stuff happens on the 17th, or non-Verizon stuff happens on the 17th. Verizon's happens on the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony correct me if I'm wrong if there's testimony Mr. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And then I imagine there may be new testimony from the Objectors, right? MR. MLENAK: They would have that right, which is why I made sure before that anything new that's coming in has to be available ten days before,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: YII do it. That's four. Alf? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to. BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to to get the work done, so fine. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fine. So residential stuff happens on the 17th, or non-Verizon stuff happens on the 17th. Verizon's happens on the 31st.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony 4. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And then I imagine there may be new testimony from the Objectors, right? MR. MLENAK: They would have that right, which is why I made sure before that anything new that's coming in has to be available ten days before, which is the exact same time frame under the MLUL and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: YII do it. That's four. Alf? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to get the work done, so fine. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fine. So residential stuff happens on the 17th, or non-Verizon stuff happens on the 17th, Verizon's happens on the 31st. Before you go, Mr. O'Donnell, you were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? Im a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony 4. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And then I imagine there may be new testimony from the Objectors, right? MR. MLENAK: They would have that right, which is why I made sure before that anything new that's coming in has to be available ten days before, which is the exact same time frame under the MLUL and which an Objector would have for the original
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I think we're going to so that's where we're going to be. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: My concern, Mike, would be I don't want to time box this application, but if we go the whole thing and it takes the whole time then you have to punt the residents. BOARD MEMBER ADDONIZIO: And I won't be here April. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Well, do you guys want to do two meetings? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: I'm not opposed to it. BOARD MEMBER ROSENBAUM: I'm okay with it. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: I'll do it. That's four. Alf? BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: If you have to. BOARD MEMBER SYMONDS: I think we have to get the work done, so fine. CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Okay. Fine. So residential stuff happens on the 17th, or non-Verizon stuff happens on the 17th. Verizon's happens on the 31st. Before you go, Mr. O'Donnell, you were raising your hand?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 the school why wouldn't you while Verizon is here revisit the firehouse at 80 feet? I'm a supporter of them and I know they need the revenue so why not visit them also? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: We hear you. Noted. Thank you. Any other business? BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Procedurally, I want to understand what we agreed to then. So we're going to potentially receive new testimony at the 31st meeting, which there will be cross-examination and potentially public comment? CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Yeah. I think if there's testimony 4. Simon and any member of the public has the right to ask questions. BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: And then I imagine there may be new testimony from the Objectors, right? MR. MLENAK: They would have that right, which is why I made sure before that anything new that's coming in has to be available ten days before, which is the exact same time frame under the MLUL and which an Objector would have for the original application.

1 MR. MEENAK: We'd be limited to the 1 CERTIFICATE 2 80 feet. 2 3 BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Yes. Conversation 2 4 with respect to 80 feet. It would be a revised 2 5 applecino. 6 Certified Shorthand Report or the Shate of New 6 BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And updates to the 3 Certified Shorthand Report or the Shate of New 7 BOARD MEMBER NOYAN: My only point is its as abstantial new undertaining: 100 FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a 12 BOARD MEMBER NOYAN: My only point is its 100 FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a 13 BOARD MEMBER NOYAN: My only point is its 1100 FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a 14 CHARMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. 120 of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a 15 Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No 16 16 171 15 is doardoned at 9:30 pm) 18 181 LA ROSA. CSR. RPR 22 22 Certificat Social science, and the science				Page 102
3 BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Yes. Conversation 3 4 with respect to 80 feet. It would be a revised 4 5 application. 5 6 BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And updates to the 5 7 site plan, right? 7 8 MR. MLENAK: Yes. And in response to the 8 9 Board's directions to the applicant tonight. 9 10 BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: My only point is it's 10 11 a substantial new undertaking. 10 12 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. 11 13 BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see. 13 14 CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. 12 15 Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No 15 16 response.) All right. We are adjourned. 16 17 (Whereupon, the hearing on this application 17 18 adjourned at 9:30 p.m.) 18 19 IXIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR 20 Certificat No. 30XI 00162800 21 22 23 23 Dated: 24	1	MR. MLENAK: We'd be limited to the	1	CERTIFICATE
4with respect to 80 feet. It would be a revised application.4I, IRIS LA ROSA, a Notary Public and5application.5Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of New6BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And updates to the site plan, right?7and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken8MR. MLENAK: Yes. And in response to the Board's directions to the applicant tonight.9and on the date hereinbefore set forth.10BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: My only point is it's a substantial new undertaking.10I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and13BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.1314CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be.1215Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1718is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR2021232424	2	80 feet.	2	
5application.5Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of New6BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And updates to the6Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true7site plan, right?7and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken8MR. MLENAK: Yes. And in response to the8stenographically by and before me at the time, place,9Board's directions to the applicant tonight.9and on the date hereinbefore set forth.10BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: My only point is it's10I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a11a substantial new undertaking.11relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be.12of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a13BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.13relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and14CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. All right.14That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1718is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR202122232424	3	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: Yes. Conversation	3	
6BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And updates to the site plan, right?Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place, and on the date hereinbefore set forth.10BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: My only point is it's a substantial new undertaking.10IDO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR 20212223232424	4	with respect to 80 feet. It would be a revised	4	I, IRIS LA ROSA, a Notary Public and
7site plan, right?7and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken8MR. MLENAK: Yes. And in response to the8stenographically by and before me at the time, place,9Board's directions to the applicant tonight.9and on the date hereinbefore set forth.10BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: My only point is it's10I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a11a substantial new undertaking.11relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be.12of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a13BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.13relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and14CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. All right.14That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1719IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR202122232424	5	application.	5	Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of New
8MR. MLENAK: Yes. And in response to the 98stenographically by and before me at the time, place, and on the date hereinbefore set forth.10BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: My only point is it's a substantial new undertaking.10I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a11a substantial new undertaking.11relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be.12of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a13BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.13relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and14CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. All right.14That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1719IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR202122232424	6	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: And updates to the	6	Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true
9Board's directions to the applicant tonight.9and on the date hereinbefore set forth.10BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: My only point is it's10I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a11a substantial new undertaking.11relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be.12of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a13BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.13relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and14CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. All right.14That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1718is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR2021222323242424	7	site plan, right?	7	and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken
10BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: My only point is it's10I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a11a substantial new undertaking.11relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be.12of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a13BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.13relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and14CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. All right.14That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1718is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR20Certificate No. 30XI 00162800212223232424	8	MR. MLENAK: Yes. And in response to the	8	stenographically by and before me at the time, place,
11a substantial new undertaking.11relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be.12of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a13BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.13relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and14CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. All right.14That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1718is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR20Certificate No. 30XI 00162800212223232424	9	Board's directions to the applicant tonight.	9	and on the date hereinbefore set forth.
12CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be.12of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a13BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.13relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and14CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. All right.14That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1718is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR20Certificate No. 30XI 00162800212223242424	10	BOARD MEMBER BOYAN: My only point is it's	10	I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a
13BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.13relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and14CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. All right.14That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1718is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR20Certificate No. 30XI 00162800212223242424	11	-	11	
14CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be. All right.14That I am not financially interested in the action.15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1718is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR20Certificate No. 30XI 00162800212223242424	12	CHAIRMAN FLANAGAN: Could be.	12	-
15Is that it? Any other business tonight? (No1516response.) All right. We are adjourned.1617(Whereupon, the hearing on this application1718is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)1819IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR20Certificate No. 30XI 00162800212122222324	13	BOARD MEMBER NEWLIN: We'll see.		
16 response.) All right. We are adjourned. 16 17 (Whereupon, the hearing on this application 17 18 is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.) 18 19 IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR 20 Certificate No. 30XI 00162800 21 22 23 Dated: 24 24	14	_		That I am not financially interested in the action.
17 (Whereupon, the hearing on this application 17 18 is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.) 18 19 IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR 20 Certificate No. 30XI 00162800 21 21 22 22 23 Dated: 24 24				
18 is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.) 18 19 19 IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR 20 20 Certificate No. 30XI 00162800 21 21 22 22 23 23 24 24				
19 19 IRIS LA ROSA, CSR, RPR 20 20 Certificate No. 30XI 00162800 21 21 22 22 23 23 24 24				
20 20 Certificate No. 30XI 00162800 21 21 22 22 23 Dated:		is adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)		
21 21 22 22 23 23 24 24				
22 22 23 23 24 24				Certificate No. 30XI 00162800
23 23 Dated: 24 24				
24 24				
				Dated:
	25		25	

A 46:3 47:2,4 agreed 35:13 31:19 33:14,15 application 15:13 75:15,15 87:11 ahead 22:15 49:18 53:12,19 45:15 63:2 ability 33:24,25 87:11 93:20 61:10 93:22 58:6,17,18 67:24 68:2 50:14 54:8 addressed 58:10 AICP 1:18 61:24 62:6,8,9 75:3,7 76: 62:20 66:7 76:6 80:1 air 12:8 65:1,14 73:10 91:6 99:4 able 17:23,25 addresses 41:22 akin 8:9 82:7 88:17 84:19 87:1 accept 11:24 adjourned 14:11 20:11 answering 21:10 100:23 10 92:19 101:16,18 Alf 1:12 23:25 Antenna 82:13 101:17 accept 11:24 adjustment 1:1 99:14 anticipation approache2 75:24 28:1 Administrative allev 19:23 28:4 72:11,22 87:24 64:16,24 accommodate Administrator 28:7,10 65:21 88:18 approache2 38:12 admitted 78:3 82:12 anyway 25:8 approprotin 36:13 98:8 admitted 78:3	1 8:3 2 3,14 12 5 1:5 5:13
A-21 11:10 48:7 60:16 73:6 100:8 38:20 39:7 5:14 7:1,1 15:13 ability 33:24,25 87:11 93:20 ahead 22:15 49:18 53:12,19 45:15 63:2 50:14 54:8 addressed 58:10 AICP 1:18 61:24 62:6,8,9 75:3,7 76: 62:20 66:7 76:6 80:1 air 12:8 65:1,14 73:10 77:6,9 81: 45:11 47:24 adjacent 52:3 albeit 11:1 12:17 90:16 91:10 91:6 99:4 65:16 66:1,24 adjourned 14:11 20:11 answering 21:10 100:23 10 92:19 101:16,18 Alf 11:12 23:25 antennas 13:12 application accept 11:24 28:1 Alf's 53:19 37:21 approachez 38:12 Administrative 38:12 anticipation approachez 38:12 Administrator 28:7,10 65:21 anywoby 59:19 approachez 36:13 95:24 advice 35:4 advice 35:4 64:22 65:4,17 apologize 9:18 aproachez 36:12 12,13 98:8 admitted 78:3 admitted 78:3 atternative 98:4 11:11 12:15	1 8:3 2 3,14 12 5 1:5 5:13
13:13 75:15,15 87:11 ahead 22:15 49:18 53:12,19 45:15 63:2 ability 33:24,25 87:11 93:20 61:10 93:22 58:6,17,18 67:24 68:2 50:14 54:8 addressed 58:10 AICP 1:18 61:24 62:6,8,9 75:3,7 76; able 17:23,25 addresses 41:22 akin 8:9 82:7 88:17 84:19 87:1 able 17:23,25 adjacent 52:3 alpei 11:1 12:17 90:16 91:10 91:6 99:4 d5:16 66:1,24 adjourned 14:11 20:11 answering 21:10 100:23 10 92:19 101:16,18 Alf 1:12 23:25 Antenna 82:13 101:17 accept 11:24 adjudicate 30:10 49:22 antennas 13:12 application 38:12 52:24 28:1 Alf's 53:19 37:21 approachez 38:12 52:8 admitted 78:3 admitted 78:3 82:12 anymore 49:10 approachez 38:12 advise 79:4 93:9 93:9 21:22 83:19 87:7 accurate 102:7 advise 79:4 93:9 93:9 21:22 83:19 87:7 accurate 102:7 advise 79:4 93:9 92:12 appleable	2 3,14 12 5 1:5 5:13
ability 33:24,25 87:11 93:20 61:10 93:22 58:6,17,18 67:24 68:2 addressed 58:10 addressed 58:10 aICP 1:18 61:24 62:6,8,9 75:3,7 76: 62:20 66:7 addresses 41:22 akin 8:9 82:7 88:17 84:19 87:1 able 17:23,25 addresses 41:22 akin 8:9 82:7 88:17 84:19 87:1 45:11 47:24 adjourned 14:11 20:11 answering 21:10 100:23 10 92:19 101:16,18 Alf 1:12 23:25 Antenna 82:13 101:17 accept 11:24 adjourned 14:11 20:11 answering 21:10 100:23 10 20:15,16 87:19 89:9 97:8 14:4 67:13 94:14 acceptable Adjustment 1:1 99:14 anticipation approach 22 38:12 Administrative 37:21 approach 24 49:2 91:9 38:12 admitted 78:3 82:12 anybody 59:19 approach 24 36:12, 13 98:8 admitted 78:3 82:12 anymore 49:10 14:11 96:12, 13 98:8 advice 35:4 advice 35:4 atrate 79:2,2 appropriata accuracte 102:7 advise 79:4	8,14 12 5 1:5 5:13
andressed 58:10 AICP 1:18 61:24 62:68,9 75:3,7 76: 62:20 66:7 76:6 80:1 air 12:8 65:1,14 73:10 77:6,9 81: able 17:23,25 addresses 41:22 alim 8:9 82:7 88:17 84:19 87:1 45:11 47:24 adjacent 52:3 albei 11:1 12:17 90:16 91:10 91:6 99:4 65:16 66:1,24 adjourned 14:11 20:11 answering 21:10 100:23 10 92:19 101:16,18 Alf 1:12 23:25 Antenna 82:13 101:17 accept 11:24 adjustment 1:1 99:14 anticipation approach 22 38:12 52:28 administrator alleged 83:1 anybody 59:19 approach 24 38:12 52:4 1:17 alternate 79:2,2 anymore 49:10 14:11 96:12,13 98:8 admited 78:3 advice 35:4 64:22 65:4,17 apologize 9:18 14:14 31:5 accourate 102:7 advise 79:4 93:9 21:22 83:19 87:7 appropriata acting 22:18 advisent 35:21 38:6,15 Applase 85:3 approval 7:25 8:4 1 accourate 102:7 advisement 35:21 38:6,15 Applase 85:3	3,14 12 5 1:5 5:13
30:14:54:3676:68:0:1air 12:865:1,14 73:1077:6,98:1able 17:23,25addresses 41:22akin 8:982:78:8:1784:19.87:145:11 47:24adjacent 52:3albeit 11:1 12:1790:16 91:1091:6 99:465:16 66:1,24adjourned14:11 20:11answering 21:10100:23 1092:19101:16,18Alf 1:12 23:25Antenna 82:13101:17accept 11:24adjudicate30:10 49:22antennas 13:12application20:15,1687:1989:9 97:814:4 67:1394:14acceptableAdjustment 1:199:14anticipationapproach 275:2428:1Alf's 53:1937:21approach 238:125:2,8alleed 83:1anywbody 59:19approachce38:125:2,8admitted 78:3admitted 78:3ascount 90:12admitted 78:3accourade 0:12admitted 78:3advice 35:464:22 65:4,17aplogize 9:1814:14 31:5accurate 102:7advise 79:493:921:22 83:1987:7actact 102:7advised 79:435:21 38:6,15Applause 85:3appropriateacting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:2161:9 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8acting 22:18advisory 73:22advocacy 10:1897:1671:7,21,24 8:629:15 34:1102:12,1413:5amende 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity -wise58:68:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:19attivity-wise58:68:14 28:24,2522:25 27:8	12 5 1:5 5:13
able 17:23,25 addresses 41:22 akin 8:9 82:7 88:17 90:16 91:10 able 17:23,25 adjacent 52:3 albeit 11:1 12:17 90:16 91:10 91:6 99:4 65:16 66:1,24 adjourned 14:11 20:11 answering 21:10 100:23 10 92:19 101:16,18 Alf 1:12 23:25 Antenna 82:13 101:17 accept 11:24 adjudicate 30:10 49:22 anteinas 13:12 application accept able Adjustment 1:1 99:14 Antenna 82:13 101:17 accest 35:2 Administrative 89:9 97:8 14:4 67:13 94:14 accommodate Administrator 28:7,10 65:21 anteinas 49:10 approached 38:12 5:2,8 admitted 78:3 accuracy 62:18 advice 35:4 82:12 anyway 25:8 appropriate accurate 102:7 advise 79:4 93:9 21:22 83:19 87:7 accurate 19:27 advise 79:4 93:9 21:22 83:19 87:7 accurate 102:7 advise 79:4 93:9 21:22 83:19 87:7 accurate 19:2	5 1:5 5:13
anit 17.23,25adjacent 52:3albeit 11:1 12:1790:16 91:1091:6 99:445:11 47:24adjourned14:11 20:11answering 21:10100:23 1092:19101:16,18Alf 1:12 23:25Antenna 82:13101:17accept 11:24adjudicate30:10 49:22antennas 13:12application20:15,1687:1989:9 97:814:4 67:1394:14acceptableAdjustment 1:199:14anticipationapproach 275:2428:1Alf's 53:1937:2149:2 91:9access 35:2Administrativealleged 83:1anybody 59:19approachec38:125:2,8allow 19:23 28:472:11,22 87:2464:16,24accommodateAdministrator28:7,10 65:2188:18approachec66:1 95:241:17alternative98:411:1 12:15accurate 00:12admittedl 78:382:12anyway 25:8appropriateaccurate 102:7advice 35:464:22 65:4,17apologize 9:1814:14 31:9accurate 102:7advise 79:493:921:22 83:1987:7accurate 102:7advise 79:438:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:166:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:216:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:216:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:22,2038:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4	1:5 5:13
10:11:10:12.1 adjourned 14:11 20:11 answering 21:10 100:23 10 92:19 101:16,18 adjudicate 30:10 49:22 antennas 13:12 application 20:15,16 87:19 89:9 97:8 14:4 67:13 94:14 application 30:10 49:22 antennas 13:12 application 94:14 approach 22 acceptable Adjustment 1:1 99:14 anticipation approach 22 38:12 52:28 Administrator 28:7,10 65:21 anybody 59:19 approach 24 accommodate Administrator 28:7,10 65:21 anymore 49:10 14:11 14:11 96:12,13 98:8 admitted 78:3 82:12 anymore 49:10 14:11 approach 24 accurate 102:7 advice 35:4 64:22 65:4,17 98:4 11:1 12:15 appropriate acturate 102:7 advise 79:4 93:9 21:22 83:19 87:7 appropriate actra 78:8 34:24 62:20 38:24 39:1,11 applicable 26:4 7:25 8:4 1 15:1 38:6,15 acting 22:18 advisory 73:22 64:10,22 64:10,22 13:6 21:1 65:9 74:16	5:13
00:1000:124101:16,18Alf 1:12 23:25Antenna 82:13101:17accept 11:24adjudicate30:10 49:22antennas 13:12application20:15,1687:1989:9 97:814:4 67:1394:14acceptableAdjustment 1:199:14anticipationapproach 2access 35:2Administrative28:7,10 65:2188:18approached38:125:2,8alleged 83:1anybody 59:19approachedaccommodateAdministrator28:7,10 65:2188:18approached66:1 95:241:17alternate 79:2,2anymore 49:1014:1196:12,13 98:8admitted 78:3adcite 35:464:22 65:4,17appropriateaccoura 90:12admitted 78:3advise 79:493:921:22 83:1987:7accurate 102:7advise 79:493:921:22 83:1987:7active 17:23advised 79:435:21 38:6,15appropriateacting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:2161:19 78:10,1324:11 25:5acting 22:18advisory 73:22advocacy 10:1897:167:17,21,24 8:629:15 34:1102:12,1413:5amended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity 51:9aestheticallyamended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity S1:9aestheticallyamended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity S1:9aestheticallyamended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity S1:9aestheticallyamended 7:6 8:213:6 21:1	5:13
accept 11:24 adjudicate 30:10 49:22 antennas 13:12 application 20:15,16 87:19 89:9 97:8 14:4 67:13 application acceptable Adjustment 1:1 99:14 anticipation approach 24 75:24 28:1 Alf's 53:19 37:21 49:2 91:9 access 35:2 Administrative 5:2,8 alleged 83:1 anybody 59:19 approached 66:1 95:24 1:17 alternate 79:2,2 88:18 approachin 14:11 96:12,13 98:8 admitted 78:3 82:12 anymore 49:10 14:11 accuracy 62:18 advice 35:4 64:22 65:4,17 apologize 9:18 14:14 31:9 accurate 102:7 advise 79:4 93:9 21:22 83:19 87:7 accurately 94:12 93:17 amenable 22:9 appear 28:13 75:13 84:2 active 17:23 advised 79:4 35:21 38:6,15 applicable 26:4 7:25 8:4 1 actrate 22:1 advisery 73:22 64:20 72:21 applicable 26:4 7:25 8:4 1 actring 22:18 advisery 73	5:13
acceptable 20:15,1687:1989:9 97:814:4 67:1394:14acceptable 75:24Adjustment 1:1 28:199:14anticipation 37:21approach 24access 35:2 38:12Administrative 5:2,8alleged 83:1 allow 19:23 28:4anybody 59:19 72:11,22 87:24approached 64:16,24accommodate 66:1 95:24Administrator 1:1728:7,10 65:21 alternate 79:2,2anymore 49:10 anyway 25:8approached 64:16,24account 90:12 accuracy 62:18 accurate 102:7 accurate 102:7 accurate 102:7 active 77:23admitted 78:3 advise 79:482:12 93:9anyway 25:8 21:22 83:19appropriata 87:7accurately 94:12 accurate 102:7 accurate 102:7 active 17:23 bis 10advise 79:4 34:24 62:2035:21 38:6,15 38:21 38:21appear 28:13 appear 28:1375:13 84:2 appear 28:13act 26:22 acting 22:18 action 78:22 action 78:22 activity 51:9 activity 51:9 activ	5:13
20:10:10:10 Adjustment 1:1 99:14 anticipation approach 2: acceptable 28:1 Alf's 53:19 37:21 49:2 91:9 access 35:2 Administrative alleged 83:1 anybody 59:19 approach 2: 38:12 5:2,8 allow 19:23 28:4 72:11,22 87:24 64:16,24 accommodate Administrator 28:7,10 65:21 88:18 approached 66:1 95:24 1:17 alternate 79:2,2 anymore 49:10 14:11 96:12,13 98:8 admitted 78:3 82:12 anymore 49:10 14:11 accuracy 62:18 advice 35:4 64:22 65:4,17 apologize 9:18 11:1 12:15 accurate 102:7 advise 79:4 93:9 21:22 83:19 87:7 accurately 94:12 93:17 amenable 22:9 84:4 appropriate acting 22:18 advised 79:4 27:20 34:11,22 applicable 26:4 7:25 8:4 1 102:12,14 13:5 advisory 73:22 64:20 72:21 61:9 7:8,10,13 24:11 25:8 activity 51:9 aesthetically amende 24:21 9:2 10:23 12:6 37:24 60:2 activity 51:9	
acceptable28:1Alf's 53:1937:2149:2 91:9access 35:2Administrativealleged 83:1anybody 59:19approached38:125:2,8allow 19:23 28:472:11,22 87:2464:16,24accommodateAdministrator28:7,10 65:2188:18approached66:1 95:241:17alternate 79:2,2anymore 49:1014:1196:12,13 98:8admitted 78:382:12anyway 25:8appropriateaccount 90:12admittedly 84:5alternative98:411:1 12:15accuracy 62:18advice 35:464:22 65:4,17apologize 9:1814:14 31:9accuratel 94:1293:17amenable 22:984:4appropriateachieve 17:23advised 79:427:20 34:11,22appear 28:1375:13 84:256:18 58:10advisement35:21 38:6,15Applause 85:3approval 7:acre 78:834:24 62:2038:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:16applicant 2:613:4,7 22:acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:216:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8activity 51:9aestheticallyamended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity 51:9aesthetically8:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:19actural 92:21affer 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16actural 92:21affer 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16actural 92:21affirmativeamending 44:1334:10	
Administrative 38:12Administrative 5:2,8alleged 83:1 allow 19:23 28:4anybody 59:19 72:11,22 87:24approached 64:16,24accommodate 66:1 95:24Administrator 1:1728:7,10 65:21 alternate 79:2,2anymore 49:10 anyway 25:8approachin 14:1196:12,13 98:8 account 90:12 accuracy 62:18 accurate 102:7admitted 78:3 advise 79:482:12 93:9anymore 49:10 82:12approachin 14:11accurate 102:7 accurately 94:12advise 79:4 93:1764:22 65:4,17 93:17apenologize 9:18 21:22 83:1914:14 31:9 87:7achieve 17:23 active 17:23advised 79:4 34:24 62:2035:21 38:6,15 38:24 39:1,11 46:13,22 60:16Applause 85:3 approval 7: applicable 26:4 31:4,7 22: 64:20 72:21approval 7: 6:19 7:8,10,13 6:19 7:8,10,13 24:11 25:8acting 22:18 activity 51:9 activity 51:9 activity 51:9advisory 73:22 88:6 8:14 28:24,25 28:25 29:164:20 72:21 92:10:23 12:661:9 7:8,10,13 37:24 60:2activity 51:9 activity 51:9 activity 51:9 actual 92:21 adt 47:10 89:13affirmative affirmative81:4 28:24,25 28:25 29:122:25 26:24,24 26:25 27:8,10 27:19,24 33:2034:3 27:16 34:14:22	
38:125:2,8allow 19:23 28:472:11,22 87:2464:16,24accommodate 66:1 95:24Administrator 1:17alternate 79:2,288:18approachin 14:1196:12,13 98:8 accuraty 02:12 accuracy 62:18 accurate 102:7 active 17:23admitted 78:3 advise 79:4alternative 93:998:411:1 12:15 apploagize 9:18accurately 94:12 achieve 17:23 56:18 58:10 acting 22:18 acting 22:18 action 78:22advised 79:4 93:1793:9 27:20 34:11,2221:22 83:19 apploagize 9:1887:7 apploagize 9:18 35:21 38:615 38:24 39:1,11 applicable 26:4 applicable 26:4 appl	
30.12Administrator28:7,10 65:2188:18approachinaccommodate1:17alternate 79:2,2anywore 49:1014:1196:12,13 98:8admitted 78:382:12anyway 25:8appropriateaccount 90:12admittedly 84:5alternative98:411:1 12:15accuracy 62:18advice 35:464:22 65:4,17apologize 9:1814:14 31:9accurate 102:7advise 79:493:921:22 83:1987:7accurately 94:1293:17amenable 22:984:4appropriateachieve 17:23advised 79:427:20 34:11,22appear 28:1375:13 84:256:18 58:10advisement35:21 38:6,15Applause 85:3approval 7:acter 78:834:24 62:2038:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:16applicant 2:613:4,7 22:acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:216:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8activity 51:9aestheticallyamended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity 51:9aesthetics 57:328:25 29:126:25 27:8,10approve 6:2actual 92:21affirmative38:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:19add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:14 4:22	
account outle1:17alternate 79:2,2anymore 49:1014:1196:12,13 98:8admitted 78:382:12anyway 25:8appropriateaccount 90:12admittedly 84:5alternative98:411:1 12:15accuracy 62:18advice 35:464:22 65:4,17apologize 9:1814:14 31:9accurate 102:7advise 79:493:921:22 83:1987:7accurately 94:1293:17amenable 22:984:4appropriateachieve 17:23advised 79:427:20 34:11,22appear 28:1375:13 84:256:18 58:10advisement35:21 38:6,15Applause 85:3approval 7:acre 78:834:24 62:2038:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:16applicant 2:613:4,7 22:acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:216:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8activity 51:9aestheticallyamended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity 51:9aesthetics 57:328:25 29:126:25 27:8,10approve 6:2actual 92:21affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:14 4:22add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:14 4:22	nr.
00.1 93.24 96:12,13 98:8 account 90:12 accuracy 62:18 accuratel 102:7 active 17:23 56:18 58:10admitted 78:3 advised 79:4 93:982:12 alternative 64:22 65:4,17 93:9anyway 25:8 98:4appropriate 11:1 12:12 apologize 9:18 21:22 83:19active 17:23 active 17:23 acting 22:18 action 78:22advised 79:4 93:1793:9 27:20 34:11,22 38:24 39:1,11 46:13,22 60:16 64:20 72:21appear 28:13 applicable 26:4 61:9 7:8,10,13 24:11 25:8 24:11 25:8 approval 7: applicable 26:4appropriate 14:14 31:9 38:24 39:1,11 applicable 26:4Act 26:22 acting 22:18 activity 51:9 activity 51:9 activity 51:9advisory 73:22 asthetically 58:6 attick 57:3 affect 27:3 affect 27:382:12 amending 44:13appropriate 39:9actual 92:21 add 47:10 89:13affirmative affirmativeamending 44:13 34:10 44:25appropriate 38:14 4:22	5
John 2, 15 96.6admittedly 84:5alternative98:411:1 12:15accurate 90:12advice 35:4advice 35:464:22 65:4,17apologize 9:1814:14 31:9accurate 102:7advise 79:493:921:22 83:1987:7accurately 94:1293:17amenable 22:984:4appropriateachieve 17:23advised 79:427:20 34:11,22appear 28:1375:13 84:256:18 58:10advisement35:21 38:6,15Applause 85:3approval 7:acre 78:834:24 62:2038:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:16applicant 2:613:4,7 22:acting 22:18advocacy 10:1897:167:17,21,24 8:629:15 34:1102:12,1413:5amended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity 51:9aesthetically8:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:19actual 92:21affect 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22	0.7
account 90.12advice 35:4advice 35:464:22 65:4,17apologize 9:1814:14 31:9accurate 102:7advise 79:493:921:22 83:1987:7accurately 94:1293:17amenable 22:984:4appropriateachieve 17:23advised 79:427:20 34:11,22appear 28:1375:13 84:256:18 58:10advisement35:21 38:6,15Applause 85:3approval 7:acre 78:834:24 62:2038:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:16applicant 2:613:4,7 22:acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:216:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8action 78:22advocacy 10:1897:167:17,21,24 8:629:15 34:1102:12,1413:5amend 24:219:2 10:23 12:637:24 60:2activity 51:9aesthetically8:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:19activity-wise58:68:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:1951:12affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22	
accurate102:7 accuratelyadvise79:4 93:1793:921:2283:1987:7accurately94:12 93:17advised79:4 93:1793:921:2283:1987:7achieve17:23 advisedadvised79:4 93:1727:2034:11,22 35:21appear28:13 appear75:1384:2 84:4appropriate appearacre78:8 34:2434:2462:20 93:1738:2439:1,11 46:13,22applicable26:4 64:207:2584:4 3pplicableAct26:22 93:1793:17 46:13,2246:13,2260:16 64:20applicable26:4 26:47:2584:4 3pplicableacting22:18 actionadvisory73:22 73:2264:2072:21 64:2061:97:8,10,13 71:17,21,2424:1125:8 29:1534:14102:12,14 activity13:5 58:6 aesthetically 51:12 actualaesthetically 58:6 81:428:24,25 28:2529:210:2312:6 26:2537:2460:2 60:251:12 add4ffect27:3 affect77:6,984:19 34:1927:19,2433:20 33:2014:327:16 27:19,2438:144:22 38:144:22add47:1089:13 affirmativeamending44:13 34:1034:1034:25 38:138:144:22 38:1	
accurately 94:12 achieve 17:23 56:18 58:1093:17 advised 79:4 advisementamenable 22:9 27:20 34:11,22 35:21 38:6,15 38:24 39:1,1184:4 appear 28:13 Applause 85:3 applicable 26:4 applicable 26:4 39:17appropriate 75:13 84:2 approval 7: 7:25 8:4 1 applicable 26:4 applicable 26:4 applicable 26:4 applicable 26:4 31:4,7 22: 64:20 72:21applicable 26:4 applicable 26:4 applicable 26:4 applicable 26:4 31:4,7 22: 29:15 34:1 24:11 25:8 29:15 34:1 24:11 25:8 action 78:22 action 78:22 action 78:22 activity 51:9 activity 51:9 activity 51:9 activity-wise 58:6 51:12 activity-wise 58:6 activity-wise 58:6 activity-wise 58:6 activity 51:9 activity-wise 58:6 activity 51:9 activity 51:9 <br< td=""><td></td></br<>	
acturately 94.12advised 79:427:20 34:11,22appear 28:1375:13 84:2achieve 17:23advisement35:21 38:6,15Applause 85:3approval 7:acre 78:834:24 62:2038:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:16applicant 2:613:4,7 22:acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:216:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8action 78:22advocacy 10:1897:167:17,21,24 8:629:15 34:1102:12,1413:5amended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity 51:9aesthetically8:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:1951:12aesthetics 57:328:25 29:126:25 27:8,10approve 6:2actual 92:21affect 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22	1
actine ve 17.25advisement35:21 38:6,15Applause 85:3approval 7:56:18 58:1034:24 62:2038:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:16applicat 2:613:4,7 22:acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:216:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8action 78:22advocacy 10:1897:167:17,21,24 8:629:15 34:1102:12,1413:5amended 24:219:2 10:23 12:637:24 60:2activity 51:9aesthetically8:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:1951:12aesthetics 57:328:25 29:126:25 27:8,10approve 6:2actual 92:21affect 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22	
acre 78:834:24 62:2038:24 39:1,11applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:16applicable 26:47:25 8:4 1acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:216:19 7:8,10,1324:11 25:8action 78:22advocacy 10:1897:167:17,21,24 8:629:15 34:1102:12,1413:5amended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity 51:9aesthetically8:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:19activity-wise58:68:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:1951:12aesthetics 57:328:25 29:126:25 27:8,10approve 6:2actual 92:21affect 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22	
Act 26:2293:1746:13,22 60:16applicant 2:613:4,7 22:acting 22:18advisory 73:2264:20 72:21applicant 2:613:4,7 22:action 78:22advocacy 10:1897:167:17,21,24 8:629:15 34:1102:12,1413:5amend 24:219:2 10:23 12:637:24 60:2activity 51:9aesthetically8:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:19activity-wise58:68:14 28:24,2526:25 27:8,10approve 6:251:12affect 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22	
acting 22:18 action 78:22 102:12,14advisory 73:22 advocacy 10:1864:20 72:21 97:166:19 7:8,10,13 7:17,21,24 8:624:11 25:8 29:15 34:1102:12,14 activity 51:9 activity-wise 51:1213:5 aesthetics 57:3 affect 27:364:20 72:21 97:166:19 7:8,10,13 7:17,21,24 8:624:11 25:8 29:15 34:1102:12,14 activity 51:9 activity-wise 51:1213:5 aesthetics 57:3 affect 27:3amended 7:6 8:2 28:25 29:19:2 10:23 12:6 22:25 26:24,2437:24 60:2 74:19actual 92:21 add 47:10 89:13affect 27:3 affirmative77:6,9 84:19 amending 44:1327:19,24 33:20 34:10 44:2514:3 27:16 38:1 44:22	
acting 22:16advocacy 10:1897:167:17,21,24 8:629:15 34:1action 78:22advocacy 10:1897:167:17,21,24 8:629:15 34:1102:12,1413:5amend 24:219:2 10:23 12:637:24 60:2activity 51:9aestheticallyamended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity-wise58:68:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:1951:12aesthetics 57:328:25 29:126:25 27:8,10approve 6:2actual 92:21affect 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22	
action 76.2213:5amend 24:219:2 10:23 12:637:24 60:2102:12,1413:5aestheticallyaesthetically58:613:6 21:165:9 74:16activity-wise58:68:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:1951:12aesthetics 57:328:25 29:126:25 27:8,10approve 6:2actual 92:21affect 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22	
102.12,14aestheticallyamended 7:6 8:213:6 21:165:9 74:16activity-wise58:68:14 28:24,2522:25 26:24,2474:1951:12aesthetics 57:328:25 29:126:25 27:8,10approve 6:2actual 92:21affect 27:377:6,9 84:1927:19,24 33:2014:3 27:16add 47:10 89:13affirmativeamending 44:1334:10 44:2538:1 44:22	
activity-wise 51:12 actual 92:21 add 47:10 89:1358:6 58:68:14 28:24,25 28:25 29:122:25 26:24,24 26:25 27:8,1074:19 approve 6:2 27:19,24 33:20actual 92:21 add 47:10 89:13affect 27:3 affirmative amending 44:1377:6,9 84:19 34:10 44:2527:19,24 33:20 38:1 44:22	
activity-wise 51:12 actual 92:21 add 47:10 89:13aesthetics 57:3 affirmative28:25 29:1 77:6,9 84:19 amending 44:1326:25 27:8,10 27:19,24 33:20approve 6:2 14:3 27:16 38:1 44:22	,1/
actual 92:21 affect 27:3 77:6,9 84:19 27:19,24 33:20 14:3 27:16 add 47:10 89:13 affirmative amending 44:13 34:10 44:25 38:1 44:22	5 75
add 47:10 89:13 affirmative amending 44:13 34:10 44:25 38:1 44:22	
	·
add-on 25:15 18:23 19:17,24 amendment 45:5 47:1 62:3 73:4, afforded 05:18 22:11 77:4 62:10 65:2 10 amproving 1	
26:14 afforded 95:18 23:11 77:4 63:10 65:3,10 approving 1 argenery 25:22 amount 27:6 (8:18 72:20) 26:17 46:2	
added 9:7 27:5 agency 35:22 amount 27:6 68:18 72:20 26:17 46:2 25:18 44:7 72:24 74:10 17 amount 27:6 68:18 72:20 26:17 46:2	
addition 47:20 agenda 97:2 35:18 44:7 73:24 74:10,17 approximate 71:22 71:22 75:12 7(:11) (4:0 (0))	•
98:14 aggressive 91:9 71:22 75:13 76:11 64:9 69:22	
additional 8:5 ago 21:5 57:21 ample 12:21 78:25 83:3 approximate 75:8 01:10 ample 12:21 78:25 83:3 (4.2)	ion
10:20 39:4 75:8 91:19 analysis 18:12 84:24 86:24 64:2	
81:23 agree 10:23,24 19:11 87:17 90:11 appurtenan	ces
Addonizio 1:13 24:8 27:13 animated 83:20 95:9 101:9 39:4	
4:7,8 51:22 34:15 35:11 84:5 Applicant's 10:4 April 99:8	
85:20,21 88:23 37:4 46:12 answer 12:25 10:10,18 74:13 architect 51	14
99:7 80:8,8 81:5 15:1 17:1 78:24 93:6 58:15	:14
address 11:21 87:9 89:11 18:23 19:12,16 Applicants area 37:20 4	
20:6,6 45:8 93:25 19:24 20:2 20:14 40:20 41:2	0:18
	0:18

				Page 104
54:21 63:1	66:15,17,24,25	76:10,14,18	BOA 1:4	66:9,15,18
areas 11:17	98:4 100:20	81:11	Board 1:1,10,17	67:2,12,16,23
16:24 41:23	avoid 7:20 12:9	basement 71:11	2:3 4:6,8,11,14	68:14,15,17,18
arguably 33:2	awful 48:17	basic 11:17	4:17,19,21 5:7	69:1,6,9,10,13
argue 57:6	awiui 40.17	basis 86:25	6:21,23 7:1,3,8	69:16,19 70:2
argument 13:5	В	87:15	7:14,17,23 9:9	70:6,10,14,18
18:18 38:12	B 3:8 33:1	bear 40:2	9:12,15 10:21	71:2,3,8,10,21
59:11,24	back 6:5,14	beauty 53:15	11:23,24 14:2	72:4,19 73:21
Aric 1:13 90:5	10:24 11:9	beginning 95:10	14:9 15:6,20	74:12,13,16,17
90:16	14:17 22:25	begs 56:4	15:24 16:6	74:20 75:12
arrival 92:13	25:2,7,13	behalf 6:19	17:11 18:1,6,8	76:7,13,22
93:3,5,11	28:20 30:4,18	beholder 53:15	21:9 22:6,16	80:17 84:8,12
articulate 9:24	32:12,16 33:7	believe 15:1	23:1,8,13,18	84:18 85:6,19
articulated	38:25 45:5,24	19:17 25:9	23:22,25 24:2	85:21,24 86:1
14:15 47:2	46:7 47:4,12	72:13 81:25	24:6,10,16,20	86:3,5,7,19,21
aside 13:2 59:9	47:19,25 48:7	84:15 85:1	24:24 25:3,14	87:10,12,20,22
59:13,15	54:1,6 63:14	87:17	26:10,11,16	87:24 88:19,23
asked 7:8 21:19	65:15 69:19	believes 74:12	28:1,7,12 29:6	89:10 90:6,20
21:20 68:16	72:21 73:25	74:13	29:12,14,17,18	90:22 91:16
78:13 88:2	75:14 76:22	benefit 20:5	29:25 30:7,11	92:1,14,16
asking 49:23	81:10 83:15,23	27:12 89:2	31:4,10,21	93:4,18 95:22
65:24 67:4	85:5,6,11,13	best 6:16 29:18	33:7,10,17	96:15,18,20
73:8 74:16,17	85:14,15 86:14	29:20 45:8	34:2,5 35:25	97:1,6,10,22
aspect 30:12,24	86:14 88:2	47:7 63:9	36:3 37:2,7,8,9	98:1,8,13,18
89:23	89:17 90:13	69:23	37:14,17,25	99:3,7,11,12
assistance 60:17	backup 67:15	better 10:7,20	38:22 39:14	99:15,16 100:7
associated 81:9	backwards 41:9	23:7 43:10	42:5,9,11,16	100:16,24
87:21	bad 31:4	51:18 52:13	42:18,19,23	101:3,6,10,13
assume 16:23	bait 59:25	beyond 76:8	43:2,6,7,11,18	Board's 6:23 7:9
27:3	balance 79:7,8	bid 8:1 21:3	43:22 44:8	8:7 27:11 74:9
assumed 94:12	balancing 79:5	33:4 59:20,23	45:3 46:6,10	75:3,6 84:1
astray 6:16	79:16 82:22	59:25 60:4	46:12,22 47:3	87:5 101:9
astute 68:10	92:20	bidding 33:4	47:5,6 48:11	body 22:8 28:13
AT&T 66:20	balloon 83:10	58:22 78:22	49:22 50:8,12	67:4 80:7,15
attention 57:16	band 8:19,20,25	80:4 81:6	50:23 51:1,5	80:19 81:4
attorney 31:14	11:12 15:11,12	big 17:16 30:14	51:22 52:1,15	book 49:16
32:3,5 72:13	15:18,19,22	52:12,13 57:8	52:21 53:1,7	booked 95:4,5
83:16 102:11	16:5,10,13	82:25 94:17	54:3,6,18,24	books 89:4
102:13	17:7,9,19	biggest 45:15	55:20 56:8,13	bore 79:19
attorneys 2:3,6	bands 11:16	49:24 70:25	56:23,24 57:1	bored 12:20
2:8 71:24	16:25 17:24	90:8 92:2	57:4,12,18	boring 19:4
attributed 14:22	bang 10:1	bind 80:20	58:3,12,15,16	Borough 71:5
authority 31:19	Bansal 2:9	binding 80:21	59:1,18 60:1	Boschulte 11:14
authorize 22:8	barely 80:1 90:2	bit 5:5 28:21	61:6,8,11,15	12:2,22,24
authorizes 26:23	90:3 Barnal 70:4 7	51:18 55:10	61:25 62:12,17	17:15,20 79:12
automatic 26:2	Barrel 70:4,7 based 9:22	83:25 91:9	62:23 63:3,11	bottom 42:6,12
26:7,7	14:14 48:14	blend 56:5	63:23,25 64:6	42:15
avail 7:18 20:18	63:7 75:8	Block 1:6	64:8,14 65:8	bound 80:10
available 13:20	05.775.0	Blue 1:8	65:11,20 66:2	box 42:6,12

				Page 105
65:16 93:8	built 52:22	62:14	40:12 41:9,11	78:18
99:4	bumped 28:10	Catalpa 35:24	43:8,10,14,20	chase 23:24 46:9
boxing 84:18	burden 65:3	categorize 93:13	43:24 44:10,18	46:19
boy 63:7	business 6:20	caused 88:14	45:21 46:15	cheap 96:1
Boyan 1:14 4:5	100:6 101:15	caveat 92:5	47:10 48:10,19	check 65:16
4:6 23:25	busy 98:20	cell 78:9,10	48:22 49:1,8	93:8
25:14 26:10,16	button 41:8	80:25 82:17	49:12,20 50:21	Chief 14:18,20
28:12 29:6	buttress 34:16	89:2,3 92:6,10	50:24 51:3,20	16:21
42:5,11,18		cellular 1:19	51:24 52:10,25	choice 50:12
61:8,11,15,25	<u> </u>	92:9	54:11,17,20	chose 28:10
62:12,23 63:3	c 2:1 6:1 102:1,1	center 8:10 41:4	55:8,16 56:4	Christel 2:10
64:8,14 65:11	cabinet 58:23	58:25 59:22	56:10,15 57:2	Christina 2:10
65:20 66:15,18	cabinetry 39:3	89:21	57:6,14,21,23	Circling 69:19
67:2,16,23	39:12 41:6,15	certain 10:17	58:1,5 59:8,19	circumstances
68:15,18 69:1	42:1 53:14,16	20:13 32:21	60:3,7,13,21	34:15 53:13
69:9,13,16,19	cabinets 53:18	43:7 53:12,20	61:3,10,20	96:19
70:2,6,10,14	70:21 81:16	80:22,23 86:22	62:7,22 63:6	civil 12:14
70:18 71:2,10	calendar 98:6	certainly 9:10	63:15 67:6	claiming 78:17
85:18,19 92:16	caliper 63:20	45:16 48:4	68:8,23 69:3	78:22
93:4 98:13	call 4:4 32:15	72:22 76:16	69:12,14,17	Class 26:22
99:11 100:7,16	73:21 83:15	82:1	71:12,13,18	clear 7:4,13 9:18
100:24 101:3	85:17	Certificate	72:2,8,16 73:3	20:22 28:21,23
101:10	called 32:4,12	102:20	73:7 74:2 85:4	32:19 33:19
Boyan's 62:8	calls 57:16 78:20	Certified 1:21	85:12,17 86:9	36:8 38:23
78:25	Cammarata	1:23 102:5	86:12 87:24	58:9,20 68:19
brand 43:13	1:15 4:13,14	certify 102:6,10	88:9,21 89:8	76:3 91:21
break 85:5,8	85:25 86:1	cetera 14:23	90:5,15,18	92:17
Brian 2:9	91:25 92:1,14	22:2,2 46:1	91:15,25 92:12	clearly 6:9 9:2
brief 6:15 85:9	cans 43:17	81:16,17	92:15 93:2,12	9:21,22 56:18
bring 14:10	capacity 9:1	Chair 39:1,10	93:21 94:4,8	client 93:17,19
87:18 92:9	11:21 17:21,25	Chair's 41:19	94:23 96:2,9	93:24 95:2
93:25 94:19	22:19,19	Chairman 1:11	96:15,25 97:4	clients 90:14
brought 87:12	care 37:8	4:1,23 5:3 6:4	97:12,18,25	Clinton 70:1,3
99:25	careful 45:17	6:10,13,21	98:5,9,15,20	close 30:16
BRUCE 1:19	Carifa 2:10	14:16 15:3,12	99:9,13,18,24	36:21 70:1
buck 10:2	carried 93:22,22	16:2,8,12,17	100:5,12	closer 36:21
bud 66:10	94:9	17:4 18:4,10	101:12,14	42:20,21
buffering 34:1	carrier 80:10	19:3,6,10 20:3	Chait 2:5 6:18	closest 53:6
build 38:8,13	carriers 13:17	21:4,6,18,23	chance 74:4	closing 71:24
39:9,11 55:23	carry 93:18,24	22:10,22 23:20	chances 65:23	77:14
builder 51:13	98:9	24:4,19 25:1	change 23:16	closure 14:10
building 1:8	case 1:4 33:19	25:16,22 27:11	27:6,7 29:21	CME 1:18
14:22 15:15	75:1,18 81:10	28:9,16 29:8	30:15 64:19	collective 47:3
16:23 17:2	81:23 83:4	29:16 30:5,9	69:18 77:3	collectively 9:10
50:16 56:7	84:2 85:2	31:12,24 32:4	81:22	Collins 2:5 6:18
57:8	86:20 94:17	32:7,11,15	changed 69:10	collocate 59:18
buildings 50:1	95:10	34:18,24 35:5	changes 30:20	collocation
50:13 55:23	cases 25:4 80:14	35:17,24 37:13	30:21 71:23	13:16,23 14:1
56:6,9 57:13	catalog 48:20,23	37:15 38:7,20	changing 76:17	14:7 37:12,22

				Page 106
41:17 66:22	committee 23:1	88:13 91:18	considering	102:11,13
collocator 28:11	23:3 25:2	99:3	87:15	couple 11:9
28:12 38:17	27:22,25 28:3	concerned 42:24	constitutes 27:6	32:19 51:23
41:18 42:1,1,1	28:17 29:3,4	69:6 89:16	36:18	55:25 56:11
42:6,13 65:22	29:17 31:18	92:7	constraints 11:5	57:9 69:1 84:9
66:16,24 67:8	32:9 38:6	concerns 32:22	construct 68:5	93:14
collocators	60:18 83:24	46:3 47:2	constructing	course 8:2,12
13:20 39:5	common 39:8	49:24 60:16	39:2	20:22 34:5
66:8	communicatio	75:12,16 76:6	construction	72:17 83:7
come 25:12 27:9	1:19 31:17	82:4 95:25,25	16:22	court 28:21 87:2
47:3,19,25	companies	onclusion	Consultant 1:19	Court 28.21 87.2 Court's 87:6
, ,	49:14	10:21		
49:5,18 73:25			consultation	courtesy 95:19 cover 56:11
76:22 81:14	company 49:15	concrete 70:23	86:24	
85:5,6 87:9	compare 79:16	condition 7:25	contemplated	coverage 8:15
comes 21:15	complain 89:19	8:3 12:12 13:3	12:18	8:21,24 9:7,23
38:17 75:14	complete 33:3	13:3,7 22:7,12	content 37:4	10:6,7,20 11:1
89:17	92:19	22:24,24 23:5	continue 79:4	11:6,21,25
comfort 74:18	completely	23:10,16 24:3	continuing	12:8,16,17
comfortable	33:21 34:10	24:5 29:15	67:16 83:5	14:18,25 15:9
45:17 46:18	60:12	34:11 46:24	contribution	15:14,17 16:5
58:17 62:16	complications	65:9 74:15	35:13,14,21	16:9,13,20,23
90:25	81:9	81:4	control 46:2	17:2,23,24
coming 10:23	composition	conditional	convened 6:22	18:11 20:20
46:7 65:24	69:10	77:18	conversation	68:12 79:12,15
67:4 72:21	compound 38:5	conditions 46:24	39:22 101:3	79:16 82:21
96:24 100:20	39:6,10 40:18	47:1 86:22	conversations	89:12 91:20
commence 21:2	40:19,24 41:4	confer 56:21	90:12	94:16
Commencing	41:20,21,24	confines 58:23	cooperation	covers 11:15
1:9	42:2,4 54:13	confirm 52:14	60:18	Cracker 70:4,7
comment 11:19	54:14 55:7,14	62:21	copious 75:6	crafty 76:3
13:1 55:21	60:19 76:25	conflict 97:16	76:5	crane 83:9
65:12 66:20	83:18	Conine 2:9,11	corner 55:7,17	created 61:13
69:20 73:1	comprehensiv	conscience	correct 15:8,23	creates 35:1
87:8 90:14	76:6	65:16 93:8	16:3,11,15,16	53:16,17 58:20
95:19,20	compromise	consensus 45:23	17:3 23:17	58:21
100:11	7:22 12:15	consent 86:25	25:11 27:3	creating 36:22
commentary	13:6 14:10	conservation	31:23 32:6	credit 76:2 78:3
82:9	58:4	68:25	36:2 42:22	criteria 65:2
comments 8:6	compromises	consider 31:8	43:1 61:2	92:20
45:23 47:14	95:24	65:8 71:22	63:24 64:11	critical 20:20
63:19 70:19	concealment	74:7,21 87:14	69:1 88:8	68:12
75:9 82:3 84:1	26:3	87:23	100:13	cross-examina
93:19,20 96:4	concept 14:1	consideration	correlation	72:24 100:10
Commission	conceptual	14:14 78:14	53:20	crux 8:22
35:14,16,19,22	82:14	82:22 89:18	Cortez 98:23	CSR 102:19
commit 74:16	concern 13:18	considerations	cost 36:7 87:21	current 26:24
commitment	32:20 35:3	74:11	Cotter 98:24	51:9 91:6
56:19	55:1 60:14	considered	Cotton 2:11	currently 87:17
committed 8:7	62:2 76:4	87:21	counsel 35:4	cut 23:23 41:20
	1	1		

				Page 107
42:2 71:5	degree 9:23	determine 73:25	69:4 71:23	36:15 76:2
T 2.2 / 1.3	10:25 12:8,16	76:13 79:7	81:13 87:1	78:17 83:2
D	44:7	deterrent 90:8	discussions 88:6	84:7 95:22
D 1:18 3:1	DelBarton 48:16	detriment 79:8	disjointed 59:3	96:1
D/b/a 1:5	deliberated	detrimental	59:7	duly 5:25 6:1
dais 47:15	75:12	79:6,17 86:23	dispute 7:3,5	duration 37:4
Dan 1:12 50:6	deliberating	developer 77:5	disputes 18:19	
92:2	73:22	devices 17:12	disrespectfully	E
Dan's 70:19	Deliberation	dialogue 84:6	96:5	E 2:1,1 3:1,8 6:1
DAS 82:13	75:2	dictate 60:25	disrupting 51:8	6:1 102:1,1
date 94:24 95:5	deliberations	difference 11:11	disruption 51:9	e-mail 65:7
102:9	87:10	17:8 18:2,4	distance 54:12	e-mails 69:2
Dated 102:23	deliberative	55:10 78:2	distinction 8:24	earlier 27:15
dates 97:17	6:24 7:10 9:11	82:21 83:18	15:8	58:18 61:22
David 2:9	delta 82:20	differences 9:23	Distributed	92:17
DAVIS 2:2	demographic	10:8 11:8	82:13	early 10:14 21:5
day 29:2 70:3	43:7	different 9:10	District 75:11	21:14 91:19
94:9	43:7 denial 20:9	10:21 12:10	77:13,21,23	easier 40:1
days 94:1	deny 6:25	14:2 33:14	78:1,6 79:18	easiest 39:21
100:20	Department	48:4 53:18	79:23 82:10,24	eastbound 49:3
dBa 14:25	8:10	60:11,12 69:7	83:7 88:14	70:13
dead 92:12 93:2		· · · ·	disturbance	easy 40:7
93:4,10	depending 89:17	80:5 81:19,20 94:14	27:7	eat 20:16
dealing 17:17		difficult 35:8	disturbed 93:6	edge 54:13,21
December 6:23	Depends 37:15 described 53:1	36:11		Education 80:18
9:11 10:22	DESCRIPTI	direct 47:1	doing 6:20 22:9 35:8 45:24	effectively 33:25
20:9 31:16	3:9	directed 31:13	46:13 51:19	effects 86:23
88:25	deserve 96:7	direction 58:9	73:19 80:13	effort 7:16 10:25
decent 47:17			86:19 97:13	14:10 21:13
decide 37:18	design 8:8 9:9 10:5 14:3,4	74:9 81:20,21 directions 101:9	dollars 20:18	55:12 74:19
93:24	,	disagree 10:23		efforts 21:1 26:4
decided 23:15	49:7,14 52:5		doomsday 70:22	Eighty 75:22
decides 93:24	52:17 56:19 67:7 74:12	10:24	dot 85:17 dotted 42:12	Eisenstein 1:19
decision 20:10		disagreement 11:4 79:25		12:23 14:20
20:14 74:5	designated		DPW 36:16,23	16:21 26:20
76:9 78:23,24	42:13	disappointed	58:25 59:2,14	28:14 66:13
87:20	designed 41:16	89:22 disclosure 13:8	60:6,8	either 12:20
decisions 29:19	41:25 86:19	15:9	Dr 1:19 12:23 14:19 16:21	22:7 80:10
50:15	designers 57:17			Elementary
deck 98:18	designing 52:5	discuss 32:9,12	26:20 28:14 66:12	8:22 11:22
deed 80:16	designs 48:5 desire 34:20	discussed 8:11	66:12 draw 8:24 15:8	12:4 15:10
defeat 26:3		43:14 63:13		elevation 13:13
deficiency 11:21	35:6 dospito 68:11 12	83:7 discusses 5:7	drawings 73:12	14:5,8
11:25 15:21	despite 68:11,13		drawings 73:12 drew 55:10	elevations 13:12
definitely 90:11	80:1 dotoil 45:14	discussing 88:11		66:13
90:25	detail 45:14	88:18	driven 47:21	eliminate 41:21
definitions 27:5	details 58:9	discussion 9:4	driveway 53:10	42:3,5 81:16
definitive 62:10	determination	9:20 22:1	59:22	eliminated
definitively 62:1	12:7 92:23	27:14 44:1	drop 59:6 92:10	37:11
	93:1,20	47:12 63:18	due 12:9 14:13	57.11
			l	

				Page 108
eloquently 76:6	81:9	36:7	32:2	79:13 82:5,11
emails 68:24	essentially 8:21	experience	familiar 70:6,17	82:19,24,24
emergency	13:13 31:15	34:25 35:7	far 55:14,20	83:9,17 84:9
17:18	42:3	48:15	59:7	88:5,11 89:24
emergent 17:22	estimate 63:6	expert 9:21	fashion 22:4	90:9,9,19
employee	et 14:23 22:2,2	12:22 14:19	favor 47:14	91:20,23 92:12
102:11,13	46:1 81:16,17	51:13 76:22	favorably 12:14	92:22 93:7
enclosures 55:21	Eunice 2:9	experts 29:18	FCC 25:19 26:1	95:10 100:2
engage 45:25	evaluate 86:21	explain 66:3	Fear 73:18	101:2,4
engaged 6:24	evaluating 86:20	explained 32:3	feasibility 70:20	fence 38:9,13,17
Engel 2:10	87:4	66:13	February 1:7	55:22 57:2,8,8
engineer 13:9	evening 5:14	explanation	4:4	57:10,15,23,24
36:13 55:2,10	6:17 74:10	8:18	Federal 80:12	90:23 92:2
64:6	91:2	expressed 34:20	feel 58:16 62:15	fenced 38:14
engineering	everybody 74:3	expression 10:1	90:24	fifth 96:13 97:14
51:12 53:8	87:16 93:15	extension 22:9	feeling 88:25	fill 18:21,24
enlarge 40:24	97:4,13	26:2 28:8	feelings 75:3,7,8	19:16,18,19,23
enormously	everybody's	extent 30:25	feet 7:7 8:1,4,20	65:4 67:17,18
74:25	98:6	32:21 46:2,22	8:23 10:3,8,17	67:20
enter 25:5 62:24	Everyone's	56:20	11:15,23 13:14	filled 20:1,2
	86:14	exterior 17:2		fills 20:10
entering 84:25 enters 23:14	evidence 75:9		13:14,22 14:6	
entire 44:18		extraordinary	14:7 16:12	final 21:23,24 70:18
	76:14,17 77:10	96:17	20:5 22:4 23:2	
entirety 20:1,11	77:23 81:11,24	eye 53:15	23:4 24:7,22	financially 102:14
39:9	82:8 83:5	F	25:5,21 26:8	
entitled 20:19	94:18	F 2:8 5:25 102:1	26:11 27:1,17	find 48:12 53:16
environment	exact 100:21	face 17:5	27:18,20,24	68:1 75:24 87:2
51:15	exactly 23:6	facility 21:2,13	28:2,5,10,19	87:2
envision 46:16	24:13 31:15	32:25 33:2	28:22,24 29:21	fine 93:21 99:17
envisioning	70:14 73:9	36:18	30:17 33:11,12	99:18
70:20	example 51:17	fact 14:22 15:12	33:13,13 36:25	finish 72:6 96:3
epiphany 83:23	76:16	16:22 33:23	36:25 37:5	Fire 8:10
equally 91:2	excellent 82:3	36:11 77:14,15	38:4,8,11,12	firehouse 67:13
equipment	exception 11:16	77:20,22 78:1	42:25 43:12,25	100:2
34:10 37:20,20	exclamation	78:14 80:15	50:18,25 51:4	firm 6:18
37:20 39:3	83:21	86:19 87:2	52:16 54:6,16	first 18:17 26:21
41:5,15,25	excuse 11:24	94:17	54:19,22,25	30:6 65:1 81:13 86:15
50:16 51:25	excused 4:10	fair 9:20 10:6	55:9 60:10,10	
52:1,11,17,23	85:23	45:12 47:6	60:25 61:13,17	88:10
53:9,13,20,22	exercise 61:4	49:9 71:22,25	61:23 62:1,3,5	fit 13:13
53:23 55:6	exhibit 3:9	74:6 89:8	62:11,13,15	five 7:5 18:3
56:12 57:25	15:13 39:22	94:24 95:13,19	63:4 64:4,13	31:3 33:24
58:23 59:4,11	40:1	95:24	64:13 65:9	36:24 96:12
76:25 81:16	exhibits 93:25	fairness 29:9	66:10,24,25	five-minute 85:5
especially 10:9	existing 62:18	57:21	67:10,13,14,17	85:8
ESQUIRE 2:3,5	62:25	faith 24:11	67:23 68:3	flag 49:11
2:8	Exit 47:22	fake 49:14	73:10 74:15	flagless 8:8
ESQUIRES 2:5	expanding 39:6	Falzarano 31:14	75:23 77:21	13:11 47:13,15
essence 77:9	expense 12:11		78:2,4,7 79:13	48:2 49:11

				Page 109
65:25 82:25	88:9,21 89:8	frame 17:13	getting 16:4,4,6	46:18 48:17
flagpole 8:9 9:9	90:5,15,18	20:21 100:21	40:11 41:1	51:12,16 53:2
10:3,9 13:10	91:15,25 92:12	frank 36:12	53:4 91:10	56:14,16 57:9
13:11 26:5,9	92:15 93:2,12	frankly 7:16	give 5:21 14:13	59:13,22 61:18
47:13,15 48:2	93:21 94:4,8	33:22 83:18	31:18 37:5	62:13 65:1
65:25 66:12	94:23 96:9,15	95:9,23	40:16 47:7	67:23 71:20
67:1 82:25	96:25 97:4,12	frequencies	56:10 62:10	72:10,23,24,25
Flanagan 1:11	97:18,25 98:5	17:13	74:17 76:2	73:11 75:15,17
4:1,22,23 5:3	98:9,15,20	frequency 8:19	89:24	75:19 76:20
6:4,10,13	99:9,13,18	8:20,25 11:12	given 16:22 58:8	77:12 78:21
14:16 15:3	100:5,12	11:16 15:11,11	71:22,24 74:10	79:15,18 80:20
16:2,8,12,17	101:12,14	15:18,18,22	77:11,12,13,14	80:24,25 81:3
17:4 18:4,10	flavors 47:25	16:5,10,13,25	79:3 85:1 88:5	81:19,20,21,23
19:3,6,10 21:6	fly 83:9	17:7,9,14,19	gives 72:19	81:24,24 83:3
21:18,23 22:10	Flynn 69:14	17:24	giving 73:22,23	83:13,17 84:2
22:22 23:20	focus 40:17	full 13:8 15:9	glad 9:17	84:18,19 88:20
24:4,19 25:1	follow 9:16	further 8:18	go 6:16 15:4	89:13,18 90:6
25:16,22 27:11	41:17,19 65:11	36:14,25 37:19	21:11 22:7,13	94:13,18 98:9
28:9,16 29:8	89:5	44:2 48:25	22:15 25:6,7,8	98:22,23,23,25
29:16 30:5,9	following 8:5	53:23 54:22	27:25 28:4	99:1,1 100:8
31:12,24 32:4	11:17	55:12,14,18	30:18 33:3,20	good 6:17 12:17
32:7,11,15	follows 71:17	57:7 88:18	37:19 38:17	30:3 31:5 43:9
34:18 35:5,17	followup 17:11	94:9 98:10	39:25 40:6,7	49:4 51:17
35:24 37:13,15	64:18	102:10	40:17,20 41:13	60:17 65:16
38:7,20 40:12	foot 39:9	future 41:16,24	43:8 45:5,13	82:2,5 89:14
41:9,11 43:8	footprint 38:24	66:7	46:9 47:11,19	93:8
43:10,14,20,24	forbid 17:18,18		48:17 49:15	goose 46:9,18
44:10,18 45:21	17:21	G	51:16 52:4,17	governing 22:8
46:15 47:10	force 69:7	G 2:3,11	54:1 56:6,14	80:7,15,19
48:10,19,22	forcing 87:3	gain 53:24 74:19	58:22 61:1,10	81:4
49:1,8,12,20	foregoing 102:6	gallery 72:9,11	66:23 67:10	governmental
50:21,24 51:3	forever 69:15	73:15 74:3	73:11 80:7	22:19
51:20,24 52:10	forget 21:3 28:3	gambrel 55:25	81:4,19 83:13	great 49:8 99:25
52:25 54:11,17	38:10	gap 18:17,21,24	83:23 84:2,19	greater 8:25
54:20 55:8,16	formally 45:25	19:12,13,16,18	88:10,18 89:9	17:21 27:1
56:4,10,15	forth 11:9 47:12	19:18,19,23	91:11 93:22	78:8
57:2,6,14,23	87:22 102:9	20:1,2,6,7,10	97:19 99:5,22	green 8:9 50:16
58:1,5 59:8,19	forward 7:23	20:11 65:4	God 17:18,18,21	51:4,17,21
60:3,7,13,21	49:5,18 92:4	67:17,18,21	goes 25:1 44:21	52:20 57:10
61:3,10,20	96:24	89:12	57:13 90:9	94:7
62:7,22 63:6	four 33:6,18	gaps 67:19	going 5:5 6:14	GREENBAUM
63:15 67:6	55:6 99:14	general 41:21	10:16 13:8	2:2
68:8,23 69:3	fourth 81:14	58:24	14:17 19:9	ground 27:7
69:12,14,17	Fox 1:18 3:3	generally 34:14	20:3 22:25	34:10 51:16
71:13,18 72:2	4:25 5:10,18	55:5 81:8	27:15,16 28:4	growing 22:4
72:8,16 73:3,7	5:18,23 46:1	generator 39:13	28:20 31:2,6	80:2
74:2 85:4,12	56:21,23 57:1	George 1:14	36:12,12 37:7	grown 58:2
85:17 86:8,9	60:17 63:2,5,9	42:10 92:5,15	37:17 38:8,9	guess 9:19 21:24
86:12 87:24	86:10	99:25	44:20 45:4,24	22:23 44:14,22

				Page IIU
45:8 55:9	81:13,14,14,17	17:25 57:25	88.12 1/ 16	92:25 93:1
63:12 64:18	81:13,14,14,17	87:19	88:13,14,16 89:14 90:8,10	92:23 93:1
67:10 70:18	94:15 95:20	highlight 69:20	92:3,21	informed 12:20
		93:5	,	
71:14 79:10 90:3	98:7 101:17		impactful 53:5	informing 22:25
	hearings 8:17 9:5 11:10	highly 68:2,6 historic 30:2	impacts 8:14 30:13 76:18	input 47:7 91:8
guessing 52:14	12:19 27:14			inquiries 32:19
59:6		75:11 77:13,21	77:24 79:7,17 82:9	inquiry 31:22 32:2,17
guys 28:4 59:15 81:14 84:10	75:4,8,23 77:10 84:10,10	77:23 78:1,6 78:12 79:18,23		inside 14:21
98:16 99:9	95:23	· · · · · ·	implementation 12:2	17:9 52:2
96.10 99.9	heck 68:25	82:7,10,23 83:7 88:14		install 12:4
H			imply 30:21	
H 3:8	height 7:7,12,25	90:25	important 69:5	instance 66:1
half 36:17	8:4,13,23 9:3	hold 93:22	89:18 91:2	instances 79:19
hallway 86:13	10:2,7,8,17,20	honest 9:20 15:6	impose 22:6,11	intelligent 82:3
hand 71:19	13:2,8 21:25	57:16 94:25	22:17	intend 12:23
99:23	22:20 24:6	97:20	imposed 80:15	interest 15:5,8
happen 22:12,23	25:20 26:25	honestly 7:16 31:20	improve 38:9	23:11 79:6
36:13	27:23 28:3		60:22 61:1,4,4	interested 84:21
happened 32:13	30:13 32:23	honoring 8:7	improvements	102:14
95:20	37:10 45:24	hope 12:13	77:4	interfere 36:20
happens 79:10	62:25 63:23,24	29:23,24 32:22	in-building	interference
99:19,20,20	64:23 65:7,14	hopefully 12:13	14:25 15:3,17	36:23
happy 6:5,12	65:17 66:6,25	14:9 60:17	15:25 16:9,13	interior 11:22
88:10 94:8	75:25 76:1,4,9	hours 82:7 84:6	16:19 17:22	15:10 16:4
hard 61:16 89:1	76:11 80:8	house 50:15	inappropriate	internal 12:7
89:20	82:19 88:15,15	housekeeping	85:1 86:17	internally 7:14
Harding 1:1	89:13,14 90:23	5:5	87:2	35:23
8:21 11:18,22	91:12,18,18	Hugh 1:14 91:15	inclined 11:24 14:2 22:21	interplayed 82:15
12:4,9,17	93:10	hundred 21:15		
15:10,15 21:2	heights 76:18	21:16 28:4	including 15:15 46:24 77:20	interpret 73:24
21:14 80:2	Heller 14:18,21	50:17,25 51:4	82:12 83:7	interrupt 51:11
hardscape 56:3	16:21 help 34:9 42:14	51:6 78:7 82:24 89:24	82:12 83:7 increase 9:8	95:17
Harsh 2:8	1	91:22	10:6 22:2	interrupted 14:12
hat 20:4	44:23 52:8,9 hereinbefore	91:22 hypothetically	25:20 26:8,25	intervals 10:15
head 71:5	102:9	14:6	46:4 66:22	investigated
hear 24:1 30:20	HEROLD 2:7	14.0	incredibly 68:9	65:10
100:5	hey 27:21 29:20	I	79:25	
heard 12:21,22	69:4 73:9	idea 52:23 62:24	indicated 27:25	investigating 65:3
16:2 18:12	81:12 82:4	ideal 53:4	31:15,15 39:1	investigation
36:16 59:16	hide 51:18,20	ignoring 82:8,8	44:4,12 46:24	79:2
77:14,23,24	56:11 57:18	imagine 19:6	indirect 26:19	invokes 60:11
79:9 81:10,11	hiding 51:24	60:23 100:16	industry 20:20	involve 46:1
82:10 84:1	high 16:9,14	impact 8:13 9:7	71:1	involved 20:25
88:24 93:14	31:6	10:5,15 51:14	inefficiency 87:5	80:9,14 87:16
hearing 5:21	higher 8:20,23	53:17 57:7	information	IRIS 1:21 102:4
8:12 9:21 19:9	8:25 9:3 10:2,7	62:5 75:11	30:1,3 63:10	102:19
20:22 50:5	11:16 15:11,18	77:11,13 82:10	79:24 84:11	irrelevant 51:6
75:5 77:6	16:5 17:9,19	82:23,23 83:6	89:23 92:18,21	issue 17:16,19
	10.3 17.3,17		07.23 72.10,21	155ut 17.10,17
			l	I

				Page III
31:1 32:25	72.9 9 20	27:24 28:18,18	83:20,25 84:5	41:12 43:4
38:5 49:24	73:8,8,20 79:24 81:8,14	28:24 29:21	91:9	85:12 98:20
53:18 60:19	· · · ·		live 48:16 95:8	lose 13:23 53:24
	82:5 83:2,3,20	44:12,13 60:24		
75:17,25 76:1	84:1 91:22	60:25	Livio 2:10	81:21
79:1 80:6,9,16	93:13 94:20,23	leased 38:4	LLC 2:8	loss 8:24
80:24 82:1	95:11 100:3	60:23	LLP 2:2	lost 8:23 44:21
	knowing 16:20	leave 45:18	locate 21:13	lot 1:6 8:18 9:4
91:12,18 92:2	20:24	left 43:23 44:3	44:23 55:7,9	12:10,10 21:11
,	knows 48:11	44:14 59:11	89:20	22:1 30:1,24
issues 30:11,23	87:12,16	88:20	located 8:9	30:25 47:12
	Koeneke 2:9	legal 32:24	25:19 36:19	53:15 58:20
94:22	L	64:21	55:3	61:8 65:5
items 45:9,9	$\frac{\mathbf{L}}{\mathbf{L} 5:25 \ 6:1}$	legally 9:6	location 30:23	67:14,14 68:25
<i>J</i> U L		length 17:16	31:8 33:14,22	76:6 77:17
	LA 102:4,19	77:15	48:12 51:7	81:8 84:11
	laid 6:16	let's 5:16 18:18	58:24 67:11	89:4 94:22
	land 20:13 22:18	23:19 25:3,4	89:6	95:24 96:22
Jersey 25:25	25:25 29:11,18	29:12 32:18	lock 70:21	98:17
95:9 102:6	29:19 75:1	38:11 59:10,13	locked 28:2	lots 16:24 98:21
job 71:6	77:2,2	level 74:18	logic 19:20	loud 50:9
· · · · ·	landlord 22:18	lied 88:21	29:10	louder 50:11
judgment 29:20	22:25 27:22	lieu 98:13,15	logical 21:18	loudly 6:9
July 40:5,6	28:17	life 20:12	29:13	love 62:12 65:12
•	landscape 56:2	light 82:14	logistically	91:17
K	landscaping	likes 72:3	26:10	low 16:10,13
TT (1	34:3,9,12,16	limit 22:20 24:6	long 26:2,3,6,8	17:7
	Lane 70:11	27:23 66:6	45:16 67:8	lower 7:25 8:4
10.00	language 89:4	80:8	78:15 90:10	11:12 15:11,18
	LaROSA 1:21	limitations 11:5	long-winded	15:22 17:24
	Lastly 89:19	limited 1:4 6:20	21:21	32:23 37:10
	late 6:6,11	33:24,25 54:10	longer 95:3	66:5 82:5 84:8
59:25 62:18	laughed 96:8	101:1	look 25:3 45:14	lowering 8:13
King 8:10	Laughter 19:5	limits 13:16	47:21 54:18	54:7 82:11
	law 2:7 6:18	line 30:17 36:14	55:12 57:10	90:9
know 5:10,16	20:13 21:19	37:1 54:4,23	59:17,19 61:18	Lunar 6:10
10:13 14:18	22:10 25:18,25	55:13,17 69:2	62:2 79:5	
16:19,19 18:5	75:1 77:2,3	77:12	80:19 91:4	M
18:10,12 19:3	80:11,12 81:7	lines 53:21	92:23 98:19	M 2:10 6:1,1
20:23 28:1,5	lawyer 13:25	list 91:1	looked 12:14	Madison 70:24
29:1,10 31:19	20:3 58:13	listen 29:22 69:4	53:11,24 93:9	71:5
31:25 32:13	lawyers 72:10	listened 37:3	looking 15:12	magic 22:12
	layout 77:4	listening 47:14	23:23 29:17	main 30:23
	lays 11:10	litigation 7:20	41:6 43:15,16	maintain 26:6,9
	lead 66:22	76:10,12,13	45:10 69:23	maintenance
	Leap 24:11	80:9 87:15	80:11,11,12	35:1
55:17,21 57:17	lease 13:21 23:3	little 5:5 28:21	looks 27:18 49:4	major 35:3
58:5 59:6,13	23:12,14,15	44:2 47:23	51:22	making 13:15
59:14 61:24	24:3,7,21 25:5	51:14,18 54:12	Lori 1:17 4:4	21:13 35:2,21
62:13 63:3	25:6,9 27:23			81:22 83:12
60.10 21 70.12	23.0,927.23	רעיע העירה ו	39:16/140.17	01.22 05.12
69:18,21 70:12	25.0,9 27.25	55:25 57:25	39:16,21 40:12	01.22 05.12

				Page 112
93:9	5:19	51:22 52:1,21	mess 59:14	MLUL 100:21
manner 9:25	McKittrick 2:10	53:1,7 54:3,6	message 7:13	mode 9:9
36:20,24 72:20	mean 10:22 18:5	54:18,24 55:20	met 65:3	models 82:14,14
manufacturers	18:6 29:13	56:8,13,23	metal 43:16	modern 17:12
49:18	31:10 34:2	57:4,12,18	method 63:7,7	money 12:10
March 47:4	37:4 54:12	58:3,12,15,16	Michael 1:15	83:8,8
61:16 73:13	56:13 90:1	59:1,18 60:1	2:9	monopole 78:6,7
93:18 94:6,16	94:20	61:8,11,15,25	2.9 microphone	month 72:21
96:3,12 98:10	meaning 44:8	62:12,17,23	4:13 6:8 50:7	96:14,21 97:6
marker 69:22	59:3	63:3,11,23,25	72:16	97:15
			middle 26:22	
market 13:21 20:21	meaningful 20:7 36:24	64:6,8,14		months 20:17 67:25 91:19
		65:11,20 66:2	36:22 50:1,13	
Maselli 1:12	mechanically	66:9,15,18	52:8 59:2,12	move 36:3,14,21
4:10,11 29:14	22:22 26:12	67:2,12,16,23	77:22	83:17,25
42:16,19 43:22	meet 66:7	68:15,17,18	midst 36:15 37:1	moved 36:25
49:22 50:8,12	meeting 4:2 5:11	69:1,9,13,16	Mike 1:11 45:3	59:10,12
50:23 51:1,5	6:23 36:17	69:19 70:2,6	89:10 90:4	moving 43:12,15
52:1,21 53:1	45:7 61:16	70:10,14,18	96:19 99:3	43:20,25 44:2
54:18,24 55:20	93:18 94:5	71:2,3,8,10	mile 69:22	44:16,17,18
56:8 57:4,12	95:8 96:13	72:4 76:12	Mill 1:8	54:22 60:14
57:18 58:3,12	100:10	85:19,21,24	Millbrook 1:5	92:4 97:12
58:16,19 59:1	meetings 95:1	86:1,3,5,7	mind 21:25	multiple 52:18
59:18 60:1	96:17,21 98:16	88:19,23 89:10	88:11	77:16
85:23,24 90:22	99:10	90:6,20,22	minimal 90:3	municipal 1:8
96:20 97:1	member 4:6,8	91:16 92:1,14	minimize 57:7	25:25 32:3,5
masonry 14:23	4:11,14,17,19	92:16 93:4	minimizing	75:1 77:1,2
Master 79:22	4:21 9:12,15	96:18,20 97:1	90:10	municipality's
Masters 48:15	15:20,24 16:6	97:10,22 98:1	minute 59:20	87:5
78:5 79:25	17:11 18:1,6,8	98:13,18 99:3	minutes 61:9	mystery 89:21
material 27:6	21:9 23:8,13	99:7,11,12,15	mitigate 46:3	
64:19 73:2	23:18,22,25	99:16 100:7,14	52:6 53:5 54:9	<u> </u>
materially 26:3	24:2,6,10,16	100:16,24	86:22	N 2:1 3:1 6:1
27:3	24:24 25:3,14	101:3,6,10,13	mitigated 32:22	name 5:17 98:25
Mathematically	26:10,16 28:7	members 1:10	91:3,12,13	narrative 15:14
25:15	28:12 29:6,14	3:15 6:21 37:8	mitigating 88:6	National 78:11
matter 1:3 7:14	29:25 30:7,11	37:8 43:7	mitigation 57:4	nature 8:15
14:13 25:18	31:4,10,21	46:12 47:14	Mlenak 2:3 5:15	near 70:4 77:20
52:22 87:18	33:7,10,17	75:10 76:7,21	5:20 22:15	nearest 30:18
93:16 94:13	34:2,5 35:25	77:25 84:13	23:10,17 24:9	necessary 7:18
95:13	36:3 37:2,9,14	87:10	24:13,18,23	11:2 39:2,12
matters 5:8	37:17,25 38:22	memo 79:10	25:9,12 26:15	need 13:11
74:18	39:14 42:5,9	87:22	26:17 28:15	16:18 18:23
Mawrowski	42:11,16,18,19	mention 94:17	44:16 64:25	19:11,16 27:23
64:4	42:23 43:2,6	mentioned 21:4	71:20 72:6,15	28:13,22 37:18
max 29:21	43:11,18,22	55:5	72:17 73:20	38:14 43:5
maximize 40:13	44:8 45:3 46:6	menu 47:20	74:22 79:4	49:10 59:4
maximum 46:2	46:10 47:5,7	Mertz 1:18 3:4	86:11,18 93:23	60:11,22 61:5
McKINLEY	49:22 50:8,12	4:25 5:10,19	97:24 100:18	66:10 67:11
1:18 3:4 4:24	50:23 51:1,5	5:19,24 86:11	101:1,8	72:22 77:20
1.10 J.T T.2T	50.25 51.1,5	5.17,27 00.11	101.1,0	-
	I	l	1	1

				Page 113
79:22 81:5	24:6,10,16,24	99:24	48:14 49:20	82:16,17
83:8,10 89:12	25:3 28:7	O'Donnells	52:16 61:17	original 8:1
97:6 100:4	29:25 30:7,11	56:16	62:7,22 65:11	57:22 63:22
needed 38:11,16	31:4,10,21	object 91:24	67:16 72:8	100:22
75:20,21	33:7,10,17	objection 45:1	74:6 79:14	originally 12:18
needs 28:24	34:2,5 35:25	objective 67:7	83:12 85:12	41:22 55:4
76:13 81:25	36:3,9 37:2	objectively 7:2	89:8 91:15,25	64:24
neg 14:25	39:14 42:9,23	13:16 14:12	93:12,21 94:15	ought 29:20
negative 88:16	43:2,6,11,18	objectives 66:7	95:22 99:12,18	out-of-building
92:20	44:8 45:3,20	Objector 87:18	old 47:23	16:20
neglected 13:4	46:6,10 47:3,5	100:22	on-site 34:15	outdoor 53:17
negotiate 23:15	53:7,25 54:3	Objectors 2:8	once 6:17 10:16	82:12
24:17	56:13,23 62:17	100:17	70:24 71:4	outlets 4:3
neighbor 30:18	63:11,23,25	obligated 76:21	82:7,10	outside 16:24
53:6	64:6 66:2,9,21	obnoxious 55:22	ones 47:17,24	17:6 25:19
neighborhood	67:12 68:17	observation	48:13,16	52:3
52:8 55:24	71:3,8 72:4	68:10	ongoing 36:16	overture 65:13
neighboring	86:6,7 89:10	Observer 4:2	open 43:15	93:10
78:2,4	96:18 97:10	obtain 7:6	61:25 62:9,11	owner 22:18
neighbors 42:14	99:15 101:6,13	obtained 7:19	72:22 81:23	owners 34:20
52:7 56:15	news 31:5	obvious 10:22	92:24 96:12,19	
81:2 82:23	nicer 47:24	obvious 10.22 obviously 13:19	opening 81:9	P
neither 102:10	night 94:11,20	66:5 90:9	operation 36:16	P 2:1,1 5:25
102:12	nights 97:6	ODAS 11:20	operational	P.E 1:18 3:3
never 13:25	Nina 2:9	12:1 92:8	36:23	5:25
28:18,23 32:12	NJ 1:9	offensive 75:18	operationally	p.m 1:9 85:10,11
35:9 58:13	nodes 12:4	offer 12:14	36:20	98:10 101:18
67:22	noucs 12.4 non-Verizon	13:18 14:9	operator 83:9	P.P 3:4 6:1
nevertheless	99:19	74:15	opinion 7:21	PA 2:7
20:2	Notary 102:4	offered 11:6	9:10 22:16	pad 37:20 38:1,8
new 1:4,9 6:6,10	noted 55:11	12:12 13:3,3,6	33:15 65:22	42:18,19,20,21
6:12,19 25:25	62:21 68:9	34:7 65:9	69:22 73:23	Page 3:3,4,9
33:3,21 38:18	87:9 100:5	offering 8:3 20:7	74:9 75:13	Pandemic 14:12
43:13 48:24	notes 75:6,14	22:5	80:23 86:18	parameters 54:2
58:21,21 68:6	76:5 82:2	official 34:8	91:14	paraphrasing
72:23 73:1,14	83:22	56:21	opinions 73:22	18:21
73:15 76:17,19	notice 50:3 56:1	oh 34:2 69:17	73:23	parking 16:24
	1			part 18:12 27:2
76:23 77:10	94:9 98:10	72:17 75:5.14	opportunity	part 10.12 27.2
76:23 77:10 80:18.19 84:25	94:9 98:10 noticeable 50:18	72:17 75:5,14 78:17.21 79:12	opportunity 10:11 37:12	33:1 50:23,24
80:18,19 84:25	noticeable 50:18	78:17,21 79:12	10:11 37:12	1
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1	33:1 50:23,24
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18 100:9,17,19	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2 noticed 4:2	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19 83:15 88:21	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1 74:6 92:17	33:1 50:23,24 65:1
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18 100:9,17,19 101:11 102:5	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2 noticed 4:2 number 44:24	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19 83:15 88:21 okay 5:3,20 16:8	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1 74:6 92:17 opposed 99:11	33:1 50:23,24 65:1 partially 68:16
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18 100:9,17,19 101:11 102:5 Newlin 1:12	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2 noticed 4:2 number 44:24 53:23 83:14	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19 83:15 88:21 okay 5:3,20 16:8 16:17 17:4	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1 74:6 92:17 opposed 99:11 option 61:4	33:1 50:23,24 65:1 partially 68:16 particular 65:17
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18 100:9,17,19 101:11 102:5 Newlin 1:12 4:20,21 9:12	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2 noticed 4:2 number 44:24 53:23 83:14 90:24	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19 83:15 88:21 okay 5:3,20 16:8 16:17 17:4 18:10 21:12	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1 74:6 92:17 opposed 99:11 option 61:4 options 56:11	33:1 50:23,24 65:1 partially 68:16 particular 65:17 80:24 84:17
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18 100:9,17,19 101:11 102:5 Newlin 1:12 4:20,21 9:12 9:15,18 10:11	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2 noticed 4:2 number 44:24 53:23 83:14	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19 83:15 88:21 okay 5:3,20 16:8 16:17 17:4 18:10 21:12 23:22 24:2	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1 74:6 92:17 opposed 99:11 option 61:4 options 56:11 87:4	33:1 50:23,24 65:1 partially 68:16 particular 65:17 80:24 84:17 88:10
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18 100:9,17,19 101:11 102:5 Newlin 1:12 4:20,21 9:12 9:15,18 10:11 11:8 15:20,24	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2 noticed 4:2 number 44:24 53:23 83:14 90:24	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19 83:15 88:21 okay 5:3,20 16:8 16:17 17:4 18:10 21:12 23:22 24:2 25:22 26:11	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1 74:6 92:17 opposed 99:11 option 61:4 options 56:11 87:4 order 26:1 67:20	33:1 50:23,24 65:1 partially 68:16 particular 65:17 80:24 84:17 88:10 Particularly
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18 100:9,17,19 101:11 102:5 Newlin 1:12 4:20,21 9:12 9:15,18 10:11 11:8 15:20,24 16:6 18:6 21:4	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2 noticed 4:2 number 44:24 53:23 83:14 90:24 nutshell 88:4	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19 83:15 88:21 okay 5:3,20 16:8 16:17 17:4 18:10 21:12 23:22 24:2 25:22 26:11 27:20 28:22	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1 74:6 92:17 opposed 99:11 option 61:4 options 56:11 87:4 order 26:1 67:20 88:10 92:19	33:1 50:23,24 65:1 partially 68:16 particular 65:17 80:24 84:17 88:10 Particularly 62:2
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18 100:9,17,19 101:11 102:5 Newlin 1:12 4:20,21 9:12 9:15,18 10:11 11:8 15:20,24 16:6 18:6 21:4 21:9 23:8,13	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2 noticed 4:2 number 44:24 53:23 83:14 90:24 nutshell 88:4 O	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19 83:15 88:21 okay 5:3,20 16:8 16:17 17:4 18:10 21:12 23:22 24:2 25:22 26:11 27:20 28:22 33:17 39:24	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1 74:6 92:17 opposed 99:11 option 61:4 options 56:11 87:4 order 26:1 67:20 88:10 92:19 ordinance 13:20	33:1 50:23,24 65:1 partially 68:16 particular 65:17 80:24 84:17 88:10 Particularly 62:2 parties 24:15
80:18,19 84:25 93:10,25 94:18 100:9,17,19 101:11 102:5 Newlin 1:12 4:20,21 9:12 9:15,18 10:11 11:8 15:20,24 16:6 18:6 21:4	noticeable 50:18 50:25 51:2 noticed 4:2 number 44:24 53:23 83:14 90:24 nutshell 88:4 0 0 5:25	78:17,21 79:12 80:7 81:3,19 83:15 88:21 okay 5:3,20 16:8 16:17 17:4 18:10 21:12 23:22 24:2 25:22 26:11 27:20 28:22	10:11 37:12 68:10 73:1 74:6 92:17 opposed 99:11 option 61:4 options 56:11 87:4 order 26:1 67:20 88:10 92:19	33:1 50:23,24 65:1 partially 68:16 particular 65:17 80:24 84:17 88:10 Particularly 62:2 parties 24:15 102:12

				Page 114
6:20	phrase 58:11	33:6,18,24	36:7,16 59:17	70:25
party 36:5 84:21	73:9	36:10,19 43:18	84:18 87:4	
party 30:3 84:21 pass 70:3	physical 53:21	55:11 56:22	89:24 100:9,11	procedurally 85:2 86:16
1	pick 80:3	65:19 66:21	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	100:7
path 47:11,19 Patrick's 94:8	1	68:9 72:23	100:24	
Paul 1:18 3:3	picture 40:24 44:3 49:16	73:13,15 74:23	pour 70:22 PP 1:18	proceed 7:11 12:12 96:3
	52:11	78:25 83:12		
5:18 44:23,23 45:18 62:23	-	92:24 94:24	practical 20:10	proceeding
	pictures 62:14	101:10	practically 9:5,6 13:23	90:18,21 92:24
peace 72:1,3 84:16 94:21	pie 20:15,16,17			proceedings 1:5 65:19
	piggybacking	pointer 40:10	PRECISION 1:23	
pending 7:1	70:19	points 27:17	-	process 6:24
Pennsylvania	PL 1:6	31:3 49:6	precluding	7:10 9:11
49:3	place 89:5,6	83:21 90:13	78:18	10:14 14:11
people 4:13	102:8	pole 37:16 51:11	prefaced 45:23	18:14 20:22
12:10 42:24	Places 78:12	67:4	preferences 8:7	21:3 33:4,21
53:16 74:5	placing 82:19	poles 18:3 49:11	preferred 9:2	58:22 68:5
96:16 97:18	plan 27:4 33:21	political 80:23	prepared 7:18	78:22 80:4
people's 34:25	34:12,16 36:4	poll 46:19,21	7:24 11:2	81:7 86:23
35:20	39:15,18 40:1	61:23 62:10,11	12:11 33:23	processed 77:7
percent 21:16	43:13 45:6,17	71:14 72:20	65:19	professionals
21:16 22:1	46:3 47:2,4,5,8	73:21 74:25	prepper 70:22	5:12 56:20
25:16 27:1,16	47:20 58:21	75:2 83:4	present 1:10,16	97:16
percentage	60:12 74:11	84:17 86:17	83:5 94:1	prohibit 24:21
25:23,24	77:3 79:22,22	88:4	presented 8:11	prohibited 22:3
perfect 56:22	101:7	pop-up 56:7,9	10:12,13 50:20	77:15
permits 25:10	planner 34:8,13	pop-ups 56:9	76:2,20 94:18	project 59:21
27:24	34:16 36:12	portion 12:17	95:10	projected 39:15
permitted 29:7,9	plans 6:16 45:14	20:10,16 33:5	presenting	projector 40:13
77:17,19	63:21 69:7	38:16 41:21	76:17	promise 80:15
person 56:22	73:12 93:25	42:3 44:20	pretty 18:7,14	96:16
72:12	95:6	60:5	30:16 49:4	prongs 86:21
Personally	planting 35:8,20	portions 20:13	82:2 91:5,20	proofs 81:23
47:16 90:22	plantings 34:21	position 33:20	95:24	proper 79:1
perspective 10:4	35:9	68:21 91:23	prevailing 13:21	properly 59:24
10:10,18,19	play 13:9 17:17	92:17	previously 8:14	65:9
44:6 53:9	20:3 36:12	positioned 76:3	43:25	properties 34:25
64:21 84:7	55:2	positive 65:2	primarily 8:15	78:3,4,8,19
persuasion	played 36:13	possibilities	8:24	79:18,24
80:23	plays 82:22	13:17 14:7	principal 36:18	property 30:17
Petticoat 70:10	please 45:21	66:23	77:16	33:5,15 34:20
phase 84:25	50:7 85:15	possibility 13:24	prior 61:16	34:21 35:9,20
phone 78:20	95:16 96:4	43:12	private 24:15	36:10,14,19,22
83:15 89:2,3	point 5:1 9:13	possible 39:16	probability 67:3	37:1 54:4,22
photo 10:11,13	10:2 11:17	possibly 39:14	probably 8:16	55:13,17 58:25
61:11,12 70:16	13:15 19:20	85:1	14:19 16:18	60:5,6,23
photograph	21:12,14,15,17	potential 7:20	45:15 61:2	68:11 78:10
62:18	22:11 24:14,14	36:23 64:22	95:2,11	80:3,5 89:21
photographs	24:25 28:6	82:14	problem 30:16	91:11
48:7 49:5	31:9 32:20,24	potentially 33:3	34:24 68:4	propose 11:2

				Page 115
18:21	74:19 88:5	34:19	32:8,18 92:22	regard 8:6 11:14
proposed 7:7,12	pursuit 74:12	quite 9:15	100:9	11:19 13:15
19:15,15 76:8	pursuit 74.12 push 41:7 54:4	quote 11:14	received 31:9	17:7 76:7 80:6
76:24 77:5	97:4	quote 11.14	32:10	84:16,16 85:2
79:3 86:22	pushing 55:14	R	recess 85:9	regarding 17:6
91:4	97:2	R 2:1 6:1 102:1	recognition	17:7 18:11
proposing 19:23	put 6:7 7:23	radios 14:21	19:25 74:15	82:9
22:3 72:18	22:23,24 23:5	raggedy 47:23	recognize 10:16	Register 78:11
proprietary	24:7,19 29:19	raises 94:21	recognized	regularly 4:2
22:18 23:11	32:18 38:18	raising 99:23	12:22	regulations
protect 23:8	39:17 50:1,6	Randolph 48:18	recollection 64:5	25:19
79:23	50:13 51:16	rates 13:21	64:12,15 68:23	reiterate 90:7
proven 89:12	52:12,18,19	re-explain 9:13	recommend	relate 38:25
90:2	53:13 54:20	reach 31:7	28:25	related 7:12
provide 10:25	56:6 57:9 59:1	reached 90:2	recommendati	39:3
12:7,15,15,16	59:13,15,15,21	read 79:9	22:7 29:19	relation 63:4
63:10 94:1	59:24 68:11	real 19:10	recommends	relative 11:20
provided 15:9	70:21,23 71:8	reality 13:7 68:3	24:20	46:25 74:11
15:14 20:5	83:21 85:12	realize 98:17	reconsider 7:11	102:11,13
75:19,21 91:21	88:3,12	realized 91:19	record 5:16,17	relayed 92:5
provider 28:8	putting 13:1	really 27:15,22	6:17 26:18	relevant 25:25
65:24 67:3	28:20 34:25	29:6 30:19	62:4,4,25 63:5	reliable 8:21
	36:15 37:1	35:2 47:16,22	63:18 76:22	
providing 79:11	58:24 94:14	51:10,11 56:1		10:25 12:8,16 14:24 17:22
provision 26:1 26:23	38:24 94:14	56:8 72:14	81:25 84:16,20	relief 26:22 37:6
	0	82:2 91:23	85:11 86:14	
provisions 77:18	quantify 18:1	reapproach 93:7	88:12 92:19	relitigate 95:13
proximate 55:6	quantitative	reason 14:3 34:7	recording 85:16	relocate 33:2 36:10 54:9
proximity 53:21 53:22	33:8,10 63:14	34:21 45:10	rectangle 44:11	
	question 12:25	55:3,4,22	44:13,17,17,19	relocating 32:25 44:6 58:20
public 3:15 8:12 8:17 9:5,20	18:7,11,20,22	60:10	recycling 43:16 52:2 56:14	
,	18:24 19:14,22	reasonable		remaining 31:1
11:10 20:22 21:3 25:19	19:24 21:10,19	10:25 20:15,21	redevelopment 78:9 79:21	67:19,21 remains 8:6
33:4 58:22	34:3 37:9,19	21:19 34:13	reduce 44:24	13:3
59:24 72:25	38:21 44:10,13	35:13,18,21	65:22 67:3	remedies 7:19
73:16 74:4	53:19 56:5	45:11 64:9	81:15	remember 9:3
	65:23 70:19	68:13 74:18	reduced 89:14	14:20 43:6
75:10 76:12,21 77:25 78:22	71:15,16 72:9	reasonably 34:8		57:20 61:11
79:6 80:4 81:6	74:6 86:16	74:21	reducing 38:5	98:25
	88:7,17 99:25	reasons 17:25	60:18,20 88:15 88:16	remind 85:6
82:17 84:14,24 85:3 95:23	questions 14:17	54:10	reduction 46:4	remind 83:6 reminder 90:8
85:5 95:25	18:16,17 19:11	recall 6:22 8:1	65:8 92:4	reminder 90:8 remote 40:15
100:11,15	19:17 30:6	10:12 13:11	referred 31:14	remote 40:15 remove 42:12
pull 31:24	37:18 46:16	44:19 63:15	32:2 70:8	removed 40:21
pumps 71:8,11	61:7,9 72:12	64:3 65:6	referring 42:17	77:13
punt 99:6	72:25 73:16,16	66:12 88:3	reflect 10:14	reopening 83:4
purpose 20:8	74:4 77:1 85:7	recapitulate	reflected 9:11	100:25
purpose 20:8 purposes 5:13	87:25 100:15	92:18	63:21,21	repeat 60:15
purposes 5:15 pursuing 74:14	quickly 19:10	receive 31:16	refresh 13:10	report 11:14
Pur sung /4.14	·1		1011031113.10	ι τερυτε 11.14
				-

15.10		25.10.17.20	07 00 1 10	151502162
15:13	respectful 11:4	25:10,17,20	97:22 98:1,18	15:1,5,23 16:3
Reporter 1:21	respectfully	26:2,7,8 27:9	99:3,12	16:7,11,15
102:5	14:13 75:18	28:9,18 29:5	rotate 40:4	17:1,15 19:1,5
Reporters 1:23	76:9 78:13	29:23 30:5	Route 48:18,25	19:8,25 21:7
REPORTING	84:25	32:11 37:1	69:20,22 77:20	21:12,21 22:5
1:23	respond 31:12	40:19,23 41:3	ROWE 2:2	22:13,16 23:6
represent 56:24	36:6 45:20	41:5,15,18	RPR 102:19	25:11,18,24
56:24	72:7,18	42:3,17,20	run 49:25	26:21 27:2
representative	response 7:9,13	43:21 44:14	running 46:7	30:12 31:2,6
49:6	7:15 31:3,9,16	47:21 49:21	49:25 53:21	31:13,23 32:1
representing	31:22 32:10,18	50:17 54:23,25		32:6,8,13,17
31:20	72:19 74:14	56:5 57:8,12	$\frac{S}{COLOO}$	33:9,12,18
represents 77:3	87:25 101:8,16	58:6 59:3,12	S 2:1 3:8	34:4,6,23 35:7
request 5:10	responsibility	60:23 61:1	safe 16:23	35:18 36:2,8
45:12 48:9	35:1,20 39:6	64:17 65:15	Saganic 2:10	37:23 38:3,19
62:21	responsive 48:8	67:7 68:21	sake 18:18 38:12	38:25 39:18,20
requested 63:10	rest 27:2	69:11 71:13,14	59:11	39:25 40:6,11
requesting	restaurant 70:5	72:10,18 73:5	Sarah 2:11	40:16,19,23
74:24	rested 84:24,24	73:23 77:22	sarcastic 96:4	41:3,10,14
require 17:12	restrict 23:3	79:9 81:17	sarcastically	42:8,21 43:1,4
24:8,12	restriction 80:16	82:19 83:8,18	83:11	44:5,9 45:2,20
required 7:6	returned 78:20	85:4 87:18	satisfactorily	45:22 46:8,13
13:19 17:22	revenue 100:4	88:1,3 89:6	74:20	46:21 47:9
34:9 64:21	review 7:14	90:5 91:6	save 44:2,14	48:6,13,21,24
81:24,25 92:20	10:11 33:21	93:12 94:15	saying 10:24	49:2,10,17
94:9 98:11	93:16,19	96:21 98:17	16:1 22:24	50:4 52:14
requirement	revised 33:22	100:15,17,18	26:11 36:1	53:11 54:8,15
22:17	47:5 93:25	100:25 101:7	45:18 59:9	55:1,11,19
requires 8:18	101:4	101:14,16	80:10 83:11	56:17 57:5,20
21:20 86:21	revising 31:8	right-hand 42:6	94:21	57:24 58:8,19
residential 30:2	revisit 100:2	42:12 55:17	says 13:25 15:14	59:9 60:4,9,15
78:7,19 79:17	RF 9:22 12:21	right-of-way	19:7 24:20	61:2,14 62:19
79:23 99:19	13:9 14:19	25:20 82:17,20	25:6 27:3	63:16,17,24
residentials	36:13 44:6	road 1:5,8 31:7	54:24,25 58:13	64:2,7,11
96:23 98:21	Rich 9:12 21:9	78:14	62:25 75:14	65:18 66:5,11
residents 99:6	43:19 66:9	roadways 82:13	80:19 89:5	66:17,19 67:22
resolution 24:20	71:21 72:6	Rob 72:6,18	93:8 98:20	68:1 69:25
27:21 28:23	81:18 95:15	95:12	scenario 12:3	70:4,8,12,16
29:20,25 30:3	96:6	ROBERT 2:8	14:5 17:17	70:24 71:4,9
resolved 12:1	Richard 2:5	role 27:22 28:17	60:11	71:16 73:5,6,7
74:20 91:17	6:18	roll 4:4 85:17	scenarios 23:23	74:8 76:1
respect 7:17	rid 57:7,15	room 36:4 37:6	schedule 94:24	79:24 86:13,13
12:9 26:21	ridiculous 78:18	86:15 98:3	95:15	88:8 89:17
36:15 62:5	right 5:1 6:4	ROSA 102:4,19	scheduled 4:2	90:17 93:13,16
64:16 65:1,20	14:16 15:5,12	Rosenbaum	scheduling	94:3,7 95:12
76:2 78:17	15:21 16:14	1:13 4:16,17	95:22,25,25	95:16 96:7,11
83:2 84:7	17:10 18:8,17	17:11 18:1,8	Schneider 2:5,5	97:14 98:12
92:24 95:22	19:1,4,16 22:2	58:15 86:2,3	6:5,12,15,18	Schneider's
96:1 101:4	22:20 24:11	88:19 90:6,20	6:19 9:14,17	73:11 78:3

				Page II/
school 8:22	56:2,2,14,16	53:17	simple 81:5	36:4
11:18,22 12:1	61:18 62:1,13	sheds 51:23	83:12	sorry 9:12 23:22
12:5 14:17	62:13 64:21	52:18,19,22,24	simply 7:22	23:25 24:1,2
15:10,16 16:24	70:23 71:10,19	55:25 57:9	11:13 52:4	25:14 33:9
17:5,9 18:11	78:5,6,9,10	sheet 39:18 40:7	73:4 81:3	38:23 39:17
64:15,24 65:6	83:16,24 87:1	40:7	sims 10:12,13	50:4,21 66:9
65:10,13 68:3	90:11 91:8,17	shelters 55:6	61:12	71:9 81:18
68:6,10,13,14	90:11 91:8,17	sheriffs 80:18	simulation	sort 18:13
68:20 69:5,5	101:13	shield 33:25	61:18 62:13	sought 22:6
69:10 90:2	seeing 62:9	34:10 57:25	simulations	sought 22.0 sound 49:9
92:7 93:7	seek 22:8 67:20	shift 44:13 55:12	61:13	sound 49.9 sounds 64:8
100:1		97:19		93:14
	seeking 58:10		sincerely 7:20	
scout 63:7	seen 18:13 47:16	shifting 58:24	12:13	south 70:14 95:9
screen 40:13	47:17 48:3	Shopping 8:10	single 52:18	Sovolos 4:9
screened 55:22	49:13 69:23	short 67:9	sir 64:12	85:22
screening 30:24	sense 44:25	Shorthand 1:21	site 12:8 21:1	SP-2 40:7
45:9	73:17 74:2,3	1:23 102:5	27:4 33:21	spaces 17:6
Sears 48:22	79:14	shot 96:1	34:15 39:5,15	41:16
seat 85:15	sent 29:3	show 49:15 97:6	39:18 43:13	speak 6:8 84:14
second 19:24	sentence 90:17	Sica 79:5	45:6,14,17	95:16
24:25 28:8	separate 39:22	side 42:7,12 49:3	46:3 47:2,5,8	speaking 9:5,6,6
36:18 40:8	40:1 77:19	70:13,15	47:20 57:22	9:21 30:13
55:3 67:4	separated 53:9	sides 63:14	58:21 60:12	46:11
74:24 80:25	serious 21:10	88:24	63:13 64:15	species 40:20
95:17	49:9	sign 31:4	65:24 73:12	specific 24:4
Secondly 62:23	seriously 49:13	signal 92:9	74:11 76:19	33:5 60:5
seconds 13:9	serve 68:6	significance	84:10 90:1	specifically 7:12
SECRETARY	SERVICE 1:23	44:5	101:7	11:8 14:20
4:5,7,9,12,15	set 102:9	significant 7:22	sites 64:22 65:4	52:23 56:21
4:18,20,22,24	setback 30:8,12	10:4,16,19	65:17 79:2	65:6 86:21
5:9 6:3,7 39:17	30:15,20 32:21	13:23 17:20	93:9	speculating 60:1
39:23 40:3,9	32:22 42:14,16	20:24 32:24	situation 17:18	spend 29:10
40:14,22 41:1	42:23 45:9	37:11 91:5	17:22 32:3	83:8
41:7,13 43:9	46:5 49:23	92:3	six 67:25	spending 29:5
50:6,10 85:14	76:24 78:19	significantly	size 38:5 54:14	spent 12:10
85:18,20,22,25	83:24,25 89:16	13:16 33:1,8	60:19 76:25	spirit 14:10
86:2,4,6,8,10	91:2,12,17	54:9	slang 10:1	53:25
94:5 96:22	setbacks 36:1	silence 31:11	smack 77:22	spoken 34:19
98:3,22	76:18 89:25	similar 57:15	small 43:3 82:17	spot 60:7
section 11:10	sets 87:22	Simon 2:8 33:19	smaller 37:21	square 44:11
60:22 61:5	seven 11:13	63:19 71:25	38:1,24	St 94:8
77:2 80:11	80:16,21	72:2,5,11	SMITH 2:2	stake 79:6
security 57:3	SGSL 2:8	74:22,24 85:7	SMSA 1:4 6:19	standard 34:11
see 18:25 23:2	Shade 35:14,15	86:15 87:8,25	solicit 74:8	77:18 86:20
40:20 41:6	35:19,22	88:1,3 94:11	solution 11:20	standards 45:13
43:5 44:11	shed 37:20	94:25 95:8,14	somebody 21:4	45:19
45:5 46:1	50:16 52:2,3,4	96:6,12 98:6,7	59:16 63:13	standpoint
52:11 53:2	52:12,12,13,18	100:14	67:10	30:15
54:1 55:24	52:18,19 53:14	Simon's 78:21	somewhat 14:2	stands 60:24
L	•		-	-

				Page 118
start 5:16 53:24	46:23 74:9	6:7,8,22 9:14	34:23 38:17	49:6 75:3
77:8,9 78:21	77:5 80:4	30:18,19 35:2	52:10 62:17,19	77:24 80:12
started 65:15	submit 76:9,16	35:5 41:13	66:12,13 75:19	89:24
state 69:24	81:22	44:23 52:11,17	76:19 78:13	test 79:5,16
78:11 80:11	submitted 34:17	61:19 69:13	84:10 85:5,7	92:20
102:5	63:22 75:4,7	84:13,15 87:13	90:11,13 92:17	testified 12:3
stated 11:13	76:15 77:6	93:7,11 100:19	93:17	17:16,20 48:15
statement 77:14	81:12 84:11	Surely 37:6	takeaway 7:2	79:12
stays 59:5	substantial 77:4	surprise 75:23	taken 20:9 35:12	testimony 5:21
stealth 8:11 10:5	77:8 79:8	75:23	44:24 75:2	9:22 12:21,24
26:6 49:17	101:11	surprises 68:20	85:9 102:7	14:18 15:13
83:1	substantially	surrounding	takes 20:17 99:5	16:18,20 27:18
stealthing 27:8	7:14 67:18	34:20 44:1	talk 6:14 30:22	30:24 63:12
Steck 36:17 37:3	69:11	survey 63:22	39:15 51:8,9	64:1,12 65:5
stenographica	sudden 75:22	Susan 2:9	81:6,7	68:12,24 72:11
102:8	80:19 81:18	suspect 55:2,3	talked 21:25	72:12,14,21,24
steps 54:12	suddenly 83:22	swear 5:13,20	46:25 73:12	73:14,15 75:9
Steve 5:9 18:13	sue 81:1,2	swing 91:5	80:17 82:18,18	75:20,21 76:20
18:21 22:14	sufficient 7:5	switch 59:25	91:1	76:23 77:10,23
23:9 27:17	suggest 71:6,20	sworn 3:3,4,15	talking 9:8 10:3	81:11 82:9
65:12 72:9	71:21	5:1,12,17,25	10:8,9 11:15	84:23 92:22
86:16	suggested 39:10	6:2 75:20,21	16:19 27:13	100:9,13,14,17
Steve's 79:9	97:14	Symonds 1:14	36:24 43:19	102:7
STEVEN 2:3	suggestion 39:7	4:18,19 37:9	44:16 59:5	thank 4:15 6:3
stipulated 13:2	96:11	37:14,17,25	64:14 69:21	6:13 14:15
stop 96:9,10	suggestions	38:22 54:6	95:14	65:12 71:12
storm 71:11	74:14	86:4,5 91:16	talks 79:22	85:2 86:15
straighten 26:20	suit 87:17,19	99:16	tall 63:8 79:11	88:1 98:12
straw 46:19,21	summarily 7:8	system 92:8	taller 22:4 23:2	100:6
61:23 62:10,11	8:15	Systems 82:13	23:4 24:22	Thanks 33:17
71:14 72:20	summarized		64:10	theoretically
73:21 74:25	18:13	T	Tax 26:22	24:18 41:24
75:2 83:4	summary 89:11	T 3:8 6:1 102:1	taxpayers' 12:11	53:8 67:24
84:17 86:17	summation	102:1	technical 18:7	68:1
88:4	95:18	T-Mobile 66:1	54:2 66:7	theory 67:2
structure 8:1	summations	66:20 67:9	technologies	thing 14:1,1
10:17 11:3	75:2	TAGLAIRINO	79:3	21:23,24 38:13
26:6 34:1	summed 77:24	1:17 4:5,7,9,12	technology	38:14 47:11,18
39:12 65:21	sump 71:8,11	4:15,18,20,22	82:12	47:23 57:15
66:6	superimpose	4:24 5:9 6:3,7	Ted 2:11	58:13,14 59:2
structure's 66:6	62:15 92:6	39:17,23 40:3	telecommunic	59:25 76:25
structures 15:15	supplemental	40:9,14,22	79:21 82:16	87:8 89:15
stuff 21:11	12:24 34:9,12	41:1,7,13 43:9	tell 18:22 53:14	99:5 100:25
29:11 38:9,10	support 17:13	50:6,10 85:14	88:9	things 27:4
38:16 59:15	45:7 97:10	85:18,20,22,25	ten 8:16 10:3	30:14 45:10,14
99:19,20	supported 26:18	86:2,4,6,8,10	26:25 94:1	47:20 64:25
subject 8:16	supporter 100:3	94:5 96:22	100:20	73:11 84:3,9
33:5,15 34:12	supposed 89:5	98:3,22 take 13:11 31:6	terms 11:11 34:1	think 6:15 7:2,3
37:23 45:22	sure 4:12 5:15	lake 13.11 31:0	34:9 45:13	7:3,4 8:18 9:19

9:25 10:6,10	18:15	tomorrow 36:9	56:24 67:5,20	trick 71:12
10:19,22 11:1	thought 18:14	tonight 4:3 5:3	78:19,20 80:18	triggering 43:13
11:3,7 12:2,19	57:25 63:17,25	6:14 8:19	88:25 89:20	triggers 36:7,7
14:19 15:6	68:5 84:22,22	12:25 46:17	91:10	trouble 50:4
16:17 17:1,15	87:20 94:12	47:7 49:21	township 1:1	true 24:8,9 66:3
18:14,18,22	99:24	61:22 68:19	8:22 11:18,22	67:12,15 102:6
19:12,13 20:19	thousand 77:21	71:23 73:5,19	12:4,9 15:10	trust 13:25
25:16 26:22	thousands 20:17	86:17 87:1	15:15 22:17	58:13
27:12,14,22	threat 76:10	88:6 94:13	23:1,3 24:21	truth 5:22,22,22
28:21,22 29:2	87:14	95:18 97:2	25:2 27:21,25	try 51:14 52:6
29:9,12,22	threatening	101:9,15	28:3,16 29:3,3	56:22 67:7
30:5,14 32:21	76:11,13	top 21:25 54:13	29:17 31:7,14	75:15 83:16
33:12,13 34:19	three 10:13 15:7	65:7 90:25	31:18 32:9	89:20
35:3 39:20	15:7 29:5 30:6	topic 34:19	33:4 34:8,13	trying 9:19,25
40:3 42:17,20	32:24 33:22	37:10	35:14 36:9	51:18 56:18
43:24 44:3,14	36:10 42:2	total 54:14	37:24 38:1,3,5	58:18 60:16
45:4,11,16,19	48:8 49:5,6	tower 8:8 13:2	45:25 46:2,25	66:22
47:6,13,14,18	55:6 58:1 69:9	14:24 16:9	56:20 59:14	turnaround
47:23 48:2,3,3	83:21,22,25	18:20,24 19:14	60:4,18 67:7	59:13
48:10 49:3,12	three-year 14:11	19:15,18,19,23	70:1 78:16	turned 19:8
52:21 54:3,15	threshold 82:1	22:3,6,20 23:2	80:2 82:16	35:10 70:25
56:22 58:8	throw 48:14	25:21 26:25	83:16,23	84:8
59:6 60:3,9,13	96:12	27:18 28:10	tradeoff 10:6	turnpike 47:22
61:3,21,24	Thursday 1:7	29:4,7 37:11	17:4	turns 35:7
62:6,9 63:9,12	94:15 95:5	39:2,12 41:4	traffic 59:14	twice 87:12
64:8 66:21	96:14 97:15	41:14,25 42:17	trailed 19:1	two 13:11 14:16
67:6,8 68:4,9	Thursdays	42:24 43:12	transcript 1:3	18:16 24:15
69:20,25 71:22	96:13	44:7,17 46:23	79:14 102:7	31:9 32:20
71:25 74:22,24	tie 94:7	50:1,13 51:5	transparently	41:22 42:1
83:3 85:6 87:2	tied 23:11	51:10,11,25	80:1	48:8,14 52:19
87:6 88:2,10	till 80:21	53:3,9,22,24	travel 95:6	52:20,24 66:13
88:11,12,17	time 5:8 6:23	54:4,7,9,13,21	treated 96:5	77:19 82:7
89:11,13 90:1	17:13 18:15	55:3,5,12 59:3	tree 8:11 14:3,4	84:6 96:21
90:20 91:11	20:21 21:15	59:12 64:16,23	26:5,9 35:14	97:6 98:16
92:3,16,18	29:11 45:16	67:20 68:6,11	35:15,19,22	99:10
94:12,24 95:3	46:20 53:25	69:21,21,23	37:16 40:20	two-fold 53:12
95:12,18,19,23	63:19 71:24	76:23 77:11	44:15,19 45:9	two-step 19:11
96:1,4,5,7,16	78:15 80:22	78:9,10 79:3	47:13,15,22	type 81:22
96:16 97:8,18	82:3,18,19	79:10 80:8	48:18 65:21	
99:1,16 100:12	87:5,6,6 88:13	81:1 82:11	66:23 69:23	
thinking 29:11	88:19,24 89:3	83:6 88:15,16	77:11 83:1	U 5:25
70:22	90:7 95:6 99:4	89:3,21 92:6	trees 35:24 44:2	ugly 47:16,22
third 41:18	99:5 100:21	92:10	44:24 46:4	52:17
81:13 94:14	102:8	towers 25:19	47:16 48:1,5,8	ultimately 7:18
95:4,20	timing 95:7	51:13 77:19	48:12 49:14	13:17 20:23 87:6
third-party's	today 39:22	town 23:13,14	62:25 63:8,20	87:6 unbelievable
35:9	90:12 92:19,25	23:15 24:7,15	64:13 77:12	83:20 84:5
THOMAS 1:13	told 50:8	25:7 30:19	tribunal 87:19	unclear 92:8,10
thoroughly	Tom 88:21	48:16 49:25,25	Tribune 4:3	uncical 72.0,10
	 	l	l	l

				Page 120
uncommon 39:8	variations 49:13	W	73:24 76:1	wife 19:7
underground	various 76:7		78:16 82:1	wiggle 37:6
70:21,23	80:16	wait 59:20 66:2	84:2 89:1	wild 46:9,18
understand 31:2	vary 48:4	66:2 75:5,20	90:10	willing 27:25
32:20 37:2	vegetation 77:12	75:21,24 95:3	we'll 6:15 65:15	45:25 67:19
42:14 45:6	verbal 31:17	97:3	83:16,24 85:5	68:19 91:4
55:1 56:17	Verizon 1:5 5:4	waiting 86:12 96:23	85:7 94:10	window 40:13
58:6 89:1,20	6:5,20 13:18	walk 46:17	101:13	wings 96:23
90:15 95:1,4	14:5 23:15	61:21 83:10	we're 5:5 6:5	wireless 1:5 6:20
100:8	24:7 33:25	walls 14:23	11:2 12:11	13:18 36:18
understanding	38:4 39:3 41:5	want 5:15 16:18	13:19 14:8	39:3 41:5 68:5
11:3 27:12	41:15,25 67:19	18:5 20:12,19	16:19 20:19	79:20
59:8	67:25 68:5	21:15 22:13	27:12,20 33:23	wished 7:9,10
understood	71:7 78:15	24:25 27:15	34:18 42:17	7:15
22:11 46:10	83:22 100:1	28:23 29:4	45:10 51:16	wishes 7:20,22
undertaken	Verizon's 21:13	30:19 35:12,19	52:16,16 62:13	73:24
86:23	99:20	36:6,9 39:24	65:15 72:15	withdraw 18:9
undertaking	Vernon 1:9	40:17 46:8,19	73:4,18,19	withstanding
101:11	verse 10:5 11:13	49:21 56:5	75:22 77:22	13:5
undo 80:25	versus 8:23	57:7 58:19	78:17 80:10,24	witness 9:22
undue 7:17	16:20 47:13	59:21 62:8	80:24 81:3,19	witnesses 76:23
unfair 65:23	64:23 77:21	64:4 68:14	82:8 83:12	94:19,20
74:25	79:6	69:20 73:21	84:18,25 85:14	wonder 14:23
unknown 76:24	view 28:22 40:1	80:25 81:6,7	85:15,15 86:12	wondering 5:12
76:25	Village 8:10	83:14 84:14	86:14 88:2	70:20
unofficial 72:19	50:17 51:4,17	88:18 89:9	89:4 97:12,13	wood 50:2,14
unwillingness	51:21 52:20	93:5,23 95:3	98:9,22,23,23	51:10 53:3
93:6	57:10	97:5,8,11,19	99:1,1 100:8	word 78:18 82:6
updates 101:6	violate 77:17	98:16 99:4,9	we've 34:14	82:6
upfront 5:6 11:7	violative 74:25	100:7	45:15 53:11,24	words 13:12
upper 55:16	visit 34:15 57:22	wanted 29:6	79:9	20:6 26:4,5
upper-most	63:13 76:19	57:23,24	wear 94:7	37:25 39:11
54:21	100:4	wants 28:1,2	week 24:16	work 14:21 35:3
upper-right	visual 9:7 10:4	55:5 61:21	97:13,19	56:20 58:23
44:20	10:15 57:4,7	66:18 71:21	welcome 4:1 6:5	61:23 67:11
upsetting 84:6	62:5 75:11	73:9 95:2	6:13 47:9	70:2 73:10
use 4:12 9:25	76:18 88:13,14	wasn't 23:18,20	92:22	98:6 99:17
20:13 25:25	88:16 90:8,10	59:24 68:25	went 18:14	works 40:15
29:7,9,11,18	92:3,21	78:16 82:4	59:10 63:18	55:23 57:10
29:19 36:18	vividly 9:4	91:1	75:4 76:8	61:24 72:13
38:7 72:16	Vogel 2:5 6:18	Water 71:2,3,4	78:15 91:22,22	75:23 82:12,15
75:1 77:2,3,16	voltage 59:6	way 20:3,7	west 48:25 49:1	88:25 95:6
77:18 89:2	vote 7:11 61:17	26:12 31:5	whatsoever	worried 52:16
uses 77:16 80:5	74:1 81:21	32:10,18 35:12	31:22	worth 20:24
usually 39:9 97:15	87:3 votes 7:5 75:16	39:8,10 41:23	whichever 27:1	27:12 74:14,19
97:13		41:24 43:25	Whitig 98:23	88:5,11,17
V	voting 62:16	48:7 58:11	wide 82:25 92:24	90:18,21
vantage 49:6	73:4,18 Vwa-La 75:22	60:23 62:16	92:24 width 54:17	worthy 45:24 wouldn't 20:7,8
	v wa-La 13.22	68:8 72:13	wiuii 34.1/	
	1	1	1	1

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					Page 121
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	25.7 12 26.4	1.800 38·8 12	12.4 22.1	57-something	90.19 91.20 23
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				0	· · · · ·
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		· ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			· · · · ·	70.2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				6	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				63:4	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	0				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		· ·		62:3 64:4,13	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			· · · · · ·		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	X	<i>'</i>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	X 1:6 3:1,8 5:25			642-4299 1:24	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				68 78:3	9
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$					9:05 85:10
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					9:10 85:11
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					9:30 101:18
yeah 49:20 52:15 56:9 61:20 83:15 96:25 100:12 year 6:6,10,12 13:10 years 15:7 21:4 29:5 33:22 83:13 91:21 36:10 57:21 58:1 69:9 71:1 83:13 91:21 120-foot 16:8 83:13 91:21 120-foot 16:8 130 75:21 83:13 90:9 83:25 yellow 41:7 83:10 York 1:4 6:19120 7:7 $8:3,14$ 9:24 10:14 11:12,15 14:24 15:24 16:3,4 23rd 75:5 81:18 23rd 75:5 81:18 23rd 75:5 81:18 23rd 75:5 81:18 23rd 75:5 81:18 30 13:9 64:9 30X1 102:20 31st 97:5,9,20 98:5,10 99:21 20:5 22:4 23:2 23:42 47,22 20:5 22:4 23:2 23:42 47,22 23:42 47,22 23:5 44:19 82:19 23:5 44:19 82:19 25:5,8 26:11 20:5 22:4 23:2 23:42 47,22 240 54:6 29:21 30:11 25:10 61:12 68:16 75:19,20 81:15 83:13 91:21 140-feet 79:11 17-18 1:4 17-18 1:4 100:9 200162800 102:20 00162800 102:20 00162800 102:20 00162800 102:20 00162800 102:20 00162800 102:20 00162800 102:20 00162800 102:20 00162800 102:20 00162800 102:20 00162800 1102:20 00163801 102:20 <td></td> <td></td> <td>· · ·</td> <td></td> <td></td>			· · ·		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	U		,		908 1:24
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		· · · · ·	· · · · ·		95 14:25
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		<i>'</i>		69:22	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	•	<i></i>			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		· · · · ·			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			3		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			30 13:9 64:9		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			30XI 102:20		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	83:25		31st 97:5,9,20	· · · · ·	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	•		98:5,10 99:21		
York 1:4 6:19 $68:16 \ 75:19,20$ $81:15 \ 83:13$ $91:21$ $35 \ 54:19 \ 82:19$ $3B \ 33:18$ $25:5,8 \ 26:11$ 			100:9		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	York 1:4 6:19		35 54:19 82:19	· · ·	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	7		3B 33:18	· · · · ·	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $,	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		17 1:6,7		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		17-18 1:4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		17th 4:4 94:6,10			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	0	94:16 96:3	46.2 80:11		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	20011141:11143:4	98:14,14,16	5		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	0	99:19,20			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		18 20:17		,	
$\begin{array}{c c} \textbf{07976 } 1:9 \\ \hline \hline 1 \\ \hline 1 \\ 1:6 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{1st } 40:6 \\ \hline \hline 2 \\ \textbf{20 } 10:3.8.17 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{00 } 10:0 \ \textbf{3010} \\ \textbf{36:25 } 60:10 \\ \textbf{64:4,13 } 67:10 \\ \textbf{57-point-some} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \textbf{81:15 } 82:5,11 \\ \textbf{82:24 } 83:9,13 \\ \textbf{83:13 } 84:9 \\ \hline \end{array}$		19 69:22			
$\frac{1}{1.1.6} \frac{2}{20,10:3.8.17} \begin{bmatrix} 300,200,000 \\ 64:4,13,67:10 \\ 57\text{-point-some} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0,1110,0210,111 \\ 82:24,83:9,13 \\ 83:13,84:9 \end{bmatrix}$		1st 40:6		,	
$\frac{1}{1.1.6} = \frac{2}{20,10:3.8,17} = 57\text{-point-some} = 83:13,84:9$				· · · · · ·	
11.6 $2010.30.17$ 1	1			· · · · · ·	
30:17 88:5,11 90:9	1 1:6	20 10:3,8,17			
			50.17	00.5,11 70.7	